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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study was conceived primarily to study the relationship between the supervisor and the trainee in the counselor education process. The study grew out of a concern with the counseling practicum in the process of counselor education. More specifically, it grew out of attempts to help beginning counselors profit from their supervised practicum experiences.

Recent developments in counselor education have seen widespread support for the assignment of supervised counseling practice to a central position in school counselor education. Both the APGA policy statement (37) and the APA Division 17 statement (1) on counselor education accord a major position to supervised practice. It is noteworthy that the APGA statement calls for supervised practice "... to consume approximately one-fourth of the entire counselor education program ...;" while an earlier APA statement on counselor training states that, "The practicum is in some respects the most important phase of the whole process of training in counseling." Further support for supervised experience is provided by the Wrenn report, the increased emphasis given to the supervised experience in recent NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institutes and the emphasis given it by recent writers.
Before focusing directly on the supervised counseling practicum, possibly a review of the use of supervision in industry and student teaching will add clarity to the meaning of supervision in counseling.

There has been an upheaval in industry that has nothing to do with machines and materials. It is a reversal in the supervisor's attitude toward his workers. Parker and Kleemeier (28) trace the historical transition from slavery, serfdom, craft guilds, through to mass production, and democratic trends. There has been a shifting pattern of industrial supervision. Only a few generations ago the boss was typically a person to be feared. Within his sphere of influence his word was law; he was a dictator who ruled his work force with an iron hand. Today this type is rare.

Perhaps the most important factor in bringing about this change in the nature of industrial supervision has been the great increase in the power of labor organizations since 1900. If employers did not give more consideration to their nonsupervisory workers, they risked the costs of labor unrest, slowdowns, and strikes. In the years after the end of World War I, the maturing science of psychology was being tested in industrial situations, where it was proving that productivity vastly increases when working people are treated as human beings who are important elements in the organization. Today's emphasis on a democratic type of supervision is based on the realization that management and labor have many objectives in common.
The title of "supervisor" covers a wide variety of work in industry. The term should be considered to apply to a person of either sex who represents the connecting link between the management and the workers. He is the sub-executive next in line to the working force. The term may include such titles as foremen, general foreman, assistant foreman, forewoman, gang boss, overseer, section chief, or leading man (8).

Brown (9) states that a long list of duties and responsibilities could be made, but lists four responsibilities that are the most important: planning jobs, passing information, getting results through others, and using authority properly. However, Beckman (8) discusses the significance of the supervisor's job in three general areas. First, the supervisor is important because the worker usually knows no other boss. The supervisor determines whether the worker holds his job, whether he is going to be considered for promotion, whether working conditions are agreeable and safe; it is he who gives the orders and supplies the workers with tools and materials. He alone has intimate personal touch with those who do the work. Skill in human relations is the second factor in the supervisor's duties. The employer now sees that since ninety per cent of his contacts with his workers must necessarily be through the supervisor, the latter's job demands additional qualifications of a special kind. Changing attitudes of workers have increased the importance of this function also. Because of the higher educational level, workers today are less satisfied with conditions and are more
inclined to express their views. The growth of unionism has also emphasized the supervisor's personal responsibilities. The supervisor's responsibilities have also changed in another respect. He has to share more responsibility with other divisions or departments. Consequently, increased emphasis is placed on his ability to cooperate and get along with others. The third major role of the supervisor is that of instructor. This may be accomplished by the apprentice system, a vestibule school, or by on the job instruction (29). At first instruction is practically individual, the supervisor devoting several hours at a time to one person, to make sure that the worker begins with the adoption of correct working procedures. After the foundation has been laid, one instructor can supervise several workers.

Brown (9) points out that there are two main types of supervisors. One is primarily work-conscious, concerned mainly with productivity, deadlines, schedules, down-time, losses, costs, and similar problems. The other understands fully the importance of getting out the work but is more worker-conscious; he knows that the only way he can accomplish the job effectively is through the willing cooperation of his work force. He strives constantly to make his workers efficient and know that if he succeeds the work will be turned out in far better quantity and quality even in his absence.

Supervisors of student teachers utilize supervision somewhat differently. A great deal of the development of supervised student teaching in the United States since 1800 has been in
imitation of earlier examples in foreign countries and is justi-
ified by analogies with other professions and a faith that less
social loss would occur by supervised practice than by haphazard
"trial and error acquisition of skill in teaching. In the United
States this work was begun in the early normal schools but of
course spread rapidly in the 1900's to colleges and universities.
There is evidence that the usual plan was for a normal school to
have facilities for "observation and practice" (24).

Today there are three major types of organization for the
supervision of student teaching. These seldom appear in the pure
form but rather are most often found to lie between these exact
types (3).

In the laboratory school type of supervision the director
of student teaching makes the placements, carries the paperwork,
observes occasionally, helps with problem cases, and checks the
final grades. Usually he carries ten per cent or less of the
actual responsibility for supervision. The student teacher is
assigned directly to the laboratory school teacher who carries
all the day to day responsibility for supervision. He is
especially employed and sometimes especially trained for this
task, and often carries the full responsibility for supervision.

In the public school type of supervision the placement
is made entirely by the college and checked by the principal.
The college supervisor conducts the campus seminar, observes the
student teacher each week, checks all lesson plans, is responsible
for the overall planning of instruction, and is entirely
responsible for the grade. He carries ninety per cent of the responsibility for supervision. The public school teacher gives the student teacher a place to work. He may help with the day to day supervision and planning but is not required to do so. His only responsibility is to be sure that the children are not being harmed.

In the professional type of supervision the college supervisor is involved in the placement, helps the cooperating teacher with the general planning, generally works through the teacher in his supervision, observes the student and has a few personal conferences, holds the campus seminar and is responsible for the final grade. The college supervisor carries from twenty to forty per cent of the responsibility for supervision. The cooperating public school teacher carries on all the day to day planning, evaluating and most of the individual conferences. He is able to secure help from the college supervisor whenever he needs it, but is professionally trained for this specific task and carries from sixty to eighty per cent of the responsibility.

The New York City Board of Education (27) lists as the goals of the student teaching program: to foster rapport between the student teachers and the school community; to develop in student teachers an understanding of the school program in action; to provide the student teacher with the opportunity to teach with confidence through planning, guiding, and evaluating learning experiences; to help the student teacher observe and cultivate the desirable personality traits which characterize the successful
teacher; and to inspire the student teacher toward a professional attitude and a love of teaching.

Thelen (39) states that one of the major objectives of teacher preparation is consolidation and internalization of role, education, and methodology; it is the problem of bringing these together, through supervised practice into an integrated psychic economy. The objective of consolidation is usually introduced along with supervised teaching. The student teacher often then role-plays the supervising teacher. Imitation under these conditions is the effort to find a model with which to compare his own situation, and the model provided by a friendly supervising teacher is a great deal better than no model. But gradually, the student teacher should test this model and modify it to fit his own unique temperament and way of life.

Andrews (2) lists some suggested joint responsibilities for the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher as: participating in two-way or three-way planning and evaluating conferences; helping set a climate favorable for the maximum growth of the student teacher; observing the student teacher at work; holding both informal and arranged conferences with the student teacher; making suggestions to the student teacher to facilitate the learning of pupils; making suggestions to the student teacher to help him solve some of his own professional and related personal problems; carrying on a continuous program of evaluation of the student teacher's progress and the effectiveness of his planning jointly with him.
Little is written about the student teacher supervisory relationship, but it may be seen that most supervisory conferences would be instructional or evaluative in nature. In recent years there has been recognition of a need for guidance services and techniques in student teaching. However, these are slow to be adopted.

Supervision in counseling has many facets including tutoring, practical experience, administration, and consultation. There is emphasis placed both on techniques as well as the relationship. Supervision, the immediate preceptorial tutoring in counseling, is said to have originated in the older psychoanalytic institutes of Europe through the simple need of young practitioners to learn practically from older colleagues. Dr. Max Eitingon of Berlin is usually given credit for having made it a formal requirement in the curriculum of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute. In the United States, supervision had an independent, or nearly independent, origin in the education of social workers. Today supervised practicum experience has become a standard educational method in the psychological world (13).

Before beginning a counseling practicum experience it is assumed that the trainee has already acquired a certain body of knowledge in this special field through courses, through an adequate study of the literature, through seminars and discussion groups, and is ready to start actual counseling. The usual practicum arrangement would then bring him into contact with the client, the supervisor from whom he is to learn and to whom he is
responsible, and possibly an administrator who maintains the practicum situation with its professional standards and demands in which both counseling services to clients and teaching services to trainees can be carried out.

The trainee has several counseling sessions with his clients. The general purpose of these sessions is for the trainee to help the client through the counseling and interpersonal skills which he already possesses and those he attempts to improve through his practicum experiences. The improvement of his skill is due not only to the experience of actually working with clients but also to the tutorial relationship with his supervisor. This relationship consists of regular, usually weekly, meetings with the supervisor which provides the trainee with an opportunity to discuss the problems of developing a counseling relationship.

The American Psychological Association (11) states that supervision involves at least four functions: planning, assignment, observation, and evaluation. The planning of the trainee's over-all program should be done in consultation with the trainee, taking into account his stage of training and needs. The assigning of tasks to the trainee should take into account the objectives set up in the over-all plan, the progress being made by the trainee, and the trainee's readiness to assume increasing responsibility. Observation of the trainee's performance may be done through direct observation, one-way screens, discussion of recorded counseling sessions, reading of case reports, and individual and group case conferences. To make the evaluations useful, they should be shared with the trainee so that he can learn
from his experiences and coordinate it with his total program. Most of the actual supervision takes place in the supervisory conference between the trainee and his supervisor.

Sanderson (36) talks about the supervisory relationship as a consultation process. Supervision is the process of helping the trainee make use of skills and his inner resources. It takes place through the medium of a face-to-face relationship. There may be considerable exchange of information between the trainee and the supervisor as they discuss the case at hand. The supervisor may encourage the trainee to express himself freely with regard to what he may have said or done with his client and whether or not he himself thinks he did the right thing. Both the supervisor and the trainee examine the assistance rendered, the techniques employed, and the feelings expressed by the trainee in the roles of counselor and trainee.

McGowan and Schmidt (23) note two major problems involved in counselor training. First, a student in training can be required to learn many of the necessary facts and principles, but can he be taught the attitudes that are essential in counseling? A second variation is that it is far easier to teach students what counseling is than it is to teach them how actually to counsel. Trainees may be highly knowledgeable about theory and techniques of counseling and still be quite ineffective counselors themselves. To contend with these difficulties, a supervised practicum in counseling is required as part of counselor training. Here the student can bring his academic learnings to the inter-
action between himself and another person through the actual experience of counseling. He can also examine his own counseling under the supervision of an effective and experienced counselor.

The purpose of the supervised practicum is to give the trainee experience in the practical application and integration of the principles and methods which he has studied. It also serves to acquaint him with the response, resistances, or irrelevant behavior of individual clients toward guidance situations and procedures. It may aid the trainee to acquire significant evidence regarding a type of future specialization for which he has some degree of aptitude and which is likely to result in occupational satisfaction. It may also provide the developmental opportunities for enhancing the trainee's concept of himself. The practicum provides learning situations which can facilitate the optimal growth of the person by freeing his potentialities to be himself. A unique aspect of the practicum, that which differentiates it from the didactic experiences, is that in the practicum, counseling theories assume meaning as they are applied to the individual clients and are critically evaluated. Supervised experience serves these purposes to the extent to which it provides opportunities for the trainee to experience actual counseling problems in adequate variety and to aid in their treatment with supervision sufficient to protect both trainee and client.

The effectiveness of supervision depends in large part upon the atmosphere within which the supervision occurs. The
effective supervisor is one who is able to establish a supervisory relationship conducive to self-development of the trainee, a relationship which is constructive rather than punitive. The effective supervisor must be sensitive to the feelings of the trainee as he struggles through the learning experiences and, at the same time, keep in mind the long-term objectives of training. He must know when to wait patiently for insights to develop and when to press for higher standards of performance. He aids the trainee in making progress toward accepting the client. This presupposes the trainee's acceptance of himself, a process in which the supervisor may play an important role. The effective supervisor should exhibit a positive attitude concerning the supervisory process which motivates the trainee and invites him to seek help rather than cover up deficiencies. The supervisory relationship may include help in personal problems short of establishing a therapist-client relationship with the trainee as client (11).

Conclusion

Differences, as well as similarities, in the conception of supervision may be noticed. Industry uses supervision only limited for training purposes; its primary use is overseeing workers on the job. The major emphasis appears to be aimed at increasing the productivity of the workers. Even when human relations are emphasized in supervision, it is with the idea
that a happier worker will turn out more goods and not focus on the personal feelings of the worker.

Student teaching uses supervision essentially for training. The emphasis is to produce an effective teacher and is therefore primarily technique oriented. The supervisory conference is instructional in nature, aimed at improving the student's teaching skills.

Counseling supervision is also instructional, but it goes beyond that; it is focused on the personal feelings of the trainee. The aim of a supervised counseling practicum is to produce an effective counselor. Counseling is a highly involved, intricate pattern of a network of flowing interactive relationships, verbal and non-verbal, between a counselor and client. This calls for a trainee to be sensitive to himself and others as well as developing a counseling style. Improved human relationships are a product of supervision as well as used in it.

The essence of supervision comes in the conferences between the trainee and the supervisor as they discuss the client, the trainee's counseling techniques, his sensitivity and understanding. In the supervising conference, significant learning may take place as the supervisor tries to understand what meaning an experience has for the trainee and attempts to clarify that experience for himself and the trainee. Attitudes are crucial. The trying to understand may be as important as actually understanding. The degree to which an atmosphere of mutual trust is present, is related to the amount of trainee
self-understanding and acceptance that will occur, and as a trainee's self-understanding and acceptance increases, his counseling behavior will also improve. This demands a good working relationship between the supervisor and the trainee. It is that relationship which this study was designed to investigate.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent to which the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship is related to the trainee's self-awareness and the trainee's level of experiencing. The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the trainee, related to the level of the trainee's level of experiencing?

2. To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the supervisor, related to the trainee's level of experiencing?

3. To what extent is the discrepancy between the supervisor's and trainee's perceptions of the relationship related to the trainee's level of experiencing?

4. To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the trainee, related to the level of the trainee's self-awareness?

5. To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the supervisor, related to the level of the trainee's self-awareness?
6. To what extent is the discrepancy between the supervisor's and trainee's perceptions of the relationship related to the trainee's self-awareness?

7. To what extent is the trainee's level of self-awareness related to his level of experiencing?

**Importance of the Study**

Walz (43) notes that the discussions and writings have not generally devoted attention to an important aspect of supervised counseling practice, namely, the supervisory process. The large majority of writings devoted to counselor supervision concern themselves with techniques and procedures useful in supervision rather than with the relationship between the supervisor and the trainee. This study was conceived primarily to investigate the importance of the relationship between the supervisor and the trainee in the counselor education process.

The 1958 APGA Committee on counselor preparation (12) felt that supervised practicum was one of the most important aspects of the training program. The Committee felt that even more important than the number of hours devoted to supervised practicum was the quality and the nature of the supervision in the practicum placement. Sanderson (36) states that they dynamics of the trainee-supervisor relationship is one aspect of supervision which has been almost completely overlooked.

Regarding the practicum, Arbuckle (5) states that the counselor educator should probably be more of a counselor with his trainees than he is a teacher. They must go through the
actual experiences, and they must have someone who will help
them understand just what is happening to them. They will
likely be in need of periodic support, since even the potenti­
ally excellent counselor will find certain facets of his edu­
cation threatening and traumatic. Possibly only a small part
of the education of the counselor should be concerned with con­
tent, since most content soon disappears unless one actually
makes use of it; the major part of his education should be con­
cerned with process. The success of the counselor depends far
less on how much he knows than on how well he can put just what
he knows into actual practice in a human relationship with
another person. In the development of the trainee, his eagerness
to practice may be followed by retreat, projection, and disap­
pointment as a reaction to his encounter with the practicing
situation. Both the supervisor and the trainee expect something
to happen as a result of the latter's participation. The change
may be threatening. The supervisor therefore becomes the chief
source of danger. But there is also the desire to learn, to
become like the supervisor, to become a professional counselor.
The mutually antagonistic drives set into motion a learning
process that is unique in the experience of the trainee.

A further importance of the study is to show the extent
to which the supervisor-trainee relationship is related to the
trainee's self-awareness. Several writers have indicated the
importance of the counselor's self-awareness.
McGowan and Schmidt (23) note that a planned and gradual introduction into the personal involvement required in the counseling relationship, as well as an increased need for self-awareness on the part of the counselors, is an essential part of the actual practicum training. A counselor who has not freed himself of his own problems in relationship to the client, who has not learned to understand his own personality needs is not likely to be able to assume his responsibilities as a counselor unless he has been helped through personal supervision.

Emphasizing the need for the trainee to understand himself and his relation to the goals and meanings of counseling, Arbuckle (4) states:

The actual counseling, of course, is simply a reflection of the counselor himself, and the general low level of counselor competence is, I fear, due not so much to the lack of training, as it is to the lack of education. In fact, it might well be that a real education has an inhibiting effect on one's training. We train technicians who ask the empirical question: "how" but only the educated man can ask the more philosophic question "why." If counseling is concerned with human dignity, and freedom, and integrity, then surely the "why" of our counseling takes precedence over the "how." We need more counselors, possibly, who know how to do things, but we need in vastly greater numbers those who know why they do what they do. When this happens we may have hope that counselors, as individuals who have found for themselves that wonderful deep sense of their own worth and dignity and integrity, will then be able to help children to slowly gather this strength in themselves . . . .

