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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present study is to predict counselor performance in a beginning training practicum. By way of introduction the first chapter will set the study in its broader context. Included will be a consideration of the definition of counseling psychology, the need for counseling services, and a brief survey of objective studies of the interview and of efforts to predict counselor performance.

The nature of counseling psychology

Several approaches might be taken in the attempt to describe the nature of counseling psychology. One of the most obvious might be an historical definition or description. Super (1955) traces the history of counseling psychology, or rather its development, through three prior movements. The first he lists is the vocational guidance movement usually traced for its beginnings to the early work of Frank Parsons in the early part of this century. The movement was given great impetus a number of years later as a result of the depression and the government sponsored studies in the Minnesota Employment Stabilization Research Institute. The mental testing movement including the work of Binet and the Army Alpha test influenced work in vocational guidance and provided as well, its own background for counseling psychology. The last major influence through which Super traces the history of counseling psychology is that of
personality theory. Personality theory, having developed in connection with psychotherapy, influenced psychologists in a number of applied areas to think of the individual as a unity and to attempt to deal with persons rather than simply with problems.

Another major historical predecessor to counseling psychology not mentioned by Super is student personnel work (Paterson, 1938). Although it is obvious that the three movements previously described interacted with each other and especially with student personnel work on the college campus, student personnel work seems to have a sufficiently clear history and separate identity that it should be mentioned as a separate predecessor to counseling psychology.

Another approach to describing the nature of counseling psychology would be to study the various definitions which have been offered. In terms of goals, the Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association (Committee on Definition, 1956) has listed the following: (1) development of the inner life of the individual, (2) harmony with the environment, and (3) the influencing of society to allow for the full development of the individual. Although it might be assumed that this list of goals would be widely subscribed to, it may easily be seen that such an approach to definition does not distinguish between counseling psychology and many other disciplines, psychological and otherwise. Neither does it describe with any specificity what is done in counseling.

A more specific definition is offered by Robinson (1950, p. 3):

The term counseling . . . covers all types of two person situations in which one person, the client, is helped to adjust more effectively to himself and to his environment. It includes the use of the interview to obtain and give information, to coach or teach, to bring about increased maturity, and to aid with decision-making and therapy.
However, it will be noted that here also the distinction between counseling and other types of helping relationships is not made explicit. Such a distinction is attempted by Tyler (1961, p. 1):

Let us use counseling to refer to a helping process the aim of which is not to change the person, but to enable him to utilize the resources he now has for coping with life.

In Tyler's definition it is implied that the work of psychiatrists and clinical psychologists is more in the changing direction -- consisting of work with those who have so few present resources that they cannot now cope with life.

Brayfield (1963) attempts a summary of the distinctive features of counseling psychology. He lists working with normal people, the feasibility of counseling throughout the life span, emphasis upon strengths and assets of the counselee, emphasis upon cognitive activities -- especially those involving choice and decision with rationality and reason stressed, and the assumption that situational factors and environmental modification are important in counseling. Hahn (1955) gives a summary somewhat similar to the above, but he also postulates a distinct set of personality characteristics for counseling psychologists in contrast to other psychological specialities.

According to Hadley (1958) the difference between counseling psychologists and others (especially clinical psychologists) is not in goals or techniques but in where one works. A study by Peterson and Featherstone (1962) gives some support to the "where one works" distinction. It was found that most counseling psychologists are located in colleges and universities. Few work with abnormals and few are in full-time research or in private practice. It was thus concluded that there is evidence of "a speciality with a hard core of uniqueness."
However, if it is true that counseling psychology is a speciality with a distinct identity, it is also obvious that it has much in common with other specialities in psychology where direct personal service is provided. Although speculations and self-descriptions of likes and differences may be carried on ad infinitum, some investigators have attempted to deal with the problem in an empirical manner. Studies by Fiedler (1950) and Wrean (1959), though focusing primarily on differences in experience level and theoretical affiliation, also included persons differing in the counseling-noncounseling speciality area. In general, wide similarities were found across specialities for the different dimensions studied. A more explicit comparison was made by Strupp (1955) in his study of psychiatrists, psychoanalysts, social workers, and psychologists. Though some differences were found, again wide overlap existed in the techniques used by persons in these different areas.

Likewise, most conceptions of interaction within the interviews tend to be inclusive and are applicable to persons doing work in a number of speciality areas. The works of Robinson (1950), Greenspoon (1962), Frank (1961), and Haley (1963) all provide basic concepts and dimensions within which a large variety of interpersonal interaction may be studied objectively.

Thus, although the present study has as its immediate context the counseling speciality, it is obvious that specialities have considerable overlap and that a study in the predictability of counselor performance has potential implications beyond the counseling speciality.
The demands for psychological services

The present study has as its context not only the definition and development of a profession but also the extensive demands for psychological services. And, in the light of this extensive demand, studies bearing on the selection and training of counselors seem particularly relevant.

Brayfield (1963) provides an overview of some of the general psychological services being provided today and the needs for their being increased. He reports that there were 11,000 school counselors in 1959 and the need was for 26,000 more. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation graduates over 1000 annually and the role of psychological training in that program is increasing, while state employment services conduct nearly one million interviews each year.

In the area where most counseling psychologists are employed -- on college and university campuses -- demands are also extensive. Sageser (1951) issued a questionnaire to entering freshmen listing the counseling services desired. Only 4 of 1218 returned questionnaires indicated no need for such services. Three-fourths of respondents indicated the need for counseling in the academic area, one-half indicated vocational counseling, and one in ten referred to the need for psychological counseling. Dement (1957) sent graduates of a highly selective men's college an open-ended questionnaire 10 years after their graduation. These men were asked how the university might have better prepared them for the past 10 years. Of the respondents, one-third mentioned counseling. Thus, in spite of the rather gross nature of these investigations, it would seem that evidence for a felt need for personal counseling services is extensive, and large numbers of trained workers are needed.
A survey of studies in counseling

If the saying is true that psychology has a long past and a short history, the saying is even more true of counseling and psychotherapy. The realization that certain kinds of human interaction have therapeutic effects is probably as old as man himself. The effort, however, to study this therapeutic interaction in a systematic and scientific manner is relatively quite recent. Although it may be argued that Freud's theory and system are quasi-scientific (Popper, 1962), both the immense impact of his work and the assumption of modifying the personality through scientific means make the work of Freud and his circle of disciples a logical place to begin. In so far as research contributions are concerned, early publications consisted mostly in therapists' descriptions of cases and in their speculations about them. However, some laboratory experiments using both animals and people were carried out to test behavioral hypotheses derived from psychoanalytic principles. Some of the earliest efforts in the sound recording of interviews were made by Zinn in 1929, Laswell in 1930, and Symonds in 1939 (letters quoted in Dollard and Auld, 1959). Some efforts were also made during this period to develop systematic means for the analysis of these recordings but the efforts were quite rudimentary and do not seem to have served as the basis for the development of more complex systems. It was not until the early 1940's that objective and systematic studies of counseling interviews were reported. These studies were conducted under Rogers and Robinson at Ohio State and included investigations by Porter, Snyder, Sherman, and others.