Another importance of this study is to show the extent to which the supervisor-trainee relationship is related to the trainee's level of experiencing.
Gendlin (19) mentions some "unofficial characteristics" of effective training situations which affect the trainee's level of experiencing. He feels there must actually be a freedom for the trainees to express and accept their direct experiences with practice, their troubles, and torn up feelings. Otherwise much time will be wasted in formal conferences and yet everyone will learn only painfully and alone. The trainee also must see both himself and the client as real people, human beings. We must eliminate the false front. We can save years by starting right out to train counselors to be themselves in a helpful way. The terms we use, whatever orientation, work effectively if, and only if, we train counselors to use these words to refer directly to somebody's experiencing, their own, or their clients. We can invite trainees to grasp experientially what the concepts refer to, what they can mean.

A final importance is to aid in the development of practicum supervisors. A limitation now imposed on practicum experience is the dearth of competent supervisors. At the present stage of development in the field of guidance, few agencies present adequate supervision. Although the profession may pride itself on having developed excellent counselors, there are few competent supervisors. Supervision as an aspect of counselor training is just now receiving due recognition. Although a counselor has demonstrated his abilities as a counselor, he may not have had an opportunity to sharpen his skills as a supervisor.
The importances of the study may be summarized in Rogers' implications of the relationship to counselor training:

... We would also endeavor so to plan the educational program for these individuals that they would come increasingly to experience empathy and liking for others, and that they would find it increasingly easier to be themselves, to be real. By feeling understood and accepted in their training experiences, by being in contact with genuineness and absence of facade in their instructors, they would grow into more and more competent counselors. There would be as much focus in such training on the interpersonal experience as on the intellectual learning. It would be recognized that no amount of knowledge of tests and measures, or of counseling theories, or of diagnostic procedures could make the trainee more effective in his personal encounter with his clients. There would be a heavy stress upon the actual experience of working with clients, and the thoughtful and self-critical assessment of the relationships formed. (34)

Definitions

For the purposes of this study the following definitions of terms apply:

**Congruence:** ... the individual appears to be revising his concept of self to bring it into congruence with his experience, accurately symbolized. Thus when self-experiences are accurately symbolized, and are included in the self-concept in this accurately symbolized form, then the state is one of congruence of self and experience, such as the individual's experience in a given relationship or in a given moment of time, then we can say that the individual is to this degree in a state of congruence. (32, p. 206)

**Empathy:** The state of empathy, or being empathic, is to perceive the internal frame of reference of another with accuracy, and with the emotional components and meanings which pertain thereto, as if one were the other person, but without ever losing the "as if" condition. (32, p. 210)

**Unconditional positive regard:** If the self-experiences of another are perceived by me in such a way that no self experience can be discriminated as more or less worthy of positive regard than any other, then I am experiencing
unconditional positive regard for this individual. To perceive oneself as receiving unconditional positive regard is to perceive that of one's self-experiences none can be discriminated by the other individual as more or less worthy of positive regard. (32, p. 208)

Relationship, interpersonal: The intercommunication between or among the minds of two or more persons; may be mutually facilitating or mutually frustrating. (20)

The relationship which I have found helpful is characterized by a sort of transparency on my part, in which my feelings are evident; by an acceptance of this other person as a separate person with value in his own right; and by a deep empathic understanding which enables me to see his private world through his eyes. (33, p. 34)

Experiencing: . . . Some initial sense of what the term "experiencing" refers to can be communicated by calling it "subjective experiencing." It refers to an individual's feeling of having experience. It is a continuous stream of feelings with some explicit contents. It is something given in every phenomenal field of every person. (34, p. 2)

Self-awareness: Knowledge of one's own traits or qualities. (150)

Level: A certain position, rank, etc., conceived of as in one of several planes of different elevation. (44)

Related: Any bond or connection that renders one entity in any way relevant to another. (15)

Limitations of the study

This study was limited to the supervision of prospective school counselors, and was concerned with the supervisory relationship as it was related to the trainee in an on-campus practicum using secondary school students as clients. The twenty-eight enrollees of the 1962-63 NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institute at The Ohio State University were the trainees in the practicum. They were divided randomly into three independent groups and assigned randomly to different supervisors.
Because the sample is selective and limited in number, the relationships found cannot be taken as definite, but suggest hypotheses for further research.

Each trainee had six supervisory conferences with the assigned supervisor during the practicum. The short duration of the practicum may impose limitations on the study.

Limitations are inherent in all statistical methods available for use, and therefore, limitations exist in those used in this study.

Organization of this study

The present chapter included an introduction of the subject of the investigation, followed by a number of statements indicating the importance of the problem, definition of terms, and limitations of the study. The second chapter contains a review of the related literature on the relationship, experiencing level, and self-awareness. The third chapter describes the procedures used in the study, the questions investigated, the procedures used, the population and scope of the study.

The fourth chapter contains the findings of the investigation obtained from an analysis of the Relationship Inventories, the Stern Activities Index and Counselor-Self-Questionnaire, and the "Experiencing Level Tapes."

The fifth chapter contains a summary of the information obtained from the investigation. Conclusions are drawn from the quantitative and qualitative information to the supervisor-
trainee relationship and the trainee's self-awareness and level of experiencing. Recommendations are advanced for future developments in this area.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The dynamics of the supervisor-trainee relationship is one area of counselor education which has been overlooked. The supervisory relationship has been neglected by research. Therefore, most of the literature is related to the counseling relationship, showing its appropriateness to supervision. The instruments and literature will be reviewed in the following areas: (a) the nature of the relationship, (b) experiencing level, and (c) self-awareness.

The nature of the relationship

The theory and research of the client-centered therapy group has focused directly on the nature of the relationship. Rogers points that significant positive personality change does not occur except in a relationship. He is primarily concerned with how a counselor can provide a relationship which a client can use for his own personal growth. Rogers (35) has postulated the necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. The conditions which have particular relevance for this study are: (a) the two persons in psychological contact, (b) the therapist must be "congruent" in the relationship, (c) the therapist must experience unconditional positive regard for his
client, (d) the therapist must experience an empathic understanding of the client's internal frame of reference, (e) the therapist must communicate both his empathic understanding and his unconditional positive regard to the client and the client must perceive these.

Barrett-Lennard (16) conducted a study in an attempt to show the effect of the counselor variables represented by Roger's necessary and sufficient conditions. The theory was transposed into operational form at the data-gathering level. It was hypothesized that each of five aspects of the therapist's attitudes and responses, as experienced by his client, are influential in the process of therapeutic change. Two of these variables are empathic understanding and congruence. In addition, he used "level of regard" and "unconditionality of regard," which represents a division of the concept of unconditional positive regard into what are considered to be two separate components. The fifth relationship variable was "willingness to be known."

Barrett-Lennard explained that level of regard refers to the affective aspects--either positive or negative--of one person's response to another. It may be considered the "loading" of all the distinguishable feeling reactions of one person toward another, positive and negative, onto a single abstract dimension. The lower extreme of this dimension represents maximum intensity and predominance of negative type feeling, not merely a lack of positive feeling.

Unconditionality of regard is specifically concerned with how little or how much variability there is in one person's
affective response to another. It is defined as the degree of constancy of regard felt by one person for another who communicates self-experiences to the first. The more the therapist's regard for the client changes in response to his changes in feeling, the more conditional (less unconditional) he is.

Barrett-Lennard tested two related hypotheses: First, the extent of a client's therapeutic personality change partly depends on the level, implied in the client's perceptions of his therapist, of each of the five therapist-response variables. Secondly, more successful therapists facilitate more therapeutic change in their clients because they respond in ways that lead their clients to experience them as more positive and unconditional in their regard, and more empathically understanding, congruent, and willing to be known in relation to their clients.

To test these hypotheses, Barrett-Lennard developed a questionnaire called the Relationship Inventory which measured the five therapist dimensions. These Relationship Inventory scores were then compared with measures of client change and with therapist expertness. The obtained results supported both of the experimental hypotheses in four of the five variables. Empathic understanding, level of regard, unconditionality of regard, and congruence were each significant at the .01 level. It was also found that the better adjusted a client is upon entering therapy, the more liking and respect he perceives in his therapist's response to him and the more secure and integrated or congruent his therapist appears to him.
Barrett-Lennard makes the following interpretations from the results: The results of a split-half reliability assessment and inter-correlation of the relationship scales are consistent with viewing each measure as a distinct aspect of the perceived relationship. Support of the first hypothesis is interpreted theoretically to mean that four of the relationship measures, from the client's perception, are indices of primary change-producing influences. Support of the second hypothesis implies that constructive personality change depends on how much the therapist's actual response causes his client to experience him as empathically understanding, congruent, and positive and unconditional in his regard.

This study lends strong support to Roger's theoretical formulations of the effect of counselor's attitudes on the nature of the relationship and the effect of this relationship in producing positive therapeutic changes. Two other studies will be mentioned here to illustrate the versatility of the Relationship Inventory.

Thornton (40) studied certain dimensions of the perceived relationship as related to marital adjustment, using the Marriage Adjustment Schedule and the Relationship Inventory. He found that there was a positive and significant relationship between the level of marital adjustment and the level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence and unconditionality of regard that each marriage partner perceives in the other's response. He also found a significant inverse relationship between adjustment in marriage and the degree to which each marital partner feels that
he is responding more positively; in the four ways measured by the Relationship Inventory, to the other partner than the other is to him; and that he is responding more positively than the other partner feels he is responding. The results suggest that the Relationship Inventory may itself be an adequate measure of marital adjustment.

Emmerling (14) divided a sample of classroom teachers into three groups on the basis of the degree to which they report concern with self-related problems, as against problems external to self. For each group of teachers he studied their student's perception of the opportunity for participation and freedom of communication in their classrooms. He also studied, for each group, the students' perception of their teacher's ability to be positive and unconditional in their regard and empathic and congruent in relation to their students. He found that for each of these variables, the group of teachers identified as most concerned with self-related problems obtained significantly higher ratings than the group most concerned with problems unrelated to self.

These studies seem to suggest that the relationship assists in facilitating growth in another person. No studies have been reported using the Relationship Inventory in the supervisory process. However, Rogers suggests that these studies would, if confirmed by further work, have significant implications for the training of counselors. "By feeling understood and accepted in their training experiences, by being in contact with genuineness
and absence of facade in their instructors, they would grow into more and more competent counselors. There would be as much focus in such training on the interpersonal experience as on the intellectual learning" (34).

In a report to the 1963 APGA Convention, Walz (42) stated that the supervisor should emphasize the relationship between himself and the trainee rather than evaluate the performance. His major goal would be to create a climate in which the trainee could view his behavior without fear of disapproval or rejection. Through his relationship with the trainee and in the accepting climate created between them the natural growth processes would exert themselves. The trainee would be stimulated to develop a counseling style appropriate to his person.

Walz also noted the importance of congruence between the supervisor's feelings and behavior toward a trainee in the supervisory relationship. Sincerity and truthfulness are important in all interpersonal relationships; especially important in a relationship that exists to free another person from the need to defend himself from threat and rejection. Only if the supervisor is able to accept his feelings can he enter into a real relationship with the trainee. His feelings and behavior toward a trainee must be one. It destroys the meaning of a relationship if a supervisor is perceived by a trainee as feeling one way and acting another.

The supervisor must accept the trainee as he is and try to understand his feelings. Roger's call for unconditional
positive regard, empathy, and warmth are as appropriate for the trainee as the client. Also the supervisor should be "with" the trainee as he experiences feelings of joy, sorrow, and discouragement. When the supervisor is "with" the trainee during his learning experiences, there is closer mutual respect and understanding.

The level of experiencing

The "process" conception of counseling, which may clarify how the relationship provides assistance in personal growth, is now discussed. In describing the development of "the process conception" of psychotherapy, Rogers (33) says that after attempting to approach the problem from several different ways without success, he finally decided simply to become a "naturalistic observer." Divesting himself of as many preconceptions as possible, he listened to many recorded therapeutic interviews, trying to listen freshly and naively to what was going on. Gradually, his observations began to cluster, and he began to feel more and more a sense of order, in the form of a continuum which reaches from rigidity and fixity of psychological functioning on the one hand to psychological flow and changingness on the other. Since this original conception, Rogers and others have clarified, modified, and attempted to define operationally these process concepts. Rogers says he now feels that this is a continuum which "seems to apply to the whole spectrum of personality change and development, and not to psychotherapy alone."
Rogers (31) describes the development of a scale to measure the strands of process. He points out that it seems clear that individuals reveal themselves and their characteristics to differing degrees in different situations, so that we need to try to approximate some standard condition under which samplings of expressive behavior might be drawn. He proposes that the standard psychological climate should be one in which the individual feels himself to be empathically understood, accepted, and received as he is. He also points out that this happens to be the situation which is hypothesized as facilitating the process in question.

The observational account of the process of therapy has been translated into a more orderly schedule of stages, with the different strands to be considered at each stage. These different strands are: (a) Feelings and personal meanings, (b) Manner of Experiencing, (c) Degree of Incongruence, (d) Communication of Self, (e) The Manner in which Experience is construed (personal constructs), (f) The Relationship to problems, and (g) Manner of Relating. The scale is called The Process Scale, and has been revised and refined many times since its original development.

Several strands of the Process Scale have been the object of special attempts to develop separate process scales. One strand was expanded into a separate process scale, called the Experiencing Scale. Gendlin (9) developed the Experiencing Scale to measure certain aspects of "experiencing," a process concept
which he has developed and discussed in some theoretical writings. Gendlin believes that the recent positivistic trends in psychology toward operational definition, are making it very hard to refer at all to the everyday phenomenon of subjective experiencing. He presents a strong case for the introduction of new concepts that allow us to refer directly to the experiencing process. He feels it is very important to be able to refer directly, for example, to "this funny feeling I have," without having to conceptualize it.

The term experiencing refers to experienced or implicitly felt meaning. It is something directly observable by the individual and observable by others indirectly in his expression of such direct observation. Conceptualizations of it can be accurate or inaccurate, yet the felt datum itself will still be directly present. Experiencing is, then, implicitly meaningful, present, directly referred to, and felt.

In describing the experiencing scale, Rogers (31) notes the continuum which reaches from rigidity and fixity of psychological functioning on the one hand, to psychological flow and changingness on the other. The continuum begins with a fixed situation in which the individual is very remote from his experiencing, unable to draw upon or symbolize its implicit meanings. Experiencing must be safely in the past before meanings can be drawn from it, and the present is interpreted in terms of these past meanings. From this remoteness in relation to his experiencing the individual moves toward the recognition of
experiencing as a troubling process going on within him. Experiencing gradually becomes a more accepted inner referent to which he can turn for increasingly accurate meanings. Finally he becomes able to live freely and acceptantly in a fluid process of experiencing, using it comfortably as the major referent for his living. In the furthest aspect of the continuum experiencing with immediacy is the major characteristic. In such moments feeling and cognition interpenetrate, self is simply the reflexive awareness of the experiencing, volition is the natural following of the meaning of this flow of internal referents. The person in this portion is a flowing process of accepted, integrated, experiencing.

Gendlin relates the theory of experiencing to the nature of the relationship. This is spelled out most clearly in terms of how experiencing relates to the congruence or genuineness of the counselor. Rogers implies that genuineness is a way of having experience which can be "congruent" without being fully conceptualized, which is what Gendlin's term "experiencing" refers to. Hence, genuineness implies that a counselor rarely gives conceptual awareness or expression of his attitudes. Instead, it implies that the counselor responds with some conceptualization of the client's experience. The question of genuineness is simply: Does the counselor have the present experiencing as well as the conceptualization he expresses, or only the latter? If he has experiencing as well as the conceptualization, then the counselor genuinely experiences the client. Genuineness, for
the counselor, seems to be analogous to experiencing for the client.

One study was undertaken to investigate the effect of expression of immediate experiencing on outcome versus expression of past or present content. Judges reliably rated the amount of immediate experiencing on a nine-point scale, the extremes of which were "expresses feelings of the moment" and "talks about feelings past or present." As predicted, the scale measuring expression of immediate experiencing correlated highly with several success measures, while the scale of past or present content did not. The authors concluded that "this type of research shows the possibility of measuring the counselor's observation of client's experiencing as something different from conceptualizations" (16).

Richard Cahoon (10) conducted a study to determine the extent to which certain counselors characteristics and attitudes were related to the counseling relationship. The population consisted of twenty-five graduate students enrolled in a practicum and fifty undergraduate students who were their clients. Each client rated his counselor on the Relationship Inventory. From each counselor, his measure of open or closed mindedness, his stated attitudes and orientations toward counseling, and his experiencing level were obtained.

Cahoon, as supervisor for the practicum, asked each counselor to make an appointment with him for an interview. During this interview, which was recorded, the counselor was asked simply
to respond to his experiences in the practicum. Attempts were made to keep the interview situation as standard as possible, in belief that each counselor would respond to the instructions in terms of his own experiencing level, and that the differences would be due to differences in the counselor's experiencing level and not the situation.

Four two-minute samples (two samples from the first half and two from the second half) were selected from each interview and placed randomly on three tapes used for judging. Reliability was achieved by two judges in rating the experiencing samples. The Pearson product moment correlation obtained between the two judges for twenty randomly selected samples was $r = .74$, significant at the .01 level. One judge then rated all of the samples.

The zero - order correlation coefficients of all the different time samples with the RI scores were positive, but only one was significant. The experiencing level for the second sample from the first half of the interview had a correlation of .32 with the RI measure of congruence, which is significant at the .05 level.

One question which Cahoon asked was "To what degree is the counselor's experiencing level related to the counseling relationship?" The results of this study indicate that there is a significant relationship between the counselor's level of experiencing and the relationship he develops with his clients by the end of the fifth counseling session. In general, the higher
the counselor's rated experiencing level, the "better" his counseling relationships in terms of the five measures of the Relationship Inventory. It was also pointed out that the counselor's experiencing level samples from the first half of his "experiencing" interview predict the relationship better than the later two scores.