Since that time the content-analysis of recorded interviews has become increasingly recognized as an area of great potential in research
and a number of systems of such content-analysis have been developed. Auld and Murray (1955) describe a variety of such systems and review research on content-analysis. The authors classify research as (1) methodological studies, in which the effort is made to develop measures, (2) descriptive studies of cases, and (3) theoretically guided studies of therapy in which the attempt is made to get at cause and effect relationships. This review by Auld and Murray is apparently the most extensive one to date, although more recent reviews of research in content analysis have been made by Dittes (1959) and Strupp (1962).

None of the above reviewers has given more than brief mention of the "communications approach" developed largely by Robinson and his students at Ohio State. This seems regrettable in the light of the relatively large and systematic body of research which has been carried out using this approach. Robinson (1955) sketches some of the broad outlines of this approach. The areas included are (1) dimensions of the client and the field, (2) dimensions of the counselor's response, and (3) dimensions of outcome. As will be seen, it is the latter two dimensions which are of special relevance in the present study and a more extensive description of these dimensions, as well as relevant research, will be discussed in the following chapter. Suffice it to say that in the "communications approach" the attempt is made to make the dimensions objective, applicable to interviewing done by counselors of any theoretical orientation, and relevant to dimensions which are widely recognized as being important in the interview.
The prediction of counselor performance

Although a considerable amount of research into the counseling process has been reported by those using content-analyses of the interview, little has been attempted by way of predicting, ahead of actual counseling, the counselor performance to be expected. On the other hand, a number of studies have been carried out with the aim of predicting counselor effectiveness. In these studies no attempt has generally been made to predict how the given individual will counsel, but simply how effective his counseling will be in terms of a given criteria. The two most extensive studies bearing on the prediction of counselor performance were those sponsored by the Veteran's Administration. Research concerning the prediction of the performance of clinical psychologists was reported by Kelly and Fiske (1951); predictive efforts for psychiatrists, by Holt and Luborsky (1958). As will be seen in the following chapter, predictions were not impressive, though the extensive research did add clarity to a number of problems involved and offered suggestions for dealing with these problems in future research. One problem had to do with the finding of a criterion which judges agreed was important and concerning which reliable judgements could be made. Another complication involved the time factor and the problem of making long-term predictions.

The present study

It is the aim of the present study to investigate further the problem of the prediction of counselor performance. For this study a "communications approach" will be attempted. It is hoped that with this approach it will be possible to predict counselor effectiveness as well as the techniques or style which the counselor will display.
The criterion selected is that of counselor performance in a beginning practicum. Since it is anticipated that counselors may change in style or effectiveness relative to one another during the course of the practicum experience, interviews from both the first and fifth weeks were included in the study.

The predictors chosen were interview excerpts to which trainees would respond as if they were the counselors in the excerpted situations. Such predictors were chosen for at least two reasons. One, they have been used in previous research on the assumption that they represent the techniques which counselors actually display in their interviews. Two, they seem to approximate a work sample. To the extent that they offer such an approximation, they eliminate many situational differences and intervening assumptions involved in other kinds of measures. Excerpts were chosen of situations which it was thought would discriminate between better and poorer trainees.

The dimensions used for analyzing test responses and practicum interviews are those common to the "communications approach." Counselor effectiveness in the interview will be assessed by the immediate outcomes measures of working relationship and client assumption of responsibility; counselor style will be measured by lead, response to core, and response to content or feeling. Previous research has shown that measured counselor use of these techniques in the interview is related to measures of interview outcomes. However, it is not known whether test responses prior to actual counseling will predict either counselor style or effectiveness in the interview. It is hoped that the approach described here will provide some answers to these questions.
The specific hypotheses to be tested are given below. These hypotheses are based on the assumption that the conditions presented by the test situation are similar to the conditions of the actual counseling situation. It will be noted that the first two hypotheses have to do with the prediction of counselor style; the last two concern the prediction of counselor effectiveness. For predicting counselor style, only comparable dimensions are studied — test lead is correlated with interview lead, etc. For the prediction of counselor effectiveness, scores for all test dimensions are utilized.

**Hypothesis 1.** Test scores of counselor style will predict scores for comparable dimensions obtained from interviews held during the first week of the practicum.

**Hypothesis 2.** Test scores of counselor style will predict scores for comparable dimensions obtained from interviews held during the fifth week of the practicum.

**Hypothesis 3.** Scores for all test dimensions will predict counselor effectiveness scores for interviews held during the first week of the practicum.

**Hypothesis 4.** Scores for all test dimensions will predict counselor effectiveness scores for interviews held during the fifth week of the practicum.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

As the demands for counseling increase, the problem of selecting counselors for training becomes more important. This is true not only because of the public need for competent services but also because of the limited training resources available and the considerable time and expense involved in the training of such counselors. The aspect of the selection problem dealt with in the present study is the prediction of counselor performance in the interview. It is obvious that overall competence as a professional counselor is more inclusive than simply counselor performance in the interview. Yet, knowledge of counselor performance would seem to be a crucial aspect of assessing professional competence. In terms of selection, the question becomes, Can we predict to any significant extent the counseling performance of trainees prior to their actual participation in a training practicum? Additional knowledge concerning this question would not only have potential usefulness in terms of the selection of counselors but would also throw additional light upon the effects of training — which variables seem most subject to training and which remain relatively constant.

It may be supposed that all studies relative to counseling may have at least potential implications for the prediction of counselor performance. Yet, studies in two areas would seem to be of particular
relevance and have been selected for inclusion in this survey. They are (1) studies of the counseling process and (2) studies in which the effort has been made to predict counselor effectiveness.