Some aspects of the relationship were predicted better than others by the counselor's experiencing level. Congruence and the total RI scores were both predicted at the .01 level of significance. The fact that the total score is predicted significantly at the .01 level seems to indicate that the general or over-all relationship is predicted by the counselor's experiencing level.

The counselor's congruence in the relationship, as perceived by his clients, is the separate aspect of the relationship that is predicted the best by the counselor's experiencing level. This lends some support to Gendlin's conceptions that congruence or genuineness, for the counselor, is analogous to experiencing, for the client. Cahoon concluded that the higher the counselor was rated on the Experiencing Scale, the more he was perceived by his clients as being genuine or congruent. The more open he was to his own feelings and experiencing, the more open he was to his clients' experiencing, i.e., the more genuinely he experiences his clients.

Cahoon felt this finding had implications to practicum courses in counselor education. He believed that the practicum
might focus more intentionally on the experiencing variable. In
that case, the focus could be on the experiencing level of the
counselor in terms of his interactions with his clients. The
supervisor's role would be a more complex one, involving a
process of aiding the counselor to be more open and sensitive
both to his own experiencing and to his clients' experiencing.

Gendlin has written some proposals on psychotherapy
training (19). Among other things he feels that there must be a
freedom for counselor-trainees to express and accept their direct
experiences with their practice. Trainees must be invited to
grasp experientially what the concepts refer to, what they can
mean.

Self-awareness

Gysbers (21) hypothesizes that the amount of threat a
trainee perceives as present in the trainee-client and supervisor-
trainee relationship is a function of his need system. He feels
that this hypothesis has implications for supervisory methodology
in terms of the strategies a supervisor employs to help trainees
understand and accept themselves as persons. The supervisory
relationship must have an atmosphere of mutual trust, in which
the two persons can communicate about the trainee needs and be-

...
Only recently have psychologists begun to scrutinize more closely the assumption that individuals are poor estimators of at least their measurable characteristics. Investigators have found significant relationships between self-estimates and objective measures in such areas as intelligence, interests, and values. These investigators caution that the indexes of relationship discovered, while positive and significant, are not sufficiently high to encourage the substitution of one type of rating for the other.

Countless assertions have been made to the effect that good self-awareness is the sine qua non of effective living. However, little attention has been given to determining the correlates of such a preferred psychological state or the relationship between self-ratings on personality dimensions and their measured counterparts. Henry's (30) review suggests the possibility that accurate self-estimators conceive of themselves as better "adjusted" than are poor self-estimators.

William Mueller (25) conducted a study with one hypothesis concerned with whether or not the clients of school counselors who had self-insight became increasingly insightful during counseling. To test this hypothesis counselors were sorted into an insightful and non-insightful group. This sorting was based upon the correlates between the counselor's self-description on the Stern Activities Index and the Counselor-Self-Questionnaire.

The Activities Index is a considerably modified version of a test originally developed by Sheviakov for the Progressive
Education Association. Unlike its predecessor, and other instruments of a similar format, the Activities Index was developed as an objective representation of variables stemming from an explicit psychodynamic approach to personality.

Murray (26) proposed a system of constructs for classifying psychogenic needs. These constructs were identified with "a force (the physiochemical nature of which is unknown) in the brain region, a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation, and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction an existing, unsatisfying situation."

Two characteristics of needs will be noted in this definition. On the one hand needs are functional in character, representing the goals or purposes which an interaction serves for the individual. In this sense the lists of needs are essentially a taxonomy of the objectives which individuals characteristically strive to achieve for themselves. The second characteristic of a need is that it is revealed in the modes of behavior employed by the individual. In this sense the list of needs is a taxonomy of interaction process.

Eight psychologists independently coded over a thousand items describing commonplace daily activities in terms of the conceptual framework for the description of personality referred to previously. An inventory was assembled from 300 of the items unanimously considered to be diagnostic of specific elements in this personality taxonomy. Subjects respond to each item by indicating their like or dislike for each activity. The test is
based on the assumption that potential participation, or the manifestation of interest, in a specific class of behaviors is a reflection of the subject's personal needs.

Preliminary studies of the relationship between the Index and various projective tests appear to indicate that diagnostic statements made on the basis of the Index are borne out by the other instruments (38).

The Counselor-Self-Questionnaire was constructed by William Mueller by abstracting from the Activities Index manual the thirty conceptual statements around which the items of the Activities Index were written. The statements were then followed by an eleven point scale from zero to ten, in order to correspond to the eleven possible responses to each of the thirty needs of the Activities Index. This questionnaire taps the same variables and is scaled in the same way as the Activities Index, differing only in transparency.

With N = 30, a correlation of .35 is significant at or beyond .05. Counselors whose correlations on these two instruments were as high or higher than .35 were called insightful. Those with correlations below this point were called the non-insightful. The scores of clients in each of these groups of counselors were then tabled. The test of the hypothesis was simply that of determining whether the clients of insightful counselors became more insightful themselves during counseling than did the non-insightful. As with the counselors, insight in the clients consisted of the correlation between the client's
Stern Activities Index and a transparent Questionnaire. Since the client described himself early and late in counseling on these same instruments, the investigator was able to determine the direction of client awareness. If a client's post counseling insight correlation was higher than his pre-counseling score, he was said to be increasingly aware of himself.

Results indicate that there are about as many increasing and decreasing scores on both sides. To test the hypothesis, Fisher's Exact Probability non-parametric test was computed for the data. It was found that the self insight of counselors was not related to the increasing self-insight of the clients.

Two other studies may be quoted here; although they do not use the same instruments, they use similar methodology of self-description on two instruments.

Renzaglia, Henry, and Rybolt (30) report a study conducted to explore possible relationships between self-estimated and objectively measured personality variables—as these variables are defined and measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (PPS) and a Self-Estimation Scale (SES) constructed to coincide with the variables of the PPS. The sample of this study consisted of 152 students in introductory psychology classes at Southern Illinois University.

Group correlations between Ss' estimates of the SES and their scores on the corresponding variables of the PPS were reported. Fourteen of the fifteen correlations are significantly different from zero; only on the Deference variable was the group unable to show a corresponding variation between their estimated
and measured scores. Measured scores on some scales are consistently underestimated while scores on others are overestimated. The manner in which the group overestimated and underestimated the PPS variables is quite similar to the hierarchy of socially desirable traits. More positively valued traits like Affiliation, Nurturance, Change, and Intracception are consistently overestimated, while such lesser valued traits as Aggression, Abasement, and Succorance are underestimated.

Each S's estimates on the SES were correlated with his measured scores. Individual product-moment correlations ranged from -.59 to +.90. Eighty per cent were in .10 to .80 range with the median r of .39. Forty-two per cent of the 152 correlations were significant at the .05 level, a better than chance finding. Some of the 152 S's were able to estimate rather well while others did not, and individual differences were quite marked.

The possible correlates of this kind of self-understanding were investigated from several perspectives, using somewhat limited measures of the Self and of behavioral effectiveness. Correlations between an index of congruence and the scales of the Index of Adjustment and Values were negligible. Contrary to self-theory, those who are fair predictors of their measured traits reported no more favorable self-conceptions, satisfactions, and aspirations than vice versa.

Arbuckle (6) conducted a study with 120 freshmen at Boston University School of Education to determine the relation-
ship between the student's immediate self-rating on certain personality traits and his test scores on a standardized personality inventory. The Heston Personality Inventory and the Gordon Personality Profile were administered as part of orientation. The six traits from the Heston were emotional stability, sociability, analytical thinking, confidence, personal relations, and home satisfaction. The two traits from the Gordon were ascendancy and responsibility.

The students were asked to rate themselves on another instrument which had a description of each trait as given by the authors of the two inventories. The instrument had a grades scale ranging from zero to ten, with zero meaning the student had less of the trait than the average freshman and a score of ten meaning he possessed as much of the trait as the average freshman. On the basis of the individual's emotional stability score on the Heston, the 120 students were divided into a "low," a "middle," and a "high" group.

The high and low groups were then compared. Results indicate that there was little in the way of a significant relationship between the test scores of students and self-rating of those who scored highest or lowest in emotional stability. The other self-scores of both groups of students in analytical thinking, emotional stability, and personal relations bears little resemblance to their test scores.
Conclusion

The review of the literature has discussed the concept of the relationship and its relevance to personal growth. The research indicates that a counselor's attitudes are influential in the process of client change. Implications for supervision in counselor education have been drawn from this concept of the relationship.

The theory, development, and research of the Relationship Inventory have been noted. Research has demonstrated the usefulness of the Relationship Inventory in measuring various relationships between people. It, therefore, appears appropriate to measure the relationship between the trainee and his supervisor.

Gendlin's theory of experiencing and his development of the Experiencing Scale have been reported. Research using the Experiencing Scale has shown the importance of the counselor's level of experiencing to establishing a counseling relationship. Implications for supervising have been drawn, indicating that the supervisor might focus directly on the experiencing level of the trainee. The supervisory relationship may thus help the trainee to become more open to his own feelings, attitudes, values, personal meanings--experiencing.

Many writers have noted the importance of counselor's self-awareness. The general indication is that if the counselor is aware of his own needs, he will be better able to control them during the counseling interview. Research has been reported
in which correlation of self-estimates with standardized questionnaires have been used as a measure of self-awareness. The importance of self-awareness has been accepted, but results of self-estimates thus far have not been impressive. There is a need, however, to investigate the effect of the supervisory relationship on the gain in counselor self-awareness.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The twenty-eight enrollees of the 1962-1963 NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institute at The Ohio State University were the trainees in the practicum. This was their first supervised counseling experience as all of them were beginning counselors. There were eight women and twenty men ranging in age from 22 to 42 with a median age of 32. Their acceptance for the NDEA Institute was dependent upon their grade point average (minimum 2.7), having a maximum of nine hours in counseling and guidance, having teaching experience, recommendations from their principal, and planning to return as a school counselor. The practicum was held winter quarter, therefore, they had had one quarter of classes before the practicum.

The trainees were divided randomly into three independent groups and assigned randomly to different supervisors. The three supervisors were doctoral students in the area of Guidance, who had experienced at least two practicia. Two of the supervisors had previously supervised one practicum, the other had supervised three practicia. All of the supervisors had been secondary school teachers and two of them had been school counselors for
two years. All three had experience counseling college students in their Education 408 classes, a freshman course introducing the student to teaching.

Each trainee had a total of six counseling interviews with secondary school students who were brought to the campus from the Columbus Public School System. There were six supervisory conferences between the assigned supervisor and the trainee.

**Instruments**

1. **The Relationship Inventory.** The Relationship Inventory is a rating scale for measuring the nature of a counseling relationship. It was developed by Barrett-Lennard at the University of Chicago, and is based on Roger's Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change.

   The client form OS-F (revised) used in this study is a paper and pencil inventory filled out by the trainee. The trainee describes his perception of the nature of the relationship with his supervisor by indicating the degree of his agreement or disagreement with 72 statements about his supervisor. Some sample items are these:

   1. He respects me.
   10. He is interested in knowing how things seem to me.
   20. He behaves just the way that he really is when I'm around.
   19. He always seems to feel the same way toward me.

   The therapist form is filled out by the supervisor as he describes his perception of the nature of the relationship. The items are identical except for a suitable change in pronouns.
1. I respect him.
10. I am interested in knowing how things seem to him.
20. I behave just the way that I really am when he's around.
19. I always seem to feel the same way toward him.

The Relationship Inventory items are scored for each of
four attitudinal subscales: Empathic Understanding, Level of
Regard, Congruence, and Unconditionality of Regard. The scale
also yields a total score.

2. The Experiencing Scale. The Experiencing Scale was
developed by Gendlin and Tomlisom and is based on Gendlin's
theory of experiencing. It is a "process" scale in that it is
designed to measure stages in the process of experiencing. It
is a rating scale to be used by judges who rate interview
material from tapes or typescripts on the basis of a 14-point
scale. Ratings can vary from the low end of the scale (stage 1)
where, in the person's experiencing, there is "no 'personally
private' or 'personality relevant' communication" to the high
end of the scale (stage 7), where there is "free movement in a
continuing stream of felt referents."

At the fixity end of the continuum, which is stage 1,
immediacy of experiencing is completely absent. Conceptuali-
izations as to the meaning of experience are all past formulations.
The distance of the individual from his experiencing is very
great.

In the second stage the individual is very remote from
his experiencing, and reacts to internal and external situations
as though they were past experiences, feeling them, rather than
the present experiencing. Extreme intellectualization is one way of holding one's experiencing at arms length.

The third stage is that the experiencing of situations is described as in the past.

In the next stage there is an unwilling, fearful recognition that one is experiencing things—a vague realization that a disturbing type of inner referent does exist.

Next on the continuum feelings are sometimes experienced with immediacy; that is, the individual conceptualizes and expresses his experiencing at the moment it occurs. This is a frightening and disturbing thing because it involves being in an unknown flow rather than in a clear structure.

Immediacy of experiencing, even of feelings previously denied, and an acceptance of being in process of experiencing, is characteristic of the sixth stage. There is full acceptance now of experiencing as providing a clear and usable referent for getting at the implicit meanings of the individual's encounter with himself and with life. There is also the recognition that the self is now becoming this process of experiencing.

In the final stage the individual lives comfortably in the changing flow of his experiencing. There is a trust in this process. The individual lives in terms of present experiencing, rather than interpreting the present in terms of the past.

There are also ratings for half stages. It can be used to rate interview samples of varying lengths. In this study three two-minute samples were judged.
3. The Stern Activities Index. The Activities Index is a personality inventory based on the application of Murray's need structure to Homey's description of three basic personality patterns. The inventory was assembled from items considered to be diagnostic of specific elements in this personality taxonomy. Subjects respond to each item by indicating their like or dislike for that activity. The test is based on the assumption that potential participation, or the manifestation of interest, in a specific class of behaviors is a reflection of the subject's personal needs. The Activities Index consists of three hundred items, ten each of which can be subsumed under thirty independent needs. Twelve additional needs have been incorporated by Stern into his model to complete the circumplex, but these twelve needs were not used in this study. The thirty needs that were used in this study include:

- abasement
- achievement
- adaptiveness
- affiliation
- aggression
- change
- conjunctivity
- counteraction
- defendance
- dominance
- ego achievement
- emotionality
- energy
- exhibition
- fantasied achievement
- harmavoidance
- humanism
- impulsion
- narcissism
- nurtrance
- objectivity
- order
- play
- pragmatism
- reflectiveness
- scientism
- sex
- sentience
- succorance
- understanding

4. The Counselor-Self-Questionnaire. The Counselor-Self-Questionnaire was constructed by abstracting from the Activities Index manual the thirty conceptual statements around
which the ten items of the Activities were written. These state-
ments are followed by an eleven-point scale from zero to ten,
corresponding to the eleven possible responses to each of the
thirty needs of the Activities Index. The derived questionnaire,
therefore, taps the same variables and is scaled in the same way
as the Activities Index, differing only in transparency.

Procedure for collection of the data

The general procedures were to obtain the measure of
relationship between the trainee and supervisor, and then de-
termine statistically the degree of relationship to the measures
of the trainees self-awareness before the practicum, at the con-
clusion of the practicum, the descrepancy between the two, and
the level of experiencing.

The data were gathered over a period of four months. The
data from the Activities Index and Counselor-Self-Questionnaire
were obtained in four different group testing sessions—two at
the beginning and two at the close of the practicum. During the
group sessions the trainees met in their regular classroom. They
were told that this was part of a research project in counseling
supervision, that it would in no way affect their grades, and
that their cooperation would be appreciated. Before beginning
the practicum, each trainee described himself on the Activities
Index. Later, but still before the practicum, each trainee
described himself on the Counselor-Self-Questionnaire. Compa-
risan of these scores were used to estimate the level of the
trainee's pre-practicum self-awareness.
During separate sessions at the conclusion of the practicum, each trainee described himself on the Activities Index and the Counselor-Self-Questionnaire. Comparison of these scores were used to estimate the level of the trainee's post-practicum self-awareness.

To obtain the trainee's experiencing level, each trainee was asked to make an appointment with his supervisor for an interview. In this interview, which was recorded, the trainee was asked simply to respond to his experiences in the practicum. The interview situation was kept as standard as possible, in the belief that each trainee would respond to the instructions in terms of his own experiencing level. Each supervisor read the following instructions:

This interview will be recorded, but it will be used only for research and all results will be kept anonymous. It has nothing to do with your grade or any other evaluation of you related to the practicum. I would like you to simply respond to or react to your experience in the practicum this quarter. This is an opportunity for you to explore the meaning the practicum has for you. I will primarily just listen, but will occasionally respond to your comments. Do you have any questions?

The supervisors were instructed to comment as little as possible, only to communicate understanding and acceptance, to allow the trainee to free associate as much as possible.

After all of the interviews were completed, three two-minute samples were selected from each "experiencing" tape. The samples were taken at the first quarter point, second quarter point, and the third quarter point of the interview. All 84
samples were then placed in random order and transferred from the 28 separate tapes to three master tapes. The master tapes were then used by two judges for rating purposes. The judges, after training together on practice tapes, independently rated the samples for experiencing level, using Gendlin's Experiencing Scale.

The mean of the two judges scores was used as the trainee's level of experiencing at each point. A mean of the three scores for each trainee was then taken.

The Pearson product moment correlation obtained between the two judges for the 84 randomly selected samples was $r = .60$, significant at the .01 level. Out of a possible range of seven steps or points, the two judges had 62 per cent of their ratings within a half step of each other, and 93 per cent within one step.

During the second group session, both the trainees and the supervisors were told that a research project on counseling supervision was being conducted. They were asked to respond to some statements about their relationship with each other. They were informed that the information was to be kept strictly confidential, that the other person would never see it, and that it had nothing to do with any grade or evaluation for either the trainee or the supervisor. All agreed to do so.