**Studies of the Counseling Process**

**The unit of analysis**

If the study of the counseling interview is to be put on an objective and empirical basis, an obvious first step involves the unit which is to be used in such an analysis. The following section provides a survey of dimensions used primarily in Communications Research conducted by Robinson and his students at Ohio State; although some reference is made to work done elsewhere.

**Single remarks**

In an early analysis of the counseling interview, Porter (1941) developed a checklist of counselor behaviors based on counseling texts and interview observations. In this study the single remark was used as the unit of analysis and the focus was on counselor behavior. A short time later Snyder (1945), in his study of nondirective therapy, made a more inclusive interview checklist by including classifications of both counselor and client remarks. Snyder further divided remarks up into separate idea units. These had the advantage of greater sensitivity when the remark tended to be complex, but reliable classification by different judges became more difficult to achieve.
Fractions

In an effort to assess the broader effects of the interview, a number of investigators have made use of fractions of the interview or of the interview series. Tenths of interview series have been used as units by Lewis (1943) and Allen (1946). Others have used quintiles (Raskin, 1949), and halves of interviews in a series (Curran, 1945). Such units offer certain advantages over the single remark type of unit. They facilitate a study of the longer term effects of the interview, offer comparable units for comparisons, make possible the use of interview series of unequal length, and clarify the changes which occur between one fraction of the interview series and another. Disadvantages to the use of fraction units are also to be noted — the primary one being the arbitrariness of the divisions themselves. Thus, the subject being discussed and the stage in the development of the interview are not taken into account. As will be pointed out later, a time segment of the interview has been used as a unit in the present study and is thus somewhat similar to the fractional unit. However, such usage was chosen with a knowledge of the limitations involved and according to goals which do not seem particularly inconsistent with these limitations.

The discussion unit

In approaching the problem of a more meaningful unit, Robinson (1949) has suggested certain limitations to the remark-by-remark type of analysis. Some of these are: the difficulty of getting judges to agree upon the number of divisions the remark should have, the implication that each remark is the result of the immediately preceding remark,
and the difficulty of evaluating the effectiveness of different counseling approaches when using this method. For example, though a client may initially reject an interpretation, there may be later evidence that he was influenced by it. Robinson suggests the use of the Discussion Topic. On the positive side, it may be seen that the single remark unit is sensitive to complex feelings and ideas occurring within the interview and makes possible the clarification of the immediate results of different client and counselor behaviors.

In line with the suggestion of Robinson, Sherman (1945) used the Topic of Conversation as a working unit in her study of counselor techniques and interview outcomes. The Topic of Conversation was defined as, "all the counselor and counselee statements and questions which were related to one main idea or problem discussed in the interview." It may be seen that the Topic of Conversation offers a broader unit than do single remarks and groups related material into more integrated units. Since Sherman's initial work with this unit, Allen (1946) has used the Topical Unit (similar in definition to Sherman's Topic of Conversation) in tracing the development of such units within the interview. He has shown that development tends to go through the steps of statement of problem, development of problem, making plans, and summary. Discussion Units have since been used in studies of the interview by Carnes (1949), Nelson (1949), and others.

The problem area

This unit has been designated variously as Problem Area, Discussion Topic, etc. In general, it consists of discussion units
grouped according to broad types of problems. Carnes (1949) classified his discussion units into what he called Topics. His list covered eight topics including lack of skill, clarification of thinking, and emotional conflict. The latter two were combined in the analysis because of the difficulty in making judgements between them. Muthard (1953) compared various units of analysis. He studied Discussion Unit, Discussion Topic, and Fractional Units (quintiles of an interview series). Under Discussion Topic he had the categories of skill, adjustment, and maturity. It was found that all three types of units provided satisfactory reliability, and no significant differences among the three were found, on his dimensions of working relationship, amount of lead, client assumption of responsibility and counselor assumption of responsibility. However, Discussion Unit and Discussion Topic proved to be significantly more sensitive to changes in the interview process and brought related material together more effectively.

Sub-role analysis

As one conclusion in Muthard's study he suggested the analysis of counselor sub-roles as a logical next step in interview analysis. Such an approach is based upon the different roles which the counselor plays within the interview. Because sub-role analysis could not be carried out on the single remarks given to typescript excerpts used as predictors in the present study and because comparable dimensions were desired for both excerpt responses and interview criteria, sub-role analysis was not chosen for the present study. Therefore, an extensive review of the literature was not attempted. However, sub-role
analysis has proven to be a very useful type of unit and has been employed successfully by Danskin (1955), Hoffman (1959), Mueller (1960) and Campbell (1961).

**Whole interviews**

In certain studies, the whole interview has been used as a unit. Porter (1941) used a directiveness rating of the whole interview and Curran (1945) summed idea units within the whole interview. Some of the same advantages and disadvantages noted for interview fractions also apply to the whole interview unit. While it can be shown that the whole interview tends to have a uniform pattern of organization, and may be evaluated for evidences of improvement, the unit is so gross that much of the dynamic interaction is lost. In other words, it is possible to tell that improvement has occurred, but it is difficult to measure how such change has come about. Apparently for this reason, a number of studies have used other smaller units of analysis in connection with a use of the whole interview.

**Summary**

In the effort to make the counseling interview amenable to empirical research, many units have been used. Most have satisfactory reliability with the possible exception of idea units. Each has advantages and disadvantages relative to the aim of any given study. The remark-by-remark analysis is sensitive to complex feelings and ideas expressed and is especially sensitive to the immediate effects of counselor and client remarks. However, in such an analysis the delayed effects of counselor techniques are often missed as well as the
influence of the previously chosen topic and problem upon counselor remarks. A remark-by-remark type of analysis has the additional disadvantage of being very time consuming. The use of larger units such as discussion unit, problem area or fractions of the interview series, may be more efficient and equally reliable for the study of many interview dimensions. They may further permit the examination of broader dynamics which would be missed by the use of more atomistic units.

In the present study 3 consecutive 5 minute segments of each interview were chosen as units of analysis. As such, this unit is similar to interview fractions. As is described in Chapter 3, it was felt that these segments provided comparable units, had the potential of satisfactory reliability, and offered samples of counselor behavior at the same relative position in the practicum experience. Because a detailed analysis of the counselor-client interaction and the effects of client response to counselor remarks was not needed, a remark-by-remark analysis was considered unnecessary. And, because of the limited interview span from which the sample needed to be taken, the use of units such as discussion topic was considered inapplicable. In this instance, then, the interview segment seemed to be the most appropriate unit even though, for some purposes, it lacks advantages offered by units more functionally related to the interview process. Thus, the choice of a unit was guided by overall goals and applicability.
Dimensions of Counselor Behavior

Degree of Lead

The degree of lead dimension was developed in connection with the early study of non-directive counseling and psychotherapy and has been widely used since that time. Degree of lead has been defined as "The amount the content of the counselor's remark seems to be ahead of the content of the client's last remark, and the degree of pressure or definiteness in the counselor's remark to bring about client acceptance of the new idea" (Carnes, 1949).

In his pioneering study of the interview, Porter (1941) included two measures of directiveness: (1) an 11 point scale upon which a rating was made after having read or heard all of a given interview, and (2) a cumulative score derived from the assignment of weights to different classes of counselor remarks. Correlations between these two measures were .94 for typescripts and .93 for recordings. It may thus be concluded that both measures are of equal sensitivity and that either typescripts or recordings are amenable to scoring along this dimension. Porter reported the following results: (1) persons committed to non-directive therapy lead less than others and, (2) training in non-directive therapy produces a decrease in degree of lead.

Thus, it may be inferred that leading techniques are subject to learning and are not simply a function of the personality.

Snyder (1945) did not use a leading scale as such, but classified counselor remarks by areas — ranging from non-directive, to semi-directive, to directive. He also found that counselors could be
trained to lead less. Some years later Seeman (1949) did an interesting replication of Snyder's earlier study. Using Snyder's same classification system he found non-directive counselors were using 85% non-directive response categories versus 62.2% reported by Snyder. Even more striking was the increase in the use of clarification remarks by non-directivists. Clarification remarks had risen from 32% to 63% of all remarks made.

These early studies, however, did not relate differences in degree of leading to differences in interview outcomes. Subsequent work has provided some evidence along this line. In his study of counselor flexibility Carnes (1949) included degree of lead and related it to certain outcomes measures. The study was based on four interviews from each of eight series of interviews and included counselors of various theoretical orientations. Both skill and clarification types of problems were represented. It was found that there was no relationship between average lead or variability of lead relative to outcomes measures. However, when the top and lowest quartiles in mean lead were compared, a relationship was found between leading and outcomes. Likewise, when the most successful and least successful units were compared, it was found that counselors who lead less were more successful. It should be noted, however, that only eight counselors were included in the study and that it was only among these 8 that the more successful led relatively less. And, though the more successful led less, they were far from using the least possible lead.

Nelson (1949) designed a study to test the relationship between outcomes and optimal leading. In this design, typescript responses
were rated by expert judges for actual lead as well as for optimal lead. In rating optimal lead, judges read the client's remark while covering the counselor's actual remark and made a rating as to the lead that would be considered optimal for that client statement. Separate judges rated the criteria. These criteria were working relationship, client growth during the interview, and client assumption of responsibility. Nelson reported that the closer the counselor came to the amount of leading the judges considered optimal, the higher were the outcomes scores. Conversely, the more deviation from optimal leading, the poorer the results.

A more recent and more extensive study of degree of lead was carried out by Danskin (1954). He studied differences in degree of lead among experienced counselors using 230 interviews of 35 counselors with 82 clients. Work at five different universities was represented. According to his findings: (1) There is a continuum in degree of lead for experienced counselors. Non-directivists lead less on the average but there is wide overlap and no dichotomy exists. (2) Counselors tend to use the same relative degree of lead from client to client. (3) Counselors tend to lead less when working with adjustment than with skill problems. Thus, this data offers some qualification to early studies which simply reported that non-directivists lead less than others.

In an effort to compare counselor differences among those committed to different counseling theories, Wrem (1959) prepared a series of interview excerpts and requested that the counselor write in the response which he would have made in this situation if he were the
counselor. On the degree of lead dimension no significant differences were found between phenomenological (included Rogerians), analytic, or eclectic counselors when group comparisons were made. However, in a classification of the types of remarks made by the different groups, significant differences were found in the use of reflection as a technique between analytic and phenomenological, and between analytic and eclectic counselors. In so far as reflection usually represents less lead than the categories most frequently used by the analytic counselors, this could be taken as evidence that phenomenological and eclectic counselors lead less. When a comparison was made among the responses given by all counselors to the different excerpt situations, significant differences were noted. It was thus concluded that situations accounted for more differences in the degree of lead used than the counselors' theoretical orientation.

**Summary**

It has been shown that the use of the degree of lead dimension has been used rather widely in counseling research and that leading scales tend to offer quite satisfactory reliability. The concept has considerable face validity in offering a distinction between nondirective counseling and other schools not so exclusive committed to putting the client in charge. Some empirical differences are reported between these two groups but there is wide overlap and no dichotomy exists between nondirective counselors and others. Parenthetically, although Wernm's data conflict to some extent with the above conclusion, it should be mentioned that his data were not secured from the actual interviews of counselors as were the other
Finally, reliable judgements may be made concerning optimal lead, and deviation from such optimal leading tends to produce poorer results. Thus, leading too little may be as detrimental as leading too much.

**Core**

Although others have implied such a concept, Elton (1951) was the first investigator to study core response as a formal dimension. His description of the core dimension is as follows:

It is recognized that a client usually attempts to express one central idea. Even when the client says several things in a speech, one idea or feeling is of primary importance. This main idea has been called the "core" of the client's speech, and the counselor usually attempts to respond to the core in the remarks he makes immediately following the client's speech (1951, p. 72).

In this initial study in which the core dimension was used, Elton investigated the effect of client and topic upon counselor behavior. Using 34 interviews of 5 counselors and 10 clients, Elton took a random sample of 20 counselor remarks with each client for each of two topics. Chi-square tests revealed no significant differences between the classifications of two judges. It was thus concluded that the two sets of classifications (for the two judges) were not drawn from a heterogeneous population and that inter-judgemental agreement was reached. Significant differences in ratio of core responses were reported between skill and adjustment topics. Different ratios of core responses were also found for different clients. Core responses ranged from 45% to 95% with the
median being 82%. Evidence was thus presented that counselor core responses are affected by both client and topic.