At the conclusion of the sixth and final supervisory conference, each trainee was asked to fill out a Relationship Inventory describing the relationship with his supervisor. At the same time, each supervisor was asked to fill out a Relation-
ship Inventory describing the relationship he had with each trainee. Each person was asked to do this in privacy and then place the Inventory in a special box placed in the office.

**Analysis of the data**

After all the data were obtained, the scores were organized and transferred to IBM cards for machine analysis. Pearson product moment correlations of coefficient were performed on an IBM computer. Also several t tests, z' transformations, and Rho correlations of coefficients were performed.

The following questions were statistically investigated:

1. To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the trainee, related to the level of the trainee's level of experiencing?

2. To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the supervisor, related to the trainee's level of experiencing?

3. To what extent is the discrepancy between the supervisor's and trainee's perceptions of the relationship related to the trainee's level of experiencing?

4. To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the trainee, related to the level of the trainee's self-awareness?

5. To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the supervisor, related to the level of the trainee's self-awareness?
6. To what extent is the discrepancy between the supervisor's and trainee's perceptions of the relationship related to the trainee's self-awareness?

7. To what extent is the trainee's level of self-awareness related to his level of experiencing?
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data obtained from the measuring instruments described in Chapter III were analyzed by means of a product moment coefficient of correlation on the IBM computer. In addition, several Rho correlations, $z'$ transformations, and $t$ scores were obtained, using different combinations of variables. The results are presented below.

Group means

The group means for each measuring instrument are presented in the first three tables. Table 1 shows the means of the trainee's Relationship Inventory measures, the supervisor's Relationship Inventory measures, and the discrepancy between these two measures.

From this table it can be seen that the trainees in group Z scored the Relationship Inventory consistently higher on all of the sub-measures and total than the trainees in the other two groups. The trainees in group Y scored the sub-measures and total Relationship Inventory consistently lower than the other two groups. These results indicate that the trainees in group Z perceived their supervisor as having a higher level of regard, empathic understanding, unconditional regard,
TABLE 1

GROUP MEANS OF THE TRAINEES' RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES, THE SUPERVISORS' RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES, AND THE DISCREPANCY SCORES BETWEEN THE TRAINEES' AND SUPERVISORS' MEAN

Computations based on data from 28 trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine and assigned to one of three supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee RI Measures</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th>Group Y</th>
<th>Group Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>121.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor RI Measures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>104.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrepancy on</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and being more congruent, thus, having a better supervisory relationship than the other two groups. The trainees in group Y perceived their supervisory relationships as less favorable than the other two.

The supervisors' scores on the Relationship Inventory were not so consistent. However, except for Level of Regard, supervisor Y scored his relationships consistently lower than the other supervisors, thus showing he perceived his supervisory relationships in a less favorable light. Supervisor X scored himself highest in Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard, while supervisor Z scored highest on the Empathic Understanding and Congruity items. Supervisor X also scored the total relationship slightly higher than supervisor Z and much higher than supervisor Y.

The discrepancy scores are found by subtracting the supervisor's measures from the trainee's measures; thereby giving positive or negative numbers, indicating the trainees perceived the relationship more positively or negatively than the supervisor.

The mean discrepancy scores point out that the trainees in group Z scored the Inventory items higher than the supervisor, meaning they saw it in a more positive light than the supervisor. The trainees in group Y scored the items higher than the supervisor in total and all sub-measures except Level of Regard. The largest discrepancies occur between the supervisor and the trainees in group X, but when the over-all average is taken, the
discrepancies average closely. The trainees scored the items higher only on Empathic Understanding and Congruity. It may be seen that the highest discrepancy in all three groups is on the empathic understanding items, as the trainees perceived the supervisors more understanding than they perceived themselves. In groups Y and Z a consistency exists between the trainees and supervisor as to the trend of scores. That is, if the supervisor scores his inventory Level of Regard items highest, Empathic Understanding items second, and Congruity items third, the trainees scored the items in the same order.

Table 2 presents the means of the trainees Experiencing Scale Scores. The trainees in group Z scored consistently higher on the Experiencing Scale and group Y scored consistently lower than the other two groups. This implies that the trainees in group Y were more remote from their experiencing and from their feelings, more likely to be cautious and defensive in their relationships. Experiencing must be safely in the past before meanings can be drawn from it, and the present is interpreted in terms of these past meanings, while the trainees in group Z are more sensitive to the changingness of their experiencing and feelings. The trainees in each group achieved their highest score on the earliest sample from the "experiencing interview."

Table 3 shows the means of the trainees pre-practicum and post-practicum self-awareness scores. The self-awareness scores were derived by the discrepancy between the trainee's self-description on the Activities Index and the Counselor-Self-
TABLE 2
GROUP MEANS OF THE TRAINEES' EXPERIENCING SCALE SCORES

Computations based on data from 28 trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiencing Scale Score</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th>Group Y</th>
<th>Group Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
GROUP MEANS OF THE TRAINEES' PRE-PRACTICUM AND POST-PRACTICUM SELF-AWARENESS SCORES

Computations based on data from 28 trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-awareness Score</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th>Group Y</th>
<th>Group Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Practicum</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Practicum</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire, thus making a lower score stand for better self-awareness. Group Y shows slightly lower self-awareness scores on the pre-practicum scores than the other groups, meaning a higher degree of self-awareness. Group X shows the lowest self-awareness score on post-practicum scores, with group Y showing a slight positive change and group Z showing a slight negative change. These results indicate that the trainees in group Y had the best self-awareness before the practicum began, but the trainees in group X had the best post-practicum self-awareness,
with the trainees in group Z reporting the least self-awareness at both times.

Table 4 presents the value of t for the means of the trainees' Relationship Inventory measures, the supervisors' Relationship Inventory measures, the discrepancy scores, the Experiencing Scale scores, and the pre- and post-practicum self-awareness scores.

The table shows that no significant differences exist between the Relationship Inventory measures of group X and Y or between the measures of group Y and Z; however, there is a significant difference (p < .01) between group Y and group Z in their perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

There is also a significant difference (p < .01) between the Relationship Inventory measures scored by supervisor X and Y and by supervisor Y and Z, which is primarily caused by the low scoring by supervisor Y.

No significant difference exists between the groups on the discrepancy scores of the Relationship Inventory. Even though there is wide variation on the mean scores, the standard deviations are sufficiently large to prohibit a significant t.

It may be seen from the table that the Experiencing Scale scores achieved by the trainees in group X and Y differ significantly (p < .01) from those achieved by the trainees in group Z.

There is no significant difference between the group means on the pre- or post-practicum self-awareness scores.
### Table 4

**Value of t for the Means of the Trainees’ Relationship Inventory Measure, Supervisors’ Relationship Inventory Measure, the Discrepancy Scores on the Relationship Inventory, Experiencing Scale Scores, and the Pre- and Post-Practicum Self-Awareness Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainees’ Total Relationship Inventory Measure</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Y</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Z</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y vs. Z</td>
<td>3.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors’ Total Relationship Inventory Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y vs. Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrepancy Scores on Relationship Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y vs. Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee Experiencing Scale Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y vs. Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Practicum Self-Awareness Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y vs. Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Practicum Self-Awareness Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X vs. Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y vs. Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant levels for these scores are: X vs. Y and X vs. Z = df = 18. Y vs. Z = df = 17.

**p .01 = 2.88**  
**p .05 = 2.10**  
**p .01 = 2.90**  
**p .05 = 2.11**
The differences that exist between the mean scores of the different groups do not permit grouping the results of all subjects together; therefore, the remainder of the results will be reported for the three separate groups.

QUESTION 1: To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the trainee, related to the level of the trainee's level of experiencing?

Table 5 shows the product moment coefficients of correlation of the trainees' Relationship Inventory measures with their Experiencing Scale scores. From this table it can be seen that in group X, Level of Regard, Empathic Understanding, Unconditionality of Regard, as well as the total Relationship Inventory score correlates significantly ($p \leq .05$) with the Experiencing Scale score of the third sample from the "experiencing tape."

In group Y most of the correlations are negative with two reaching significance at the .05 level; Level of Regard with the Experiencing Scale score at the third quarter, and Congruity with the average experiencing score. The following ten negative correlations are significant at the .01 level: Empathic Understanding with the first and third sample experiencing scores; Congruity with the experiencing score from the first and third sample; Unconditionality of Regard with the third sample and the average experiencing score; and the total Relationship Inventory measure with the first, third, and average experiencing score.

The correlations in group Z show variability. The Level of Regard and the second and average experiencing scores, as well
TABLE 5
COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF EXPERIENCING SCALE SCORES WITH THE TRAINEES' RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES

Computations based on data from 28 trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group Y</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group Z</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td>Sample 3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td>Sample 3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td>Sample 3</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.382*</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.400*</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.716**</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.515**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.436*</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>-.708*</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.501**</td>
<td>-.488*</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.524**</td>
<td>-.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>-.628*</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.579**</td>
<td>-.401*</td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.400*</td>
<td>-.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>-.353</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.453*</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.624**</td>
<td>-.624*</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Relationship Inventory</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.415*</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>-.640**</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.673**</td>
<td>-.480**</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance levels for these correlations are: ** p < .01 (df = 26) = .478
* p < .05 (df = 26) = .374
as Unconditionality of Regard and the first experiencing score, are correlated significantly at the .01 level. The third experiencing score correlates negatively with Empathic Understanding (p .01) and Congruity (p .05).

Table 6 presents the Rho coefficients of correlation of the trainees' Relationship Inventory measures with their experiencing Scale scores. It can be seen that all of the correlations reach significance at the .01 level. The trainees in group Z scored each sub-measure and the total Relationship Inventory higher, as well as achieving a higher score on the Experiencing Scale; while the trainees in group Y scored each sub-measure and total Relationship Inventory lowest as well as achieving the lowest Experiencing Scale scores. This leaves the trainees in group X always scoring in between group Y and Z.

Discussion

In Tables 5 and 6 the variability among the three groups may be observed. The trainees in group X show some positive relationship between their perceptions of the supervisory relationship and their experiencing scores, trainees in group Z show various correlations, while all of group Y correlations were negative. No definite trends can be shown from these. In fact, from Table 5 indications are that there is little relationship existing between the trainees' perceptions of the supervisory relationship and their level of experiencing.

However, Table 6 indicates that according to the group, there is a relationship between the trainee's perception of the
TABLE 6
RHO COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF COUNSELOR-TRAINEE RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES WITH EXPERIENCING SCALE SCORES

Computations based on data from 28 counselor trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainees' Level of Regard with Average Experiencing Score</th>
<th>Trainees' Empathic Understanding with Average Experiencing Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \rho = 1.00 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainees' Congruity with Average Experiencing Score</th>
<th>Trainees' Unconditionality of Regard with Average Experiencing Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \rho = 1.00 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainees' Total Relationship Inventory with Average Experiencing Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance levels for this correlation are: \( p < 0.01 \) (df = 1) = 1.00, \( p < 0.05 \) (df = 1) = .997.
supervisory relationship and his level of experiencing. The trainees in group Z perceived their supervisory relationships highest and they also achieved the highest experiencing scores. Those in group X perceived their relationships less favorably and achieved lower experiencing scores, while the trainees in group Y report the least favorable perceptions and the lowest experiencing scores.

This possibly means that because the trainees in group Z perceived the supervisor as having a high level of regard, empathic understanding, and unconditional regard for them, as well as having his actions be congruent with his feelings, they felt the atmosphere threat-free enough to examine their feelings and experiences. Possibly because the trainees in group Y did not perceive such an atmosphere, they were unable to reach as high a level of experiencing. However, the negative correlations in Table 5 show that even the trainees in group Y who perceived the relationship as good had low experiencing scores.

Because the trainees in the three groups were randomly selected from the same population, it may be assumed that the supervisor in each group was the affecting variable. This indicates that the supervisor with whom the trainee works may affect his professional growth. Gendlin (18) points out that the competence of the counselor depends on the manner in which he employs his vocabulary and concepts to grasp and refer to the actual experiencing of an individual. This includes himself and the client. Gendlin has proposed a research design to measure the
counselor's ability to judge the experiencing level of clients; however, he has found that the judge is only as good as his own personality permits. Cahoon (10) reported that the counselor's experiencing level was related to his being able to establish better relationships with his clients.

QUESTION 2: To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the supervisor, related to the trainee's level of experiencing?

Table 7 shows the coefficients of correlation of the supervisor's Relationship Inventory measures with the trainee's Experiencing Scale scores. Supervisor X's Empathic Understanding, Congruity, and total Relationship Inventory measures correlate significantly (p < .05) with the trainees' Experiencing Scale scores on the third sample. The Unconditionality of Regard measure is negatively correlated (p < .05) with the first experiencing score.

Supervisor Y's Level of Regard measure is negatively correlated with the trainee's first and second Experiencing Scale scores at the .05 level showing that the supervisor's high Level of Regard was related to his trainees having a low experiencing score. The Unconditionality of Regard measure is negatively correlated with the first experiencing score at the .05 level and with the third score at the .01 level. The Empathic Understanding measure also correlates negatively (p < .05) with the second Experiencing Scale score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th>Group Y</th>
<th>Group Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample #1</td>
<td>Sample #2</td>
<td>Sample #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.402*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.440*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>-.412*</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.441*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance levels for these correlations are: 
**p < .01 (df = 26) = .478,  *p < .05 (df = 26) = .374.**
Supervisor Z's Level of Regard and Congruity measures are correlated significantly (p < .01) with the trainees' second, third, and average experiencing scores. Also, the total Relationship Inventory measure correlates significantly with the second and average experiencing score at the .01 level and the third score at the .05 level. The Empathic Understanding measure correlated (p < .05) with the second sample of experiencing.

Discussion

Once again, the variability of the groups must be pointed out. Supervisor X's perceptions of his relationships has little or no relationship with the trainees' level of experiencing; supervisor Y's perceptions have a negative relationship, while supervisor Z's perceptions are highly related to his trainee's level of experiencing.

Supervisor Y scored his supervisory relationships quite low. Supervisor Y's perceptions of having a good relationship is in general related to the trainees having a low experiencing score. Thus, it may appear that this supervisor was unable to establish positive relationships with his trainees, which in turn affected their experiencing scores. In fact, the more sensitive trainees did not perceive the relationship as good.

In general, as supervisor Z perceived himself as having a good supervisory relationship, his trainees achieved a higher level of experiencing. Actually, his perceptions of the relationship are a better indication than the trainees. This would mean that if he is accurate in his perceptions of the atmosphere he
sets, he would know if he inhibited or facilitated the trainee's openness to experience. This is contrary to the popular belief that how the one person perceives himself is not important; it is how he is perceived that has the affect on the second person. However, Truax (41) notes that it is really the therapist that sets the atmosphere of the relationship. He conducted a study with eight therapists, having eight clients rotate therapists and describe the relationship on an inventory. From this he concluded that some therapists consistently had better relationships than other therapists.

Is there a relationship between the supervisor's perceptions of the supervisory relationship and the trainee's level of experiencing? From these results, one might conclude it depends upon the supervisor—with one there was none, with one it was negative, and with another there was a positive relationship.

QUESTION 3: To what extent is the discrepancy between the supervisor's and trainee's perceptions of the relationship related to the trainee's level of experiencing?

Table 8 shows the coefficients of correlation of the Experiencing Scale scores with the discrepancy between the trainees' and the supervisors' Relationship Inventory measures.

In group X little or no significant correlations were found. Group Y reported several scattered correlations with the first and third experiencing samples but only the discrepancy on
TABLE 8
COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF THE EXPERIENCING SCALE SCORES WITH THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN TRAINEES' RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES AND THE SUPERVISORS' RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES

Computations based on data from three supervisors working with 28 counselor trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group Y</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group Z</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-.555</td>
<td>-.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.370</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>-.600</td>
<td>-.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>.376*</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-.612**</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.510**</td>
<td>-.393*</td>
<td>-.492**</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>-.694**</td>
<td>-.741**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Relationship Inventory</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.450*</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.482**</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>-.479**</td>
<td>-.708**</td>
<td>-.721**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance levels for these correlations are: **p .01 (df = 26) = .478
*p .05 (df = 26) = .374
the Congruity measures reaches significance (p .05) with the average experiencing score.

From the table it can be seen that in group Z the correlations are primarily negative. The discrepancy on the Level of Regard measures is correlated with the third and average Experiencing Scale scores at the .01 level. Empathic Understanding is correlated with the second (p .05), third (p .01), and the average (p .05) experiencing score. The discrepancy on the Congruity measures is correlated at the .05 level with each of the samples and the average experiencing scores. Also the discrepancy on the total Relationship Inventory measures correlated with the second, third, and average Experiencing Scale scores at the .01 level. These all indicate that the more discrepancy that exists in perception of the supervisory relationship, the lower the experiencing level of the trainee.

Discussion

In group X no significant relationships exist; however, group Y shows a tendency and group Z shows a stronger trend toward high discrepancy in perception of the supervisory relation being related to the trainee's lower experiencing level. This would indicate that the trainees who were less sensitive, as measured on the experiencing tapes, were also less sensitive as to how the supervisor actually felt. One might hypothesize that these trainees would also be insensitive to the feelings of their clients. This would reinforce Gendlin's concept that a counselor's sensitivity to others is restricted by their own personalities.
One could also note that the inverse relationship must exist. The lower the discrepancy in perception, the higher the experiencing level of the trainee. Thus, one might conclude that the more congruent the perceptions or the more sensitive the two are to each other, the better the chances that the trainee will achieve a high experiencing level.

One must conclude that the discrepancy in perception of the relationship is related to the trainee's experiencing level only with certain supervisors.

QUESTION 4: To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the trainee, related to the level of the trainee's self-awareness?

Table 9 presents the coefficients of correlation of the trainees' Relationship Inventory measures with their self-awareness scores. The z' transformation gives a critical ratio showing the significance of difference between the pre-practicum and post-practicum correlations.