Wrenn (1959) studied the differences among experienced counselors of different theoretical orientation in response to typescript excerpts of situations thought to differentiate the approaches of different schools. He was thus asking the question, Do people of different schools of counseling actually counsel differently? No significant differences on core responses were reported for those committed to different schools of counseling. Core responses averaged 85%, secondary responses averaged 15%. It will be noted that these percentages are very close to those reported by Elton in his analysis of actual typescripts of interviews.

Evidence concerning the relationship of core responses to interview outcomes was presented in a study by Swearingen (1961). In her design she used typescripts of 24 interviews from 8 counseling centers. Her immediate criteria were working relationship and client assumption of responsibility. Analysis of data revealed a correlation of .53 between the composite criterion and counselor response to client core. This was significant at the .01 level. A surprising additional finding of the study was the difference in percentages of core responses between counselors and their clients. Counselors responded to client core 56% of the time; while clients responded to counselor core 66% of the time. This difference was significant at the .05 level. It will be noted that counselor core responses for Swearingen's sample (56%) were considerably less frequent than those reported by Elton (82%). Since both samples
were drawn from a common universe of interviews, it may be that judges in the two studies were using different standards in the classification of core responses.

Summary

Though the core dimension has not been so widely used as degree of lead, for example, such evidence as we do have makes it appear to be a potentially useful one. Core ratings seem to possess satisfactory interjudgemental reliability for both the analysis of interview typescript responses and of written responses to interview excerpts. Core seems to be significantly related to the type of problem being discussed and to the characteristics of the client. And, the evidence relating core responses to interview outcomes appears rather impressive. This dimension also has some face validity as a measure of counselor sensitivity. As such, the dimension would appear especially promising in the present study of beginning counselors for whom learning to listen to the client often represents a large hurdle.

Content-feeling dimensions

As with degree of lead, the content-feeling dimension has been used rather widely and was included to some extent in the earliest studies of interview typescripts. Although it is possible to study responses to content or feelings apart from classifications made to the core of the client's speech, it will be seen that later studies used content-feeling classifications as two specific types of core responses.
The earliest classification of content-feeling responses is given by Porter (1941) in his checklist of counselor behavior. As sub-classifications under the heading of Developing the Client's Insight and Understanding, the following categories were given: Recognition of Content in the Immediate Client Remark, Recognition of Feeling in the Immediate Client Remark, and Interpretation or Recognition of Feeling Not in the Immediate Client Remark.

Considering these categories, some qualification needs to be made to Snyder's (1945) assertion that Porter's classification ignores the part played by the client in the interview. Though the focus is on counselor behavior, the client's role is implied by the presence of such categories in the checklist.

Snyder (1945) expanded upon the classification system of Porter by including also a classification of client statements. In this study Snyder attempted to measure the immediate effects of different counselor statements upon client statements. His classification of lead taking categories included, Nondirective Response to Feeling — Acceptance, Restatement, Clarification. No comparable nondirective responses to content categories are given. It is therefore implied that if the statement is non-directive it is by definition a response to feeling. Hence, Snyder's study does not provide information concerning the immediate effects of responding to content or to feeling. It is interesting to note that Snyder classifies counselor responses to feeling and client responses with feeling. Supposedly the counselor expresses no feelings in his
remarks. The concept seems similar to Freud's ideas about the negative value of countertransference and the impassivity of the therapist.*

Reid and Snyder (1947) related counselor identification of feelings with instructor's performance rating in a class in nondirective therapy. The study was based on 15 graduate students and utilized 144 interview excerpts. Part were from typescripts and part were sound recordings. Students were asked to designate the feelings expressed by each client statement. It was found that the closer the student came to listing the modal feeling designated by the group, the higher he tended to be rated by the instructor in the class in nondirective therapy. Correlations were .70 for recordings and .49 for typescripts. Since all statements contained feelings, the counselor had to make no choices as to whether to respond to feelings or not. One problem encountered in the study was in the poor judgemental agreement on the identification of specific feelings. Each excerpt was classified, on the average, into five different categories.

Elton (1951) in the study previously mentioned, classified content-feeling responses as specific types of core responses. Chi-square tests revealed satisfactory interjudgemental agreement in the classification as to content or feeling. As with core responses, content-feeling ratios were significantly related to type of topic

*In his later work using Q-sorts to evaluate the therapy relationship, Snyder corrects this omission and assesses the feelings of both client and counselor (1961).
being studied (skill or adjustment) and to different clients. Elton found no counselor differences in content-feeling ratios. However, it would seem that this was in part a result of his experimental design. His procedures were based on the assumption that topic is independent of counselor preferences or techniques. There seems to be considerable evidence for questioning this assumption. Ells and Guppy (1963) have presented evidence that counselors differ in their expressed preference for specific types of client problems. Further, Carnes (1949) noted that it was difficult to secure lack-of-skill and clarification-of-thinking units for each counselor in his study. Rather, counselors tended to have a predominance of one type of unit or the other in their interviews. It was that author's impression that the type of unit tended to be a function of the counselor's technique. Such a view would be consistent with the work of Greenspoon and his associates (work reviewed by Greenspoon, 1962).

An investigation into the differences in counselor styles within discussion topics was made by Dipboye (1954). It was found that counselors tend to respond to content when study habits, skills, and educational and vocational problems are discussed. On the other hand, counselors tend to respond to feelings when dealing with interpersonal relations, family relations, and problems of self-reference. The author concluded that the interview could be meaningfully divided into cognitive and affective units. It was also concluded that there were significant individual counselor differences in responses to content or feeling within topics of a similar type.
Swearingen (1961), in the study previously described, classified core responses as to content or feeling. She found that of core responses, 86% were to content and 14% were to feeling. In contrast, clients gave only 5% feeling responses to counselor core. The correlation of counselor response to client core with the composite criterion of working relationship and client assumption of responsibility was .53, which is significant at the .01 level. Thus, for her sample of counselors, the higher the percentage of feeling responses, the more successful the outcomes.

In Wrenn's (1959) study of responses to interview excerpts, no significant differences were found on the content-feeling dimension for experienced counselors of different theoretical orientations. However, all tended to give a predominance of feeling responses. Of core responses, 12% were to content and 85% were to feeling. This is close to a complete reversal of the percentages reported in studies by Swearingen and Elton. It may be that the samples were drawn from a different population of counselors. There may also be a difference between the excerpt situations and those occurring typically in counseling. Perhaps the excerpts were all biased in the direction of presenting situations typically eliciting feeling reactions from counselors.

Summary

Although the classification of specific types of feelings presents some problems in achieving interjudgemental reliability, a simple content-feeling classification seems reliable in interview
analysis as well as in the analysis of responses to typescript excerpts. Swearingen's evidence for better counselors giving more feeling responses confirms a good bit of prior theory and clinical observation. And, the content-feeling dimension seems to differentiate between the approaches best suited for dealing with certain types of topics. As with the core dimension, the content-feeling dimension seems to focus on an area of special difficulty for beginning counselors. One problem presented by the research is the different ratios of content-feeling responses reported by Wrenn for typescript excerpts in contrast to ratios reported for actual interview analyses. Though possible explanations were considered in this survey, the reasons for this radical difference in content-feeling ratios is by no means certain.

Criteria of Outcomes

Most studies in the Communications Approach to interview analysis have used so called "immediate criteria." In this approach ratings are made of aspects of the interview which are considered to be symptomatic of more delayed effects. The justification for such an approach is offered by the absence of satisfactory external and long-term criteria. Further, even if satisfactory external criteria were available, they would provide no immediate feedback to the counselor concerning the effects of his use of various techniques. Such feedback is, on the other hand, available by the use of immediate criteria. Most immediate criteria are considered descriptive of conditions necessary for therapeutic change and are
taken as evidence of progress or lack of it in the interview. However, in the absence of external validation it is inferential to suppose that good counseling in terms of immediate criteria is a sure prediction of future therapeutic effects. In this respect immediate criteria might be considered analogous to the client's coming back for interviews. It is possible that he may not be helped even if he continues with counseling, but it seems unlikely that he will be helped if he doesn't.

A number of immediate criteria have been suggested for use. Robinson (1950) lists the following: statements of insight and plans, feeling reactions, working relationship, and client responsibility. Of this list, working relationship and client responsibility have seemed most satisfactory in terms of reliability of ratings, stability across interviews, extensive use, and high intercorrelations. Thus, the following survey will only include research relative to these two dimensions.

**Working relationship**

The following statement would seem to express logical as well as very widely held assumptions concerning the counseling relationship.

"Good rapport or a good working relationship is one of the most important characteristics of an effective conference. That it, counseling is most effective when the client and counselor exhibit feelings of mutual respect and the client talks freely about problems which he considers important" (Robinson, 1950, p. 101).

Sherman (1945), in her study of counselor techniques and interview outcomes, was the first investigator to use working
relationship as an immediate criterion. In addition to working relationship she also used growth of client in insight and skill, and responsibility for direction of the interview. All were rated on five point scales and all were found to be significantly interrelated. A correlation of .43 was reported for working relationship and responsibility for the direction of the interview.

When studying factors related to resistance in the interview, Daulton (1947) developed a "resistance score" which was calculated by multiplying the frequency times average severity of different types of resistance. As rated working relationship was found to correlate -.64 with resistance scores, it was concluded that resistance constitutes a large component of poor working relationships. In a further analysis of the data, a distinction was made between resistance having its source in the counselor (external resistance) and that having its source in the client's conflicting motives, beliefs, etc. (internal resistance). When this latter distinction was made, external resistance proved to be of the highest average severity.

Working relationship was related to the role of client talk in the interview by Carnes and Robinson (1948). These authors reported that although client talk correlated .31 with working relationship, this correlation dropped considerably when the effect of counselor technique was controlled for. Correlations were .12 for skill problems and .23 for adjustment problems when such a correction was made. Such evidence seems to indicate that client
talk is not a strong sign of a good working relationship. And, it may be that client talk follows, rather than produces, a good working relationship.

Carnes' (1949) study of counselor flexibility utilized a 50 point scale of working relationship. He reported the average interjudgemental reliability of ratings of working relationship to be .58. Corrected by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula this became .81. Working relationship correlated with client growth .86 and with client assumption of responsibility, .89. Although the relationship of average counselor lead to working relationship was not reported, there was a significant relationship between a lower level of lead and higher composite outcomes scores.

A considerable amount of valuable and rather unique data relative to working relationship and other immediate criteria was proved by the investigation of McCormick (1951). This study differed from others in that McCormick traced the stability of immediate criteria across a series of interviews with the same counselor and clients. Using three counselors and 10 clients with six interviews for each client, sequences of discussion units were selected. All were on study-skills topics and each sequence of four discussion units was concerned with the same subject or problem. Interjudgemental reliability for working relationship was .91. Working relationship intercorrelated with client responsibility from .90 - .98 within the same discussion unit (first through fourth). Distributions of all immediate criteria scores tended to be skewed in a positive direction, a fact which somewhat complicates the use of
significance tests based on the normal distribution. It was found that scores for working relationship in a prior discussion unit tended to predict working relationship scores in subsequent units, with correlations tending to become smaller as units were farther separated from one another in the sequence of four. One exception to this trend was the significant drop in the correlations of most immediate criteria scores when moving from the third to the fourth units. Of the immediate criteria, working relationship was the most consistent in the four discussion unit sequences.

In Danskin's study of counselor roles (1955) no difference in working relationship was found when the counselor played a role different from that which the client seemed to be expecting. However, when different roles were compared, the reflecting role produced significantly better working relationship scores than the other five roles studied.

More recently, Swearingen (1961), in her study of core responses, reported interjudgemental reliabilities of two judges to be .62. When corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula these became .76. And, as mentioned previously, a significant relationship was found between counselor response to client core and working relationship.

Summary

On the basis of the figures presented it seems evident that the immediate criterion of working relationship has satisfactory inter-judgemental reliability and has a rather high consistancy from one
interview period to another for a given counselor, client, and topic. In addition, it has relatively high intercorrelations with other immediate criteria and is predicted by a number of interview variables which it would seem reasonable to expect. Thus, some evidence is provided for its construct validity. Whether working relationship is predictive of external criteria is still something of an open question. In the only study which attempted to relate the two, the results were inconclusive. However, at this stage in counseling interview research, the above evidence would seem to recommend working relationship as one of the most satisfactory immediate criteria.

Assumption of responsibility

It seems theoretically reasonable, as well as in keeping with observations of counseling, that progress in the interview and the client's active assumption of responsibility should occur together. This seem especially to be expected when one considers the responsibility the client actually assumes, rather than simply his stated intentions of exercising responsibility. A number of studies have explored assumption of responsibility in the interview and have used it as an immediate criteria.