In group X it can be seen that the pre-practicum self-awareness scores are all negatively correlated with the Relationship Inventory: Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard (p .01); Empathic Understanding, Congruity, and the total Relationship Inventory (p .05). Only the Congruity measures reached significance (p .05) with the post-practicum self-awareness scores. However, the critical ratio shows that significant change in self-awareness did take place between pre- and post-practicum correlations. The change was significantly
TABLE 9

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF SELF-AWARENESS SCORES WITH THE
TRAINEE'S RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES

Computations based on data from 28 counselor trainees divided into three groups of ten,
nine, and nine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Practicum</td>
<td>Post-Practicum</td>
<td>p^a</td>
<td>Pre-Practicum</td>
<td>Post-Practicum</td>
<td>p^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>-.510**</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.420*</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>-.411*</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>-.396*</td>
<td>.433*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>-.506**</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Relationship Inventory</td>
<td>-.440*</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aProbability obtained from z' transformations showing the significance of difference
between the correlations.
correlated at the .01 level with all of the Relationship Inventory measures except Unconditionality of Regard. This indicates that the trainees who perceived the relationship high had a significant decrease in self-awareness, from the beginning to the end of the practicum.

In group Y only Level of Regard was significantly related to the pre-practicum self-awareness scores. Empathic Understanding was negatively correlated with the post-practicum self-awareness scores. The critical ratios show that there was a significant change in self-awareness related to the Empathic Understanding measures and the total Relationship Inventory scores. These show that there was an increase in self-awareness from the beginning to the end of the practicum for those trainees perceiving a good relationship.

In group Z Congruity, Unconditionality of Regard, and the total Relationship Inventory measures were significantly related (p .01) with the self-awareness scores before the practicum. The post-practicum scores are correlated (p .05) with the Congruity measures and negatively correlated (p .05) with the Unconditionality of Regard measures. The critical ratios show that only the change in Self-awareness related to the Unconditionality of Regard measures reached significance, showing an increase in Self-awareness.

Discussion

In group X the trainees who perceived the supervisory relationship as being good had a larger discrepancy on the two post-
practicum self-descriptions than on the pre-practicum, thus indicating less self-awareness at the conclusion of the practicum. However, as a group, the trainees in this group had the highest change toward self-awareness.

Contrary to this, the trainees in groups Y and Z with perceptions of a good relationship show a trend toward better self-awareness at the conclusion of the practicum. As a group the trainees in group Y had only a slight change in self-awareness; however, there was a trend for those who perceived a good relationship to have a change toward better self-awareness. As a group the trainees in group Z had a slight decrease in self-awareness, but those who perceived a good supervisory relationship show a trend toward better self-awareness.

The most obvious issue presented by Table 9 is the opposite results obtained from group X and group Y. In group X there was a significant change in self-awareness related to the trainee's perception of the total relationship, indicating a decrease in self-awareness for trainees who felt they had a good supervisory relationship. Among the trainees in group Y there was a significant increase in self-awareness related to their perception of a good relationship.

There is some difficulty with this, as well as the next four tables, because of the concept of self-awareness. Actually, self-awareness as used in this study is self-consistency. The person is asked to describe himself on one instrument (Activities Index) and a few days later asked to describe himself again on a
second instrument (Counselor-Self-Questionnaire), which is actually the same instrument, "differing only in transparency."
The more consistent these two descriptions are, the better self-awareness is implied. It is possible that the trainees who perceived a good relationship with their supervisor were free enough to see themselves differently at different times. Hence, there is a need to examine the concept of self-awareness as well as to utilize different instruments to measure self-awareness.

A relationship does seem to appear between trainee's perceptions of the supervisory relationship and his level of self-awareness as used in this study. However, it is dependent upon which supervisory group the trainee is in: in one group there was no significant relationship, in one it was related to self-awareness, and in one to decrease in self-awareness.

QUESTION 5: To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the supervisor, related to the level of the trainee's self-awareness.

Table 10 shows the coefficients of correlation of the trainees' self-awareness scores with the supervisors' Relationship Inventory measures. The z' transformation scores give a critical ratio showing the significance of difference between the pre- and post-practicum correlations.

In group X, the supervisor's Level of Regard, Empathic Understanding, and total Relationship Inventory were negatively related to the pre-practicum self-awareness scores at the .05 level, and the Congruity measures were negatively related at the .01 level. Only Unconditionality of Regard was negatively related
**TABLE 10**

**COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF THE TRAINEES' SELF-AWARENESS SCORES WITH THE SUPERVISORS' RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES**

Computations based on data from three supervisors working with 28 trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th>Group Y</th>
<th>Group Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Practicum</td>
<td>Post-Practicum</td>
<td>Pre-Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>-.375*</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>-.417*</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>-.499**</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>-.521**</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Relationship Inventory</td>
<td>-.465*</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probability obtained from z' transformations showing the significance of difference between the correlations.

Significance level of these correlations are: **p.01 (df = 26) = .478, *p.05 (df = 26) = .374**.
(p .01) with the post-practicum self-awareness scores. The critical ratios show variability with the only significant change being related to the congruity measures, indicating that the supervisor's perceptions of being congruent were related to the trainees' decrease in self-awareness.

In group Y, the supervisor's Level of Regard was related (p .01) with the pre-practicum self-awareness scores and Unconditionality of Regard was related at the .05 level. Unconditionality of Regard was negatively related (p .01) with the post-practicum score. The critical ratios show that there is variability in the change in self-awareness with the only significant change being related to Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard measures, indicating that the supervisors' perceptions of having a high level of regard and unconditionality of regard were related to the trainee's increase in self-awareness.

In group Z, the trainees' pre-practicum self-awareness scores were related (p .01) with the supervisor's Empathic Understanding of Regard measures. Only the supervisor's Congruity measures were related (p .05) with the trainees' post-practicum self-awareness scores. The critical ratios show that there was a significant change in the trainees' self-awareness related to the supervisor's Empathic Understanding and Unconditional Regard measures. These scores indicate that there was an increase in the trainees' self-awareness related to the supervisor's perception of having high Empathic Understanding and Unconditional Regard.
Discussion

The different supervisor's perceptions of the supervisory relationship are related to various changes in the trainees' self-awareness. However, no general trend is evident, indicating little or no relationship between the supervisor's perceptions of the relationship and the trainees' self-awareness. Once again there is a difficulty because of the concept of self-awareness or self-consistency.

QUESTION 6: To what extent is the discrepancy between the supervisor's and trainee's perceptions of the relationship related to the trainee's self-awareness?

Table 11 presents the coefficients of correlation of self-awareness scores with the discrepancy between the trainees' Relationship Inventory measures and the supervisor's Relationship Inventory measures. The $z'$ transformations give a critical ratio showing the significance of difference between the pre- and post-practicum correlations.

In group X, no significant correlations existed with the pre-practicum self-awareness scores. However, the post-practicum self-awareness scores were significantly related to the Level of Regard, Empathic Understanding, and Unconditionality of Regard measures at the .05 level, and Congruity and total Relationship Inventory measures at the .01 level. These indicate that the higher the discrepancy in perception of the supervisory relationship the higher the self-awareness scores, meaning poorer self-awareness scores, meaning poorer self-awareness. The critical ratios show that all of the correlations changed greatly and two,
TABLE 11

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF SELF-AWARENESS SCORES WITH THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN TRAINEES' RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES AND THE SUPERVISORS' RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY MEASURES

Computations based on data from three supervisors working with 28 trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>Group X</th>
<th>Group Y</th>
<th>Group Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Practicum</td>
<td>Post-Practicum</td>
<td>Pre-Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.453*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.428*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.445*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Relationship Inventory</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Probability obtained from z' transformations showing the significance of difference between the correlations.

Significance level for these correlations are: ** P<sub>0.01</sub> (df = 26) = .478

* P<sub>0.05</sub> (df = 26) = .374

* P<sub>0.05</sub> (df = 26) = .374
Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard, reached significance at the .05 level.

In group Y no significant correlations existed with the pre-practicum scores. The post-practicum self-awareness scores were significantly correlated (p < .05) with the discrepancy scores on the Unconditionality of Regard measures, and negatively correlated (p < .01) with the discrepancy scores on the Empathic Understanding measures. The critical ratios show that significant differences exist between the correlations with the pre- and post-practicum scores and the discrepancy scores on the Empathic Understanding and the Unconditionality of Regard measures. This means that the higher the discrepancy on these measures, the better the self-awareness of the trainees.

In group Z the pre-practicum self-awareness scores were related to the discrepancy scores on the Level of Regard, Congruence, and Unconditionality of Regard, and the total Relationship Inventory at the .01 level. There were no significant correlations between the post-practicum self-awareness scores and any of the Relationship Inventory discrepancy scores. The critical ratios show that significant differences exist between the correlations with the pre- and post-practicum scores and the discrepancy scores on the Level of Regard, Empathic Understanding, Unconditionality of Regard, and the total Relationship Inventory measures. This indicates that on all, except the Empathic Understanding measures, the higher the discrepancy the better the trainee's self-awareness.
Discussion

Strong differences exist among the groups. The trainees in group X who have a high discrepancy in perception of the supervisory relationship have a higher post-practicum self-awareness score, meaning poorer self-awareness. This would mean that the reverse may be assumed; that the smaller discrepancy would be related to better trainee self-awareness.

Nevertheless, there is a tendency in group Y and a strong trend in group Z for those trainees with a high discrepancy in perception of the supervisory relationship to have the lowest self-awareness scores, meaning better self-awareness. There is one possible explanation for these results. The self-awareness scores indicate that the trainee is really self-consistent. These people have a tendency to stereotype themselves by description and possibly do the same with the supervisory relationship. Many of the trainees in group Y and Z scored the relationship much higher than their supervisor. This may have occurred because they were not sensitive to the supervisor's feelings, but merely stereotyped him as being good.

Because of the great conflict in results no definite relationship can be seen between the discrepancy in perceptions of the supervisory relationship and the trainees' self-awareness.

QUESTION 7: To what extent is the trainee's level of self-awareness related to his level of experiencing?

Table 12 presents the coefficients of correlation of the Experiencing Scale scores with the self-awareness scores of the
TABLE 12

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF EXPERIENCING SCALE SCORES WITH SELF-AWARENESS SCORES

Computations based on data from 28 counselor trainees divided into three groups of ten, nine, and nine, each with a different supervisor.

| Experiencing Scale Scores | Self-Awareness Scores | Group X | | | | Group Y | | | | Group Z | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                          |                       | Pre-Practicum | Post-Practicum | P<sup>a</sup> | Pre-Practicum | Post-Practicum | P<sup>a</sup> | Pre-Practicum | Post-Practicum | P<sup>a</sup> |
| Sample #1                |                       | .010     | .373     | .17     | -.167   | .363     | .04     | -.206    | -.372*   | .47     |
| Sample #2                |                       | .105     | .366     | .32     | -.419*  | .127     | .04     | .074     | .075    | .99     |
| Sample #3                |                       | -.646**  | -.212    | .04     | -.594** | .578**   | .01     | -.265    | -.248   | .96     |
| Average                  |                       | -.274    | .287     | .04     | -.447*  | .412*    | .01     | -.268    | -.149   | .65     |

<sup>a</sup>Probability obtained from z<sup>'</sup> transformations showing the significance of difference between the correlations.

Significance levels for these correlations are:

- \( **p_{.01} \) (df = 26) = .478
- \( *p_{.05} \) (df = 26) = .374
trainees. The z' transformations give a critical ratio which shows the significance of difference between the pre- and post-practicum correlations.

In group X there was a negative correlation (p .01) between the pre-practicum self-awareness scores and the Experiencing Scale scores on the third sample. There are no significant correlations with the post-practicum self-awareness scores. The critical ratios show that there was a significant change in the correlations with the third and average experiencing score. This means that the trainees in this group who achieved the highest experiencing scores had a significantly lower level of self-awareness at the conclusion of the practicum.

In group Y the pre-practicum self-awareness scores were negatively correlated with the second and average experiencing score at the .05 level and with the third experiencing score at the .01 level. The post-practicum self-awareness scores were correlated with the third (p .01) and average (p .05) experiencing score. The critical ratios show that there was significant differences between the pre- and post-practicum correlations with all the Experiencing Scale scores. This means that the trainees with higher Experiencing Scale scores had a significantly lower level of self-awareness at the conclusion of the practicum.

In group Z no significant correlations existed between the pre-practicum self-awareness scores and the Experiencing Scale scores. Only the first experiencing score was negatively
correlated with the post-practicum self-awareness score. The critical ratios indicate that there was no significant change between the pre- and post-practicum correlations.

Discussion

A trend exists for the trainees with a high experiencing score to have a higher post-practicum self-awareness score, meaning poorer self-awareness. At first this looks contrary to what might be expected. However, on closer examination one may see that the difficulty with this, as well as the preceding tables dealing with self-awareness scores, is caused by the instruments.

The difference between self-awareness and self-consistency may be clearly seen. Each trainee was asked to describe himself on one instrument (Activities Index) and a few days later asked to describe himself again on a second instrument (Counselor-Self-Questionnaire), which is actually the same instrument, "differing only in transparency." If the trainee described himself the similar on these two occasions he was termed "self-aware" when he was actually consistent and may not have been aware. Should a person achieve a high level of experiencing, he would be aware of his varying feelings. Hence, he may describe himself differently on different days and yet be accurate in his description and aware of his feelings. Therefore, the trainees who were sensitive to their experiencing, as measured by the
Experiencing Scale, described themselves differently on separate occasions because they were aware of different feelings at those times.

One must conclude that there is a negative relationship between the trainee's level of self-awareness, as measured by self-estimate, and the trainee's level of experiencing.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was conceived primarily to study the relationship between the supervisor and the trainee in the counselor education process. The purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent to which the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship is related to the trainee's self-awareness and the trainee's level of experiencing.

The importance and theoretical background of the study were discussed by reference to the theory and research related to three areas: the nature of the relationship, experiencing level, and self-awareness, as they were related to the supervised counseling practicum.

The nature of the relationship was discussed primarily in terms of the client-centered conceptions of the helping relationship as conceived by Rogers (35) in his article on the necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Barrett-Lennard developed an instrument, the Relationship Inventory, to measure the level of positive regard, the degree of empathic understanding, the conditionality or unconditionality of regard and the degree of congruence or genuineness. The instrument may be used to determine the quality of the counselor's interaction with a client. Other studies were cited
to show that if the one person is congruent, if he likes the second person, unconditionally, and if he understands the essential feelings of the second person as they seem to him, then there is a strong probability that this will be an effective helping relationship. Literature was noted to show the appropriateness of this concept to the practicum supervisory relationship.

The experiencing level was discussed primarily in terms of the client centered conception of psychotherapy. Gendlin (17) developed the Experiencing Scale from one strand of the Process Scale. The experiencing level concept can be summarized by the term "subjective experiencing," or the process of having experience. It refers to experienced felt meaning. Gendlin relates the concept of experiencing to congruence or genuineness by pointing out that the counselor is congruent if he experiences or feels, as much as possible, his clients feelings. The ability to do this is inhibited or facilitated by the counselor's own personality. Cahoon's (1) investigation indicates that there is a relationship between the counselors experiencing level and the relationships he establishes with his clients. Gendlin (19) proposes that a counselor's experiencing level may be enhanced by the supervisory process.

Self-awareness was discussed and studies cited showing the utilization of self-estimates. Implications for the supervisory methods were noted in terms of the strategies a supervisor might employ to help trainees understand and accept themselves as
persons. The supervisory relationship must have an atmosphere in which the two persons can communicate about the trainee's needs and behavior. The degree to which this relationship exists is directly related to the amount of trainee self-understanding and acceptance that will occur. Further, as a trainee's self-awareness and acceptance increases, his counseling interview behavior will also improve.

The problem of the study was stated in seven questions which the study was designed to answer. These questions can be summarized as follows: To what extent is the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship, as perceived by the trainee, related to the trainee's level of experiencing and self-awareness? To what extent is the level of supervisory-trainee relationship, as perceived by the supervisor, related to the trainee's level of experiencing and self-awareness? To what extent is the discrepancy between the supervisor's and trainee's perceptions of the relationship related to the trainee's level of experiencing and self-awareness? To what extent is the trainee's level of self-awareness related to his level of experiencing?

The procedures used to test these questions were to have each of the twenty-eight trainees rate the supervisory relationship with their supervisor on the Relationship Inventory. Likewise, the supervisors rated the relationship they had with each trainee.
Before the practicum, but in separate group sessions, each trainee described himself on the Stem Activities Index and the Counselor-Self-Questionnaire. The same procedure was conducted at the finish of the practicum.

At the conclusion of the practicum each trainee was asked to have an interview with his supervisor. In this recorded interview, he was asked to respond to his practicum experiences in terms of what was significant or meaningful for him. The tapes were later analyzed in terms of the trainee's experiencing level, using Gendlin's Experiencing Scale.

Data were then prepared for analysis on an IBM computer. Product moment correlations of coefficient, Rho correlations of coefficient, t tests, and z' transformation were conducted.

Conclusions

One of the primary findings in this study was the variability among the trainees in the separate groups. Because the trainees in the groups were randomly selected from the same population, it may be assumed that the supervisor in each group was the affecting variable.

Because of the variability in the groups some interesting conclusions may be drawn concerning the supervisory relationship in the counselor education process. Let us first describe the relationships as perceived by the different trainees and supervisors.
The trainees in group Z perceived their supervisor as having a high level of regard, unconditionality of regard, empathic understanding, and as being a congruent person. Thus, they rated their total supervisory relationship very high, much higher than the other two groups. The trainees in group X perceived their supervisor as having a lower level of regard, unconditionality of regard, empathic understanding, and as a less congruent person. Therefore, they rated their total supervisory relationship as average, in comparison to the other two groups. The trainees in group Y perceived their supervisory as having the lowest level of regard, unconditionality of regard, empathic understanding, and as being the least congruent person. They ranked their total supervisory relationships as the lowest, in comparison with the other two groups. There was a significant difference in the rating of the relationships by trainees in group Z and Y.

Likewise, supervisor Y rated the four sub-measures as well as the total supervisory relationship lowest of the three supervisors. In fact, he rated the total relationship lower than the trainees. Supervisor X rated his total relationships highest of the three supervisors and slightly higher than his trainees. There was great discrepancy between the trainees and supervisor X on the sub-measures, indicating there was some misperceptions. Supervisor Z rated his supervisory relationships in between the other two supervisors but lower than his trainees. This indicates that the trainees perceived supervisor Z to have
a higher level of regard, unconditionality of regard, empathic understanding, and to be more congruent than he perceived himself. There was significant difference in rating the relationship by supervisor Z and Y, as well as supervisor Z and X.

From these relationships, several significant conclusions stand out:

The trainees in group Z perceived their supervisory relationship highest and they achieved the highest experiencing scores; trainees in group X perceived their relationships less favorably and achieved lower experiencing scores; while the trainees in group Y reported the least favorable relationships and achieved the lowest experiencing scores. In fact, the trainees in group Y who perceived the relationship as good had low experiencing scores. Thus, this suggests that the experiencing level of the trainee is able to achieve is somewhat related to the supervisor with whom he works.

Another finding showing the differences in the groups is related to the supervisor’s perceptions of the supervisory relationship and the trainee's experiencing scores. Supervisor Z’s perceptions of his supervisory relationships correlated very highly with the trainees experiencing scores. This suggests that when supervisor Z perceived a good relationship his trainees achieved a higher level of experiencing. This is similar to Truax's position that it is the counselor who sets the atmosphere of the relationship, only here it would be the supervisor that would set the atmosphere of the supervisory relationship.
A third finding showing the differences in the groups is related to the discrepancy in perceptions of the relationship and the trainee's level of experiencing. The discrepancy in perceptions of the supervisory relationship and the trainee's level of experiencing was negatively correlated in group Z. This shows that the greater the discrepancy, the lower the trainees experiencing level. The trainees who mis-perceived the relationship were also less sensitive to their own experiencing.

Opposite results were obtained from groups X and Y as to the relevance of the trainee's perceptions of the supervisory relationship to their self-awareness scores. The trainees in group X who perceived a good relationship had a significant decrease in self-awareness during the practicum. The trainees in group Y who perceived a good relationship had a significant increase in self-awareness. This indicates that there is a relationship between the trainee's perceptions of the supervisory relationship and their self-awareness scores, however, it is dependent upon the supervisory group within which the trainee was working.

Little or no relationship is reported between the trainee's level of self-awareness and the supervisor's perceptions of the supervisory relationship, or the discrepancy between the two relationship inventory scores. This is possibly caused by the measurement of self-consistency rather than self-awareness.

There appears to be a negative correlation between the trainees' level of experiencing and their level of self-awareness,
as measured by self-estimates. This may be explained by showing that "self-awareness" as measured here is really "self-stereotyping" while a high experiencing score suggests the person is aware of the fluidity in his feelings.

An over-all conclusion would be that supervisors establish different relationships with their groups of trainees, drawn from the same population, and these relationships appear to affect different trainee behaviors.

Implications

The following section will suggest some implications of this study. Suggestions will be of two types: action and further research. Actions will be possible steps which may be taken by practicum supervisors. Further research will suggest additional investigations which might be made in the area of practicum supervision.

Implications for action.—Supervisors might aim toward a more clear and sensitive awareness of the trainee's inner being; toward a greater ability to deeply understand the trainee's moment-to-moment feelings and experiences. Supervisors could allow themselves to express more openly their deep caring for the trainees with whom they work; to do this unconditionally would be to set no conditions for the prizing of the person. Supervisors could risk confrontation with the trainee as a person rather than in a professional role; their open or non-defensive intactness, their genuineness, would encourage the trainee to also deeply be himself within the relationship. In short,
Supervisors might focus more directly on establishing a good working relationship with each trainee. By relationship oriented supervision we may foster relationship oriented counseling, rather than reinforcing technique counseling by technique supervision.

Supervisors might also focus more directly on the trainee's experiencing level and help him to become more open to his experiencing. This does not mean that the supervisor would serve as a therapist for the trainee. However, if the trainee's experiencing level is to be permitted to reach its peak within the interview, the supervisor's responses and his attitudes must be as helpful as possible. The supervisor must help the trainee reach his peak experiencing level, instead of remaining obscure as in the "experiencing interview." The supervisor's role would be to aid the trainee to be more open and sensitive both to his own experiencing and to his clients.

Implications for research.—The task ahead for research is to further specify the separate types of supervisor behavior and evaluate their relevance to counselor education.

There is a need to study the supervisors' differences. A complete study should be made including testing and personal interviews. To enable the investigator to see the differences a particular supervisor would have on each group, the supervisors should be rotated so they work with each of the groups. This process would lead to further research in studying the differences that exist between the supervisors. Studies may be designed to
investigate the differences in the supervisors' personality make up, level of experiencing, and their techniques. Through taping the supervisory interviews, one could study the dynamics that take place between the two persons, as well as the frequency of certain supervisor responses, such as reflecting, accepting, supporting, questioning, interpreting, identifying errors, or instructing.

Another step that is necessary in research is to study the outcomes of different supervisory behaviors. There is a need to see if the trainee who experiences a better supervisory relationship is better able to establish a better counseling relationship. In fact, there is a need to follow-up different supervisory techniques to find their relatedness to the counseling process.

Research with practicum supervision will continue to be slow because of the small numbers enrolled in each practicum. This difficulty may be overcome by several supervisors working together in cooperative research.

One would hope that such research would lead to supervisor selection, educational standards, and better supervision of counseling practicum; resulting in better prepared counselors.
Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement carefully for your present relationship with ________________________________.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in plus (+) or minus (-) to stand for the following answers:

+++ Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
++ Yes, I feel it is true.
+ Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-- No, I feel it is not true.
*** No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. He respects me.
2. He tries to understand exactly how I see things.
3. He is interested in my only when I am talking about certain things.
4. He tells me things that he does not mean.
5. He disapproves of me.
6. He understands my words but does not know how I feel.
7. Sometimes he is more friendly toward me than he is at other times.
8. What he says to me is never different from what he thinks or feels.
9. He is curious about what makes me act like I do, but not really interested in me as a person.
10. He is interested in knowing how things seem to me.
11. The way I react to him does not affect his liking for me.
12. He is upset whenever I talk about or ask about certain things.

13. He likes to see me.

14. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.

15. He likes me when I feel certain ways about myself but when I feel other ways he does not like me.

16. He has feelings about me that he doesn't say anything about and these make it harder for me to get along.

17. He feels indifferent about me.

18. At times he thinks that I feel more strongly or more concerned about something than I actually do.

19. He always seems to feel the same way toward me.

20. He behaves just the way that he really is when I'm around.

21. He appreciates me.

22. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels.

23. He likes me in some ways and dislikes me in others.

24. At times I think he is not aware of the way he feels about me.

25. He is friendly and warm toward me.

26. He understands me.

27. If I am annoyed with him he becomes annoyed with me.

28. He pretends that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.

29. He cares about me.

30. His feelings about things I say or do keep him from really understanding me.

31. Whether I am expressing "good" or "bad" feelings seems to make no difference in the way he feels toward me.

32. He does not avoid anything that he thinks or feels about me.
33. He feels that I am dull and uninteresting.
34. He ignores some of my feelings.
35. Sometimes he is warm and friendly toward me, at other times cold or disapproving.
36. I feel that I can trust him to be honest with me.
37. He is interested in me.
38. He appreciates how my experiences feel to me.
39. Depending on the way he feels, he sometimes responds to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than he does at other times.
40. He is at ease in our relationship.
41. He just "puts up" with me.
42. He tells me what my actions and feelings mean.
43. How well he likes me depends on what I tell him about myself.
44. He is acting a part with me.
45. He really cares about what happens to me.
46. He does not realize how strong some of my feelings about things are.
47. His general feeling toward me varies a lot.
48. Sometimes I feel that what he says to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.
49. I feel that he really thinks I am worthwhile.
50. He responds to me mechanically.
51. Whether I like or dislike myself makes no difference to the way he feels toward me.
52. I don't think that he is being honest with himself about the way he feels toward me.
53. He dislikes me.
54. He looks at the things I do from his own point of view.
55. Sometimes he seems to like me and at other times he doesn't seem to care.
56. I feel that he is being genuine with me.
57. He is impatient with me.
58. He generally sees how I am feeling.
59. He likes me better when I behave in some ways than when I behave in other ways.
60. Sometimes I can see that he is not comfortable with me, but we go on and pay no attention to it.
61. He feels a deep liking for me.
62. He understands completely what I say to him.
63. Whether I feel fine or feel awful makes no difference to how he feels about me.
64. He does not try to mislead me about his own thoughts or feelings.
65. He thinks I'm disagreeable.
66. He can be fully aware of my most painful feelings, without being upset himself.
67. I can be very critical of him, or I can like him, without its changing his feeling toward me.
68. What he says gives a false impression of his total reaction to me.
69. At times he feels contempt for me.
70. Even when I can't say quite what I mean, he still understands me.
71. How I feel about him does not make any difference in the way he feels about me.
72. He tries to avoid telling me anything that might upset me.
73. How much does your relationship with this person matter to you? (Check one)
   1. It means more to me than my relationship with anyone else.
2. It is just as important to me as any other relationship I have.

3. There are some other people with whom I have relationships that are more important to me.

4. Compared with other relationships I have, it is not important to me.

5. It is not at all important to me.

74. How satisfied do you feel with the relationship that you now have with this person? (Check one)

1. I feel completely satisfied with it.

2. I am satisfied.

3. I am fairly satisfied.

4. I am about half satisfied, half dissatisfied.

5. I am rather dissatisfied.

6. I am quite dissatisfied.

7. I am extremely dissatisfied.

HS form by G. T. Barrett-Lennard and R. E. Bills (revised by F. van der Veen)
RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY--THERAPIST FORM

Female client
(HS - revised)

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement carefully for your present relationship with ______________________________.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in plus (+) or minus (-) marks to stand for the following answers:

+++ Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
++ Yes, I feel it is true.
+ Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-- No, I feel it is not true.
+++ No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. I respect her.
2. I try to understand exactly how she sees things.
3. I am interested in her only when she is talking about certain things.
4. I tell her things that I do not mean.
5. I disapprove of her.
6. I understand her words but do not know how she feels.
7. Sometimes I am more friendly toward her than I am at other times.
8. What I say to her is never different from what I think or feel.
9. I am curious about what makes her act like she does, but not really interested in her as a person.
10. I am interested in knowing how things seem to her.
11. The way she reacts to me does not affect my liking for her.
12. I am upset whenever she talks about or asks about certain things.
13. I like to see her.
15. I like her when she feels certain ways about herself but when she feels other ways I do not like her.
16. I have feelings about her that I don't say anything about and these make it harder for us to get along.
17. I feel indifferent about her.
18. At times I think that she feels more strongly or more concerned about something than she actually does.
19. I always seem to feel the same way toward her.
20. I behave just the way that I really am when she's around.
21. I appreciate her.
22. Sometimes I think that she feels a certain way, because that's the way I feel.
23. I like her in some ways and dislike her in others.
24. At times she thinks I am not aware of the way I feel about her.
25. I am friendly and warm toward her.
26. I understand her.
27. If she is annoyed with me I become annoyed with her.
28. I pretend that I like her or understand her more than I really do.
29. I care about her.
30. The way I feel about things she says or does keeps me from really understanding her.
31. Whether she is expressing "good" or "bad" feelings seems to make no difference in the way I feel toward her.
32. I do not avoid anything that I think or feel about her.
33. I feel that she is dull and uninteresting.
34. I ignore some of her feelings.
35. Sometimes I am warm and friendly toward her, at other times cold or disapproving.
36. I feel that she can trust me to be honest with her.
37. I am interested in her.
38. I appreciate how her experiences feel to her.
39. Depending on the way I feel, I sometimes respond to her with quite a lot more warmth and interest than I do at other times.
40. I am at ease in our relationship.
41. I just "put up" with her.
42. I tell her what her actions and feelings mean.
43. How well I like her depends on what she tells me about herself.
44. I am acting a part with her.
45. I really care about what happens to her.
46. I do not realize how strong some of her feelings about things are.
47. My general feeling toward her varies a lot.
48. Sometimes I feel that what I say to her is quite different from the way I feel underneath.
49. I feel that I really think she is worthwhile.
50. I respond to her mechanically.
51. Whether she likes or dislikes herself makes no difference in the way I feel about her.
52. I don't think that I am being honest with myself about the way I feel toward her.
53. I dislike her.
54. I look at the things she does from my own point of view.
55. Sometimes I seem to like her and at other times I don't seem to care.

56. I feel that I am being genuine with her.

57. I am impatient with her.

58. I generally see how she is feeling.

59. I like her better when she behaves in some ways than when she behaves in other ways.

60. Sometimes she can see that I am not comfortable with her, but we go on and pay no attention to it.

61. I feel a deep liking for her.

62. I understand completely what she says to me.

63. Whether she feels fine or feels awful makes no difference to how I feel about her.

64. I do not try to mislead her about my own thoughts or feelings.

65. I think she's disagreeable.

66. I can be fully aware of her most painful feelings, without being upset myself.

67. She can be very critical of me, or she can like me, without it changing my feeling toward her.

68. What I say gives a false impression of my total reaction to her.

69. At times I feel contempt for her.

70. Even when she can't say quite what she means, I still understand her.

71. How she feels about me does not make any difference in the way I feel about her.

72. I try to avoid telling her anything that might upset her.

73. How much does your relationship with this client matter to you? (Check one)

   1. It means more to me than my relationship with any other client. (If you see no other
client at this time, change "client" to "person" on each of these choices, and mark accordingly. Please also, make a note of this change.)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is more important to me than most of my relationships with other clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is just as important to me as any other relationship I have with a client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is not as important to me as most of my other relationships with clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is the least important to me of my relationships with clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. How satisfied do you feel with the relationship that you now have with this person? (Check one)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel completely satisfied with it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am fairly satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am about half satisfied, half dissatisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am rather dissatisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am quite dissatisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am extremely dissatisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HS form by G. T. Barrett-Lennard and R. E. Bills (revised by F. van der Veen)
RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Male client
(HT - revised)

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement carefully for your present relationship with ____________________________.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in plus (+) or minus (-) marks to stand for the following answers:

+++ Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
++ Yes, I feel it is true.
+ Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-- No, I feel it is not true.
— No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. I respect him.
2. I try to understand exactly how he sees things.
3. I am interested in him only when he is talking about certain things.
4. I tell him things that I do not mean.
5. I disapprove of him.
6. I understand his words but do not know how he feels.
7. Sometimes I am more friendly toward him than I am at other times.
8. What I say to him is never different from what I think or feel.
9. I am curious about what makes him act like he does, but not really interested in him as a person.
10. I am interested in knowing how things seem to him.
11. The way he reacts to me does not affect my liking for him.
12. I am upset whenever he talks about or asks about certain things.
13. I like to see him.
15. I like him when he feels certain ways about himself but when he feels other ways I do not like him.
16. I have feelings about him that I don't say anything about and these make it harder for us to get along.
17. I feel indifferent about him.
18. At times I think that he feels more strongly or more concerned about something than he actually does.
19. I always seem to feel the same way toward him.
20. I behave just the way that I really am when he's around.
22. Sometimes I think that he feels a certain way, because that's the way I feel.
23. I like him in some ways and dislike him in others.
24. At times he thinks I am not aware of the way I feel about him.
25. I am friendly and warm toward him.
26. I understand him.
27. If he is annoyed with me I become annoyed with him.
28. I pretend that I like him or understand him more than I really do.
29. I care about him.
30. The way I feel about things he says or does keeps me from really understanding him.
31. Whether he is expressing "good" or "bad" feelings seems to make no difference in the way I feel toward him.
32. I do not avoid anything that I think or feel about him.
33. I feel that he is dull and uninteresting.
34. I ignore some of his feelings.
35. Sometimes I am warm and friendly toward him, at other times cold or disapproving.
36. I feel that he can trust me to be honest with him.
37. I am interested in him.
38. I appreciate how his experiences feel to him.
39. Depending on the way I feel, I sometimes respond to him with quite a lot more warmth and interest than I do at other times.
40. I am at ease in our relationship.
41. I just "put up" with him.
42. I tell him what his actions and feelings mean.
43. How well I like him depends on what he tells me about himself.
44. I am acting a part with him.
45. I really care about what happens to him.
46. I do not realize how strong some of his feelings about things are.
47. My general feeling toward him varies a lot.
48. Sometimes I feel that what I say to him is quite different from the way I feel underneath.
49. I feel that I really think he is worthwhile.
50. I respond to him mechanically.
51. Whether he likes or dislikes himself makes no difference in the way I feel about him.
52. I don't think that I am being honest with myself about the way I feel toward him.
53. I dislike him.
54. I look at the things he does from my own point of view.
55. Sometimes I seem to like him and at other times I don't seem to care.
56. I feel that I am being genuine with him.
57. I am impatient with him.
58. I generally see how he is feeling.
59. I like him better when he behaves in some ways than when he behaves in other ways.
60. Sometimes he can see that I am not comfortable with him, but we go on and pay no attention to it.
61. I feel a deep liking for him.
62. I understand completely what he says to me.
63. Whether he feels fine or feels awful makes no difference to how I feel about him.
64. I do not try to mislead him about my own thoughts or feelings.
65. I think he's disagreeable.
66. I can be fully aware of his most painful feelings, without being upset myself.
67. He can be very critical of me, or he can like me, without it changing my feeling toward him.
68. What I say gives a false impression of my total reaction to him.
69. At times I feel contempt for him.
70. Even when he can't say quite what he means, I still understand him.
71. How he feels about me does not make any difference in the way I feel about him.
72. I try to avoid telling him anything that might upset him.
73. How much does your relationship with this client matter to you? (Check one)
   1. It means more to me than my relationship with any other client. (If you see no other client at this time, change "client" to "person" on each of these choices, and mark accordingly. Please also, make a note of this change.)
2. It is more important to me than most of my relationships with other clients.