Sherman (1945) used a five point scale of client responsibility for the direction of the interview. She found that responsibility ratings proved to be the most reliable of the three immediate criteria used. On 26 interview units she achieved perfect agreement for two judges 65% of the time and only one degree of
difference was found the other 35% of the time. It will be noted that this accounts for all of the variance and constitutes excellent reliability. Responsibility intercorrelated .43 for working relationship and .48 for growth in insight. Sherman observed that high counselor responsibility was associated with client apathy and that the best working relationship exists when the counselor does not take too much responsibility. Thus, good working relationship and client responsibility seem to occur together.

Evidence concerning the relationship of client responsibility as a counselor technique and as an interview outcome was provided by Elton (1948). Using 78 recorded interviews it was concluded that the amount of responsibility assumed by the client can be affected by counselor technique. In an additional analysis, when derived score was used to discount the effect of counselor technique, client assumption of responsibility was reported to be significantly related to other interview outcomes. Intercorrelations ranged from .37 to .62 depending upon the immediate criteria compared and the type of topic discussed. By this investigation Elton provided evidence that there is a tendency for clients to assume responsibility which is independent of counselor technique. And, when such client responsibility is high, other measures of outcome are more favorable.

Following the suggestive findings of Elton, Carnes (1949) in his study of counselor flexibility developed two responsibility scales. One measured counselor intention as to the division of responsibility. The other was designed to measure the amount of
responsibility the client was actually interested in assuming regardless of the intentions of the counselor. Both were fifty point scales. By these scales it was thus implied that responsibility is not a single continuum ranging from total counselor responsibility to total client responsibility, as Sherman's scale had implied, but that the responsibility of client and counselor were independent. Thus, both counselor and client might assume a considerable amount of responsibility in the interview or both might assume little. It is to be noted that it is the second scale -- client interest in assuming responsibility -- that constitutes the immediate criterion scale. The other is considered to be a measure of counselor technique. When mean interjudgemental reliabilities were computed, the agreement of three judges was found to be .73 on the client assumption of responsibility scale. By the use of the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula this became .89. Unusually high intercorrelations were reported for immediate criteria in Carnes' study. The relationship of client assumption of responsibility with working relationship was .78 and with client growth was .69.

In McCormick's study (1951) of immediate and delayed criteria, interjudgemental reliability of client responsibility was .88. Intercorrelations of client responsibility and working relationship in the same discussion unit ranged from .90 to .98. For client responsibility and client growth the intercorrelations ranged from .88 to .92. Responsibility scores in one discussion unit predicted
those in the one immediately following, with the exceptions of units 3 and 4. This same exception was previously noted for working relationship. Unit of analysis also apparently makes no significant differences in client responsibility scores according to the evidence provided by Muthard (1953).

Somewhat lower interjudgemental agreement and intercorrelations with other immediate criteria were reported by Swearingen (1961). The agreement of two judges on client responsibility was .63, the correlation becoming .77 with the Spearman-Brown correction. Intercorrelations for client assumption of responsibility and counselor response to client core was .40. Responsibility and counselor response to client feeling were related .48.

Summary

As was concluded for working relationship, the immediate criteria of client responsibility seems to meet a number of standards for usefulness. It has face validity in that it seems to agree both with good theory and practical observation that the client must be involved and assume responsibility if progress is to be made. It may further be looked upon as a sample of behavior usually considered to be associated with good adjustment. Thus, if such behavior is evidenced in the interview it seems reasonable to expect such behavior to generalize to situations outside the conference. As a criterion, client responsibility has been rather widely used and satisfactory agreement of judges has been reported. It further seems to have rather high consistency across interview units with the same client and counselor. As with
working relationship, it agrees well with other immediate criteria and is predicted by various measures for which it would seem reasonable to expect prediction. In this sense, it may be said to possess construct validity. Again, the relation of client responsibility to external criteria is unknown and more research is needed.

**Summary of Communications Research**

Considerable progress has been evidenced in the objective study of the counseling interview. It has been shown that the interview is amenable to empirical research and that reliable descriptions can be made of atomistic units as well as of more global characteristics. Quantitative, and in some cases, qualitative dimensions have been investigated. It has been shown that some counselor techniques tend to produce better results in terms of immediate criteria than others. However, most of this research has not been predictive in nature. That is, it does not enable one to predict ahead of actual counseling, which counselor will likely be the most effective. Thus, studies in communications research might be called correlational or descriptive. In the following section a survey will be made of studies in which the effort has been made to predict counselor performance.
THE PREDICTION OF COUNSELOR EFFECTIVENESS

In the following section a survey will be made of studies in which the attempt has been made to predict counselor effectiveness. Logically prior to such an examination however, would seem to be an asking of the question, What are we looking for in terms of counselor performance? One answer to this question is presented by the various descriptive qualifications for counselors drawn up by various professional organizations. Also, by way of introduction and contrast, actual selection procedures may be noted.

Statements on Selection and Practices in Selection

In formal statements concerning the standards for counselor selection and in the practices of counselor selection there is implicit if not explicit prediction of counselor performance. As will be seen, the ability to predict success as professional psychologists or as able counselors is not impressive. Yet, many groups and individuals are able to state with some definiteness what they think they are looking for.

An official statement of the American Personnel and Guidance Association on counselor preparation (1958) provides the following list of qualifications: intellectually able, professionally motivated, emotionally and socially mature, and able to sustain intimate interpersonal relationships enriched by their experience. They acknowledge that the optimal configuration of such traits is difficult to know and consider that there may be several. It is recognized that prior work
experience may have both good and bad implications in so far as trainee qualifications are concerned. Public school teaching experience may, for example, provide one with valuable experience in dealing with various interpersonal relationships. But, it may also be that many who come into counselor training from the teaching profession are misfits and seek to enter counseling as an escape. The ARGA thus suggests other alternatives to the rigid requirement of prior work experience. It is noted that most actual selection techniques provide only a gross screening of the obviously unfit and that continuous evaluation and selection is occurring during training.

Division 17, of the American Psychological Association (1952) has published its document on Recommended Standards for Training Counseling Psychologists at the Doctoral Level. Concerning selection this document stresses intelligence, professional motivation, maturity and curiosity. However, in this same group's analysis of actual selection practices (1954) the ideals of selection and the practices of selection bear little similarity.