3. It is just as important to me as any other relationship I have with a client.

4. It is not as important to me as most of my other relationships with clients.

5. It is the least important to me of my relationships with clients.

74. How satisfied do you feel with the relationship that you now have with this person? (Check one)

1. I feel completely satisfied with it.

2. I am satisfied.

3. I am fairly satisfied.

4. I am about half satisfied, half dissatisfied.

5. I am rather dissatisfied.

6. I am quite dissatisfied.

7. I am extremely dissatisfied.

HS form by G. T. Barrett-Lennard and R. E. Bills (revised by F. van der Veen)
EXPERIENCING SCALE
Dr. Eugene Gendlin

Outline of EXP Scale

See Section I for definitions and cues of stages
See Section II for definitions and cues of 1/2 stages

Stage 1 AN: No "personally private" nor "personality relevant" communication:

At Stage 1 the individual either tells nothing about himself or his private life, or he tells only what one might tell people to a potentially unfriendly stranger. He also does not offer information with the intention of describing the sort of personality he has or had.

Stage 2 AY: There is "personally private" or "personality relevant" communication with

and DN: No "self-involvement" in process of communication:

The Stage 2 individual reports personal facts in the manner of an observer who is not involved in these facts. He is not self-involved because he doesn't inject his feelings into his discussions. He may give his family history, talk about his environment, or explain what kind of person he is or was but his way of doing so is "externalized," "intellectualized," or "mechanical," or "reciting."

Stage 3 BY: There is "self-involvement" on process of communication with

and CN: No connected examination focused on self:

Stage 3 individual communicates with "unexamined self-involvement" because he narrates with his feeling without noticing the significance of his feeling. He is immersed in feeling with no examining focus on himself. He does not look for the meanings of his feelings and his focus is on the circumstances which aroused his feelings. (The individual who interrupts his narration to look at, explain or explore feelings but not with Stage 4 connected "self-examination" is rated 3.5)

Stage 4 CY: There is connected examination focused on self with

and DN: No sense of or for "immediately felt inner events."
Stage 4 individual is following a "connected" chain of thoughts to look inside himself and to examine into his feelings and think about what they mean about himself. There are no "immediately felt inner events" interrupting his chain of discussion. (The individual who speaks from much present emotion or speaks about hitherto-hidden aspects of himself with new insight but not with Stage 5 sense for immediately felt inner events or Stage 5 subjective definitions is rated at 4.5.)

Stage 5

Stage 5 DY: There is a sense of "immediately felt inner events" with
and EN: No steady hold of "specific felt referents":

The Stage 5 individual notices the presence or absence of new immediate feelings but has to struggle to find or hold onto them. He finds ordinary vocabulary inadequate to describe these new events, and therefore he uses "subjectively-defined language" in his communications. Felt data is not firm. (The individual who does not explore with direct reference to a specific new inner event but who uses subjective language with reference to a global sense of a new self is rated 5.5.)

Stage 6

Stage 6 EY: There is a steady hold of specific "felt referents" with
and FN: No free movement in continuing stream or felt referents.

The Stage 6 individual is actively engaged in discovering new facets of a specifically felt datum. He is using the datum as a "felt referent" by holding onto it while he is studying it. He explores the felt datum for new meanings and directs his exploration inward by a steady reference to a specific feeling. (The individual who discusses one after another "felt referent" but separately without using each as a guidepost for a smooth progression from one referent to another is rated 6.5.)

Stage 7

Stage 7 FY: There is free movement in a continuing stream of felt referents:

The Stage 7 individual easily clarifies his own feelings and meanings, by direct access to a continuous flow of inner events. He uses his "felt referents" as sure guideposts with reliance on his own free movement within his whole subjective field.
Dichotomous Criteria Scale for Experiencing

AN: No personally private nor personality relevant communication.
AY: There is personally private or personality relevant communication.

BN: No self-involvement in process of communication.
BY: There is self-involvement in process of communication.

CN: No connected examination focused on self.
CY: There is connected examination focused on self.

DN: No sense of or for immediately felt inner events.
DY: There is a sense of or for immediately felt inner events.

EN: No steady hold or specific felt referent.
EY: There is a steady hold of specific felt referent.

FN: No free movement in continuing stream of felt referents.
FY: There is free movement in continuing stream of felt referents.

If: Score: Then if: Raise Score to:
AN 1 Section II cues apply: 1.5
AY and BN 2 " " " " 2.5
BY and CN 3 " " " " 3.5
CY and DN 4 " " " " 4.5
DY and EN 5 " " " " 5.5
EY and FN 6 " " " " 6.5
FY 7 " " " " 7.5
Experiencing - Rater Instruction

Rater can ask only 2 questions: WHAT? and HOW?

EXP:

1. **What** are the words in segment? i.e., what is the individual saying?
2. **How** is it being said?

The rater must not ask Why, When, or Where, or add anything to the context because it is the Here and Now of each verbalized segment which has to be rated.

Warning: Be sure to rate the rater and not his conversational partner's comments or interpretation.

Read cues carefully before making stage decision. Be sure segment has passed Stage 1 before considering Stage 2 and don't consider Stage 4 without being sure segment has passed Stage 3, etc.

Don't use half-stage cues before making whole stage decision.

After whole stage decision has been made consult half-stage cues and only then decide if segment should be raised a half-stage.
Stage 1: No **personally private or personality relevant** communication.

**Personally Private:**

Any communication which makes the individual more vulnerable or tender, and/or any communication which would not be said to a potentially unfriendly stranger.

**Note:** Excluded from this definition are facts or details of private life or about environmental situations (hospital, family, therapy, job, etc.) which are part of an individual's social facade or public aspects of his past history.

**Personality Relevant:**

Communications (descriptions, self-conceptualizations, thoughts, feelings, etc.), which are intended to help the listener understand the kind of person the speaker is or was.

**Note:** This does not include what the rater can infer about the speaker's personality.

It may include a wide variety of ways of communicating (raving, muttering, "crazy talk," stilted self analyses, self exploration, etc.), provided there is an indication that the speaker is making an attempt to reveal or describe himself to the listener.

A segment is rated in Stage 1 if the speaker reveals nothing private or tender about himself or if he is not making an attempt to reveal or characterize his personality to the listener.

A person leaves Stage 1 either if he reveals something private or tender about himself or if he is making an attempt to reveal or characterize his personality to another. The latter need not be also personally private, and personally private material is not necessarily personality relevant.
Stage 2: Not Self-Involved in the Process of Communication

At Stage 2, though discussing personally private or personality relevant material, the person is remote from his experiencing and has objectified, neutralized, or dramatized his feelings or situation in a non-participating and distant manner. Frequently a "pat story" quality is evident.

Typical types of remoteness are defined below.

Externalized: Denotes the absence of feelings, personal meanings, or emotional involvement. Descriptions of external events and behaviors (including his own) occur and the feelings and personalities of others may be discussed, but the individual is lost in outside events. He speaks as if his own feelings and personal meanings were simply missing.

Intellectualized: The individual uses concepts about himself, states opinions, describes himself, using labels that sound like feelings or personal aspects, but his use of these is such that he cannot have much inward awareness or inner experience of what the concepts or labels refer to in him.

Mechanical: Denotes a manner of talking about self, or parts of self, as though talking about objects. The individual is a reporter or observer of symptoms about an object, and he may describe traits, patterns, things inside him, symptoms, etc., as acting of their own accord.

Passionate Recitation: Although apparently much emotion and involvement are put into it, it is as if the individual is reciting a piece well known and repetitious for him. The "feeling" and "emotions" or "passions" belong to the recited piece, not to him. (The individual is an actor [though he may also seem to be observing his own performance] and although he may be using his part to make contact with other persons, he also uses it to maintain distance, both from himself and others.)
Stage 3: "Unexamined Self-Involvement"

**Definition:** The individual is involved in the revealing of personal material but isn't stopping to examine what it means to him. He is immersed in his descriptions or absorbed in his narrative but is not actively aware of the significance of what he is saying. He injects himself into his telling whether or not the material itself is seemingly important or unimportant, deeply felt.

External events are described in a way which communicates self-involvement but the individual does not directly focus on his involvement. He may narrate events to illustrate personal themes but does not return to make specific use of the illustration. Usually what is illustrated is personal and felt, but not specific.

Whatever the Stage 3 individual tells has broad relevance to feelings (and his narrations may include some explicitly expressed feelings) but the sequence will be that of a personal narrative or of memory associations based on external events. The basis of the discussion will be the circumstances arousing the feelings involved and the chain of expression will proceed without more than a step or two of exploring a feeling itself.

The individual is not looking inside himself but he is telling his feelings in a vague or narrowly-channeled way. Intellectual labels, if any, will not be examined regarding how accurately they fit.
Stage 4: "Focused and Connected Self-Examination"

Definition: The examination of feelings and personal meanings lends the basic context and chain of thought to the discussions. The individual focuses on his own feelings and wonders about their meanings.

In place of the occasional one or two steps of exploration in Stage 3 there is connected texture of exploration. The main self-interrogations provide the connections between what is just said and what is said next. Thoughts are tied to feelings in an inside way.

External descriptions specifically illustrate personal themes and the individual returns to the significance he senses the described events have for him and makes specific use of his descriptions.

The individual is trying to understand himself and seek personal insights too. He may still speak like a narrator but he narrates and interprets his feelings with self-perception and self-interrogations.

(Note: Remember that in order to be rated Stage 4, a segment must pass 2 and 3.)
Stage 5: "A Sense of Immediately Felt Inner Events"

Definition: The individual is searching for and sometimes discovering new feelings which he struggles to hold onto while he investigates possible new personal meanings. It is hard for him to search deeply inside himself and it is important to him to communicate his findings with exactness. Discoveries are rechecked and redefined for closer precision and the individual speaks with many private distinctions and surplus and tentative meanings.

There may be irregular and surprising or puzzling occurrence of immediate subjective events during the hour. Feelings may suddenly change, shift, bubble up, hit, etc. The individual has only an unsteady hold on such immediately felt events. Often, there are none, and he may note their absence. (I can't feel this now, but . . .") Or, when such events occur, he may dodge them or lose them, have difficulty finding them again. He may beat the bushes for something felt, try in all directions to get a hold of something, yet not find anything that is immediately felt. He does manifest that he seeks or expects immediately experienced events, or is aware that there are such events possible.

Both the deep exploration and the unsteady occurrence or possibility of immediately experienced events mark Stage 5. Either is sufficient. Either requires subjectively defined language. The social vocabulary is insufficient. Words are used in such a way that meaning is given them which makes sense only to these two persons at this moment.

Definition: "Subjectively defined" language usage can be recognized by the following cues. (Any of these are sufficient.)

Distinction drawn between the common meaning and the one which he is trying to convey and which sounds the same in common words.

Words such as "funny," "odd," "fresh," "real," used to carry the main message. (He might use such words at any stage, but in Stage 5, such words are depended upon to convey the whole main point . . . as distinguished from the insufficient expression possible in terms of the common words.)
Explicit statement that words don't fit what he wants to say.

A datum concretely inside himself (though unsteady, might lose it, doesn't steadily explore it); explicit statement locating eventfulness in his subjective field.

Underlining or emphasizing of minor words in a sentence to convey the main point. """"I had to feel that way."""

The statement of the main message does not make sense unless one assumes an inner reference which gives it meaning. As an objective statement it is meaningless. (This cue involves trying out the sentence interpreted in terms of dictionary meanings only.)
Stage 6: "Steady Hold on Specific Felt Referent"

Definition: The explorations or descriptions of Stage 6 are guided by a direct and steady sensing of immediately felt subjective referents.

i.e., The individual explores (often does not as yet know) the meaning of the directly felt datum. He holds on to it steadily. It may change, of course, but his subjective referring is now not unsteady or likely to be lost.

The cues given under 5 for non-social ("subjectively defined") language will be present in 6 also.

In Stage 6, the immediately felt data are the main focus of discussion, although statements of "I have always . . ." "I always felt . . ." will occur, they are intended to help characterize the individual's present felt datum, his present felt sense which he now has a hold of. There is an absence of struggle or strain to hold on to immediately felt subjective data. The effort is not in the holding on to, or the emergence of subjectively felt events. The effort goes into the exploration, the coming to know what these subjective events contain.

One felt referent may be explored for some time. There is no swift succession of felt referents, and they are not easily and swiftly characterized to the individual's satisfaction.

The individual does not freely move all about his subjective field. He has a steady grip on just this referent of now.

The process seems smooth, has its own direction and momentum. "It" moves. The individual goes with it where "it" goes. He may work on clearly grasping the meaning of something he now feels, but he need not beat the bushes, seek or pike something out. There is much effort and strain, but not to make the events move or come. They are there.

The individual has a direct, sharp and continuing hold of subjective referents. He may note that his words for them are vague, but his experience of them is definite. He may "work on" such a referent for quite some time, all the while holding to it subjectively.
Stage 7: "Continuing Stream of Felt Referents" (reliance on subjective field and free movement all about, within it. Whole self is the experiencing process.)

Note: At Stage 7 the individual may still be troubled. He may have all sorts of serious personality problems and difficulties as yet. He may remain in need of help for quite some time to come. On the other hand, he could do without help. You need make no inferences about the individual and his state of maturity. These are not relevant.

Definition: The progression of behavior now moves swiftly from one felt referent to another and another. There is a sense that puzzling or cognitively unknown referents will be clear any minute. Non-optimal feelings are discussed as if they were expected to alter or become more differentiated any minute, as the individual talks.

If the self is discussed, it may be unclear in content but it is definite in location, and solid and reliable. These aspects of it are noted not as occasional or in contrast to still solid opposite aspects of self, but as (perhaps surprisingly) steady.

The individual's inward references seems not dependent on the moment by moment statements of the respondent. He moves about inwardly so freely that he evidently could do so by himself using his felt referents as his guideposts.
Section II of EXPERIENCING Scale

Decisions on 1/2 stages:

If Stage 1, rate 1.5 if: Voice quality or other non-verbal behavior vary with what is being said, or if

Indications of strain, tension, reluctance, difficulty, etc., indicate that what is being said - or the saying of it - are not a neutral experience for the client right now.

If Stage 2, rate 2.5 if: The person’s discussion fits Stage 2 cues but the individual is unable to maintain his detachment from his own story. Here, real feelings break through the remoteness but without the immersed quality of Stage 3. This may take the form of a fluctuating involvement in which the person lets himself go for moments into what he is saying but pulls himself back into the role of observer or reciter. Similarly, there may be an effect of semi-involvement in that part of the individual appears quite involved but at another level he is watching the effects of or is detached from what he is saying.

If Stage 3, rate 3.5 if: You had difficulty deciding between Stage 3 and 4 and are still not content that your decision had to be 3, or if

The individual interrupts his narration to look at, explain or explore feelings but not with Stage 4 connected self examination.

If Stage 4, rate 4.5 if: Exploration has new understanding or insight or redefining, or emergence of hidden aspects of self, but cues are for 5 absent, or if
Incidents, or expressions of feeling about them contain much present emotion from which he speaks, but cues of 5 are absent.

If Stage 5, rate 5.5 if: There is no directly stated reference to an immediately felt referent which he now has and explores, but there is reference to a global sense of self which has to be phrased in terms of the non-social linguistic cues of 5, and which is a new self.

If Stage 6, rate 6.5 if: Many quite subjectively defined aspects of self or feelings are discussed one after the other—and each seems directly felt or sensed as it is discussed in the present hour, (many felt referents) but instead of a progression of self or relationship feelings, as in 7, they are separate one from the other. The freedom to move about subjectively is not in evidence therefore.
STERM ACTIVITIES INDEX

Form 1158

George G. Stern, Syracuse University

This booklet contains a number of brief statements describing many different kinds of activities. You will like some of these things. They will seem more pleasant than unpleasant to you, perhaps even highly enjoyable. There will be others that you will dislike, finding them more unpleasant than pleasant. The activities listed in this booklet have been obtained from a great many different persons. People differ in the kinds of things they enjoy, like to do, or find pleasant to experience. You are to decide which of these you like and which you dislike.

DIRECTIONS

Print the information called for at the top of the special answer sheet: your name, the date, your age and sex, etc. Then, as you read each item, blacken space

L—if the item describes an activity or event that you would like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

D—if the item describes an activity or event that you would dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

Be sure to fill in the whole space between the dotted lines with a heavy, black mark, using the special pencil provided. You need not spend much time on any one item; go through the list quickly, being sure to answer every item. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Copyright 1958, by George G. Stern
Distributed by Psychological Research Center
Syracuse University
Legend:  L— if the item describes an activity or event that you would like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

D— if the item describes an activity or event that you would dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

1. Taking the blame for something done by someone I like.
2. Setting difficult goals for myself.
3. Concealing a failure or humiliation from others.
4. Having other people let me alone.
5. Getting what is coming to me even if I have to fight for it.
7. Scheduling time for work and play during the day.
8. Working twice as hard at a problem when it looks as if I don't know the answer.
9. Seeing someone make fun of a person who deserves it.
10. Persuading a group to do something my way.
11. Being a newspaperman who crusades to improve the community.
12. Listening to music that makes me feel very sad.
13. Taking up a very active outdoor sport.
14. Keeping in the background when I'm with a group of wild, fun-loving, noisy people.
15. Toughening myself, going without an overcoat, seeing how long I can go without food or sleep, etc.
16. Diving off the tower or high board at a pool.
17. Learning about the causes of some of our social and political problems.
18. Doing something crazy occasionally, just for the fun of it.
19. Imagining what I would do if I could live my life over again.
20. Feeding a stray dog or cat.
21. Taking special precautions on Friday, the 13th.
22. Washing and polishing things like a car, silverware, or furniture.
23. Making my work go faster by thinking of the fun I can have after it's done.
24. Being good at typewriting, knitting, carpentry, or other practical skills.
25. Understanding myself better.
26. Learning how to prepare slides of plant and animal tissue, and making my own studies with a microscope.
27. Holding something very soft and warm against my skin.
28. Talking about how it feels to be in love.
29. Belonging to a close family group that expects me to bring my problems to them.
31. Suffering for a good cause or for someone I love.
32. Working for someone who will accept nothing less than the best that's in me.
33. Defending myself against criticism or blame.
34. Going to the park or beach with a crowd.
35. Shocking narrow minded people by saying and doing things of which they disapprove.
36. Getting up and going to bed at the same time each day.
37. Planning a reading program for myself.
38. Returning to a task which I have previously failed.
39. Doing what most people tell me to do, to the best of my ability.
40. Having other people depend on me for ideas or opinions.
41. Being an important political figure in a time of crisis.
42. Crying at a funeral, wedding, graduation, or similar ceremony.
43. Exerting myself to the utmost for something unusually important or enjoyable.
44. Wearing clothes that will attract a lot of attention.
45. Working until I'm exhausted, to see how much I can take.
46. Being careful to wear a raincoat and rubbers when it rains.
47. Studying the music of particular composers, such as Bach, Beethoven, etc.
48. Acting impulsively just to blow off steam.
49. Thinking about ways of changing my name to make it sound striking or different.
50. Discussing with younger people what they like to do and how they feel about things.
51. Waiting for a falling star, white horse, or some other sign of success before I make an important decision.
52. Keeping my bureau drawers, desk, etc., in perfect order.
53. Spending most of my extra money on pleasure.
54. Learning how to repair such things as the radio, sewing machine, or car.
55. Thinking about different kinds of unusual behavior, like insanity, drug addiction, crime, etc.
56. Studying wind conditions and changes in atmospheric pressure in order to better understand and predict the weather.
57. Eating after going to bed.
58. Watching a couple who are crazy about each other.
59. Working for someone who always tells me exactly what to do and how to do it.
60. Finding the meaning of unusual or rarely used words.
61. Being polite or humble no matter what happens.
62. Setting higher standards for myself than anyone else would, and working hard to achieve them.
63. Admitting when I'm in the wrong.
64. Leading an active social life.
65. Doing something that might provoke criticism.
66. Rearranging the furniture in the place where I live.
67. Putting off something I don't feel like doing, even though I know it has to be done.
68. Having to struggle hard for something I want.
69. Listening to a successful person tell about his experience.
70. Getting my friends to do what I want to do.
71. Taking an active part in social and political reform.
72. Avoiding excitement or emotional tension.
73. Staying up all night when I'm doing something that interests me.
74. Speaking at a club or group meeting.
75. Imagining myself president of the United States.
76. Crossing streets only at the corner and with the light.
77. Listening to TV or radio programs about political and social problems.
78. Being in a situation that requires quick decisions and action.
79. Pausing to look at myself in a mirror each time I pass one.
80. Helping to collect money for poor people.
81. Paying no attention to omens, signs, and other forms of superstition.
82. Keeping an accurate record of the money I spend.
83. Dropping out of a crowd that spends most of its time playing around or having parties.
84. Helping to direct a fund drive for the Red Cross, Community Chest, or other organization.
85. Imagining life on other planets.
86. Reading articles which tell about new scientific developments, discoveries, or inventions.
87. Chewing on pencils, rubber bands, or paper clips.
88. Talking about who is in love with whom.
89. Being a lone wolf, free of family and friends.
90. Spending my time thinking about and discussing complex problems.
91. Trying to figure out how I was to blame after getting into an argument with someone.
92. Competing with others for a prize or goal.
93. Being ready with an excuse or explanation when criticized.
94. Meeting a lot of people.
95. Arguing with an instructor or superior.
96. Being generally consistent and unchanging in my behavior.
97. Going to a party where all the activities are planned.
98. Doing a job under pressure.
99. Going along with a decision made by a supervisor or leader rather than starting an argument.
100. Organizing groups to vote in a certain way in elections.
101. Living a life which is adventurous and dramatic.
102. Having someone for a friend who is very emotional.
103. Sleeping long hours every night in order to have lots of rest.
104. Playing music, dancing, or acting in a play before a large group.
105. Thinking about what I could do that would make me famous.
106. Riding a fast and steep roller coaster.
107. Comparing the problems and conditions of today with those of various times in the past.
108. Doing whatever I'm in the mood to do.
109. Daydreaming about what I would do if I could live my life any way I wanted.
110. Comforting someone who is feeling low.
111. Avoiding things that might bring bad luck.
112. Arranging my clothes neatly before going to bed.
113. Getting as much fun as I can out of life, even if it means sometimes neglecting more serious things.
114. Learning how to make such things as furniture or clothing myself.
115. Trying to figure out why the people I know behave the way they do.
116. Doing experiments in physics, chemistry, or biology in order to test a theory.
117. Sleeping in a very soft bed.
118. Seeing love stories in the movies.
119. Having someone in the family help me out when I'm in trouble.
120. Working crossword puzzles, figuring out moves in checkers or chess, playing anagrams or scrabble, etc.
121. Admitting defeat.
122. Taking examinations.
123. Being corrected when I'm doing something the wrong way.
124. Belonging to a social club.
125. Teasing someone who is too conceited.
126. Moving to a new neighborhood or city, living in a different country, etc.
127. Finishing something I've begun, even if it is no longer enjoyable.
128. Staying away from activities which I don't do well.
129. Following directions.
130. Being able to hypnotize people.
131. Playing an active part in community affairs.
132. Going on an emotional binge.
133. Walking instead of riding whenever I can.
134. Doing something that will create a stir.
135. Thinking about winning recognition and acclaim as a brilliant military figure.
136. Standing on the roof of a tall building.
137. Studying different types of government, such as the American, English, Russian, German, etc.
138. Doing things on the spur of the moment.
139. Having lots of time to take care of my hair, hands, face, clothing, etc.
140. Having people come to me with their problems.
141. Being especially careful the rest of the day if a black cat should cross my path.
142. Recopying notes or memoranda to make them neat.
143. Finishing some work even though it means missing a party or dance.
144. Working with mechanical appliances, household equipment, tools, electrical apparatus, etc.
145. Thinking about what the end of the world might be like.
146. Studying the stars and planets and learning to identify them.
147. Listening to the rain fall on the roof, or the wind blow through the trees.
148. Flirting.
149. Knowing an older person who likes to give me guidance and direction.
150. Being a philosopher, scientist, or professor.
151. Having people laugh at my mistakes.
152. Working on tasks so difficult I can hardly do them.
153. Keeping my failures and mistakes to myself.
154. Going to parties where I'm expected to mix with the whole crowd.
155. Annoying people I don't like, just to see what they will do.
156. Leading a well-ordered life with regular hours and an established routine.
157. Planning ahead so that I know every step of a project before I get to it.
158. Avoiding something at which I have once failed.
159. Turning over the leadership of a group to someone who is better for the job than I.
160. Being an official or a leader.
161. Actively supporting a movement to correct a social evil.
162. Letting loose and having a good cry sometimes.
163. Taking frequent rest periods when working on any project.
164. Being the only couple on the dance floor when everyone is watching.
165. Imagining situations in which I am a great hero.

166. Driving fast.
167. Talking about music, theater or other art forms with people who are interested in them.
168. Controlling my emotions rather than expressing myself impulsively.
169. Catching a reflection of myself in a mirror or window.
170. Lending my things to other people.

171. Carrying a good luck charm like a rabbit's foot or a four-leaf clover.
172. Making my bed and putting things away every day before I leave the house.
173. Going to a party or dance with a lively crowd.
174. Managing a store or business enterprise.
175. Seeking to explain the behavior of people who are emotionally disturbed.

176. Going to scientific exhibits.
177. Chewing or popping gum.
178. Reading novels and magazine stories about love.
179. Having others offer their opinions when I have to make a decision.
180. Losing myself in hard thought.

181. Accepting criticism without talking back.
182. Doing something very difficult in order to prove I can do it.
183. Pointing out someone else's mistakes when they point out mine.
184. Having lots of friends who come to stay with us for several days during the year.
185. Playing practical jokes.

186. Doing things a different way every time I do them.
187. Keeping to a regular schedule, even if this sometimes means working when I don't really feel like it.
188. Quitting a project that seems too difficult for me.
189. Listening to older persons tell about how they did things when they were young.
190. Organizing a protest meeting.
191. Getting my friends to change their social, political, or religious beliefs.
192. Yelling with excitement at a ball game, horse race, or other public event.
193. Having something to do every minute of the day.
194. Speaking before a large group.
195. Imagining how it would feel to be rich and famous.
196. Playing rough games in which someone might get hurt.
197. Finding out how different languages have developed, changed, and influenced one another.
198. Letting my reasoning be guided by my feelings.
199. Dressing carefully, being sure that the colors match and the various details are exactly right.
200. Taking care of youngsters.
201. Having a close friend who ignores or makes fun of superstitious beliefs.
202. Shining my shoes and brushing my clothes every day.
203. Giving up whatever I'm doing rather than miss a party or other opportunity for a good time.
204. Fixing light sockets, making curtains, painting things, etc., around the house.
205. Reading stories that try to show what people really think and feel inside themselves.
206. Collecting data and attempting to arrive at general laws about the physical universe.
207. Sketching or painting.
208. Daydreaming about being in love with a particular movie star or entertainer.
209. Having people fuss over me when I'm sick.
210. Engaging in mental activity.
211. Making a fuss when someone seems to be taking advantage of me.
212. Choosing difficult tasks in preference to easy ones.
213. Apologizing when I've done something wrong.
214. Going to the park or beach only at times when no-one else is likely to be there.
215. Questioning the decisions of people who are supposed to be authorities.
216. Eating my meals at the same hour each day.
217. Doing things according to my mood, without following any plan.
218. Doing something over again, just to get it right.
219. Disregarding a supervisor's directions when they seem foolish.
220. Talking someone into doing something I think ought to be done.
221. Trying to improve my community by persuading others to do certain things.
222. Being with people who seem always to be calm, unstirred, or placid.
223. Giving all of my energy to whatever I happen to be doing.
224. Being the center of attention at a party.
225. Setting myself tasks to strengthen my mind, body, and will power.
226. Skiing on steep slopes, climbing high mountains, or exploring narrow underground caves.
227. Learning more about the work of different painters and sculptors.
228. Speaking or acting spontaneously.
229. Imagining the kind of life I would have if I were born at a different time in a different place.
230. Talking over personal problems with someone who is feeling unhappy.
231. Going ahead with something important even though I've just accidentally walked under a ladder, broken a mirror, etc.
232. Keeping my room in perfect order.
233. Being with people who are always joking, laughing, and out for a good time.
234. Being treasurer or business manager for a club or organization.
235. Imagining what it will be like when rocket ships carry people through space.
236. Reading scientific theories about the origin of the earth and other planets.
237. Eating so much I can't take another bite.
238. Listening to my friends talk about their love-life.
239. Receiving advice from the family.
240. Solving puzzles that involve numbers or figures.
241. Taking the part of a servant or waiter in a play.
242. Sacrificing everything else in order to achieve something outstanding.
243. Having my mistakes pointed out to me.
244. Going on a vacation to a place where there are lots of people.
245. Fighting for something I want, rather than trying to get it by asking.
246. Avoiding any kind of routine or regularity.
247. Organizing my work in order to use time efficiently.
248. Avoiding something because I'm not sure I'll be successful at it.
249. Carrying out orders from others with snap and enthusiasm.
250. Directing other people's work.
251. Being a foreign ambassador or diplomat.
252. Seeing sad or melodramatic movies.
253. Avoiding things that require intense concentration.
254. Telling jokes or doing tricks to entertain others at a large gathering.
255. Pretending I am a famous movie star.
256. Swimming in rough, deep water.
257. Studying the development of English or American literature.
258. Being guided by my heart rather than by my head.
259. Making my handwriting decorative or unusual.
260. Taking care of someone who is ill.
261. Finding out which days are lucky for me, so I can hold off important things to do until then.
262. Having a special place for everything and seeing that each thing is in its place.
263. Doing something serious with my leisure time instead of just playing around with the crowd.
264. Learning how to raise attractive and healthy plants, flowers, vegetables, etc.
265. Thinking about the meaning of eternity.
266. Reading about how mathematics is used in developing scientific theories, such as explanations of how the planets move around the sun.
267. Walking along a dark street in the rain.
268. Being romantic with someone I love.
269. Having people talk to me about some personal problem of mine.
270. Following through in the development of a theory, even though it has no practical applications.
271. Telling others about the mistakes I have made and the sins I have committed.
272. Picking out some hard task for myself and doing it.
273. Concealing my mistakes from others whenever possible.
274. Inviting a lot of people home for a snack or party.
275. Proving that an instructor or superior is wrong.
276. Staying in the same circle of friends all the time.
277. Striving for precision and clarity in my speech and writing.
278. Giving up on a problem rather than doing it in a way that may be wrong.
279. Having friends who are superior to me in ability.
280. Influencing or controlling the actions of others.
281. Converting or changing the views of others.
282. Being unrestrained and open about my feelings and emotions.
283. Doing things that are fun but require lots of physical exertion.
284. Doing things which will attract attention to me.
285. Thinking about how to become the richest and cleverest financial genius in the world.

286. Being extremely careful about sports that involve some danger like sailing, hunting, or camping.
287. Reading editorials or feature articles on major social issues.
288. Making up my mind slowly, after considerable deliberation.
289. Trying out different ways of writing my name, to make it look unusual.
290. Providing companionship and personal care for a very old helpless person.

291. Going to a fortune-teller, palm reader or astrologer for advice on something important.
292. Keeping a calendar or notebook of the things I have done or plan to do.
293. Limiting my pleasures so that I can spend all of my time usefully.
294. Being efficient and successful in practical affairs.
295. Concentrating so hard on a work of art or music that I don't know what's going on around me.

296. Studying rock formations and learning how they developed.
297. Reading in the bathtub.
298. Reading about the love affairs of movie stars and other famous people.
299. Being with someone who always tries to be sympathetic and understanding.
300. Working out solutions to complicated problems, even though the answers may have no apparent, immediate usefulness.
COUNSELOR-SELF-QUESTIONNAIRE (#5)

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

You are to read each statement or set of statements in the questionnaire and encircle the number of the point on the eleven point scale which describes you as you see yourself. Use the appended answer sheet, Descriptions of Myself, to record your responses.

Ten (10) is always the highest score you can give yourself or someone else.

a. I am just like the trait.
b. The trait describes me completely.
c. I have all of that trait.

A score of zero (0) would be given such interpretations as the following:

a. I am not at all like the trait.
b. The trait does not describe me at all.
c. I do not have any of the trait.

Whenever two statements are separated by "versus" (e.g., short versus tall) consider them bi-polar descriptions. Thus, a score of ten (10) would be given such interpretations as the following:

a. I am just like the first trait and not at all like the second.
b. The first describes me completely.
c. I have all of the first trait and none of the second.

A score of zero (0) would be given such interpretations as the following:

a. I am just like the second trait and not at all like the first.
b. The second trait describes me completely.
c. I have all of the second trait and none of the first.

Be reminded that identification is only for purposes of coding data for research and that your responses are confidential and for use only by the research team.
1. Self-depreciation and devaluation; acknowledgment of mistakes, failures, and humiliation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. Surmounting obstacles (physical, personal, or interpersonal) and proving personal worth. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. Acceptance of advice and criticism versus concealment or justification of failure or humiliation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. Close, friendly, reciprocal associations with others. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. Overt or covert hostility toward others versus the denial of such impulses. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. Unroutinized, changeable behavior versus repetitious, perseverative action patterns. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7. Organization of cognitive activities versus uncoordinated, diffuse, or non-conforming behavior. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
8. Restriving in order to overcome experienced frustration, failure, or humiliation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
9. Submission to the opinions and preferences of others perceived as superior. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
10. Assertive or manipulative control over others. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
11. Self-dramatizing, idealistic social action; active or fantasied achievement oriented in terms of personal potency, influence, or power. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
12. Intensive, active emotional expression versus calm, serene, restrained responsiveness. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
13. Intense, sustained, vigorous effort versus sluggish inertia. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
14. Self-display and attention-seeking. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
15. Daydreams of success in achieving extraordinary personal recognition; narcissistic aspirations. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
16. Avoidance, withdrawal or protection from situations which might result in physical pain, injury, illness or death. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
17. Manipulation of external social objects or artifacts through empirical analysis, reflection and discussion...

18. Impulsive, spontaneous, impetuous, unreflected behavior versus careful, cautious, considered deliberative behavior...

19. Preoccupation with self...

20. Supporting others by providing love, assistance, and protection...

21. Rejection of superstition versus magical autistic egocentric perceptions and beliefs...

22. Organization of the immediate physical environment; preoccupation with neatness, order, arrangement, and meticulous detail...

23. Pursuit of amusement and entertainment...

24. Practical, concrete achievement; adaptation to reality "as given" and the manipulation of external objects (physical or social) for more or less immediately tangible ends...

25. Intraceptive activities; introspective preoccupation with private psychological spiritual, esthetic, or metaphysical experience...

26. Manipulation of external physical objects through empirical analysis, reflection, and discussion...

27. Sensuous or voluptuous self-gratification...

28. Erotic interest or expression versus the denial of such impulses...

29. Dependence on others for love, assistance and protection versus detachment, independence and rebellion...

30. Detached intellectualization; problem-solving, analysis, or abstraction as an end in itself...
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