Hill (1961) has surveyed practices in the selection of school counselors. He describes the following procedure as that most often occurring: (1) A teacher takes some interest in guidance and is assigned some guidance duties. Or, some administrator recognizes some teacher as potentially a good guidance worker and encourages him to seek training. (2) The teacher seeks admission to graduate school. Such admission is usually determined by the giving of evidence that the candidate has the academic ability to do graduate work. (3) Assessment of counselor ability is made in different practicum experiences. These are
often little related to academic work in counseling or to other practicums. We see that in selection a sequence of separate stages or steps is involved which may bear little similarity to one another.

A longer list of ideal counselor traits is given by the APA Committee on Training in Clinical Psychology (1947). The list includes fifteen traits including, in addition to those previously mentioned, such things as breadth of cultural background, sense of humor, discriminating sense of ethical values, etc.

In summary it will be evident that the lists vary in length, and although there is occasionally a disagreement between lists of ideal requirements such as the necessity of prior teaching experience, few would argue with the desirability of counselors possessing such ideal qualifications. However, these lists often do not discriminate between characteristics desirable for psychologists and those desirable for persons in any other profession. Finally, such lists are of minimal assistance in the actual process of selection and in making the choice as to whether applicant A or B will ultimately make the preferable psychologist.

**Empirical Studies**

A number of studies have been carried out in the hope of putting the selection process on a more empirical basis. Such studies vary according to criteria of performance, measures used to predict, control groups used, etc. In the following survey these studies will be grouped somewhat arbitrarily into those using multiple predictors and those employing single predictive measures.
Studies using multiple predictors

The most extensive effort in the prediction of performance in clinical psychology was financed by the Veteran's Administration and is reported by Kelly and Fiske (1951). The study employed large numbers of eminent psychologists, used extensive tests of every major type, and covered a wide gamut of criteria measures. Some of the criteria were content exams, rated research competence, academic performance, clinical skills in diagnosis and therapy, skills in social relations, etc. From the beginning it was evident that the discovery of criteria to which a large percentage of clinicians could agree, was a major difficulty. Reliability of judgements also presented a problem, especially ratings of clinical competence. As a result of the study it was found that intellectual criteria could be predicted rather well. Correlations ranged from .35 to .60. Relative academic standing, such as length of time required for completion of the degree, proved to be more predictable than the simple pass-fail criterion. The study provided very poor prediction of clinical competence and social skill. And, the best predictors were found to be the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and the Miller Analogies.

Though reviewed very briefly here, the Kelly and Fiske study was extremely extensive and thorough. It is thus particularly discouraging that the results were so unimpressive. Still, the research was valuable in terms of what it did predict and serves as a good starting point for further efforts at the prediction of performance in psychology.

Even though the Kelly and Fiske study did not result in impressive predictions, one particular aspect of that study was thought to
warrant a more detailed review in light of its particular relevance to the present investigation. This has to do with the criteria used in the investigation of therapeutic competence. Criteria included the following: (1) Progress notes were scored for the amount of crucial topics discussed. (2) Judges' subjective ratings of clinical competence were made from progress notes. On this rating, satisfactory reliability was reported. (3) Judges rated the feelings of the therapist for the patient and his perception of the patient as similar to himself. This criteria proved to lack satisfactory reliability. (4) On recordings made of the trainees' interviews with patients, judges rated overall competence. Although judges reached significant agreement, the average interjudgemental reliability was only .43. (5) In the effort to make composite ratings of therapeutic competence it was concluded that most such measures were almost independent. Thus, the satisfactoriness of the criteria were not impressive, but they underline the difficulty of making reliable judgements of competence and offer several approaches which did not prove worthwhile.

In a follow-up of the original Kelly and Fiske study, Kelly and Goldberg (1959) utilized questionnaires, the APA Directory and Psychological Abstracts. Several of the results were striking. Nearly one-half of those who had entered clinical psychology reported that they would not choose it if they were starting over again. And, in terms of scholarly productivity, as measured by number of publications, the original data of the Kelly and Fiske
study accounted altogether for no more than 10% of the variance. It was postulated that one reason for the poor prediction of clinical performance is that the criteria of such performance may be quite specific to a given situation. The primary positive result of this follow-up was the presentation of evidence concerning the predictability of specialization within clinical psychology. A deliniation was made of different personality constellations and biographical characteristics for academicians, therapists and administrators.

The relationship of counselor characteristics to the ability of counselors to communicate effectively with their clients was investigated by Brams (1961). The study was based on 27 graduate students and utilized the MMPI, the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, the Bills Index of Adjustment and Values, and the Berkeley Public Opinion Questionnaire. The latter was developed by Adorno et al. (1950) and is considered to be a measure of tolerance for ambiguity. The ratings of counseling interviews by two supervisors on a counselor communication scale constituted the criterion. It was found that only the tolerance for ambiguity measure (Berkeley POQ) was related to counselor communication. The correlation of these scores was -.36. This was significant at the .06 level of confidence.

Another very extensive study financed by the V.A. was that conducted for psychiatric residents at the Menninger School of Psychiatry (Holt and Luborsky, 1958). As with the Kelly and Fiske study, a wide variety of tests and criteria were employed. One
particular difference in design was the development of special TAT and Rorschach manuals for purposes of psychiatric predictions. Contrary to the findings of the Kelly and Fiske study, the SVIB (even the special psychiatrists keys) and the Miller Analogies test failed to provide significant predictions. The best predictions were afforded by experienced judges making global evaluations based upon a variety of test and interview information. Correlations were reported in the high .50's for some criteria. However, judges varied considerably in their predictive success. This fact holds out some encouragement for the possibilities of clinical prediction but makes practical application based on the reported findings difficult — that is, it is difficult to know if you have located a judge with a high hit ratio.

Stefflre, King, and Leafgren (1962) studied characteristics of trainees judged effective by their peers. A forced distribution Q-sort was used as the criterion. Predictors included the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale - Form E, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and grade-point average. Perhaps the most impressive finding of the study was the high interjudgemental agreement reported for the Q-sort criterion measure. In addition, however, it was found that the criterion was predicted significantly by the dogmatism measure and by the SVIB — especially the IM scale. As there was a high correlation between peer choice and grade point average, the authors offered the interpretation that peer choice may have been influenced by signs of staff favor which was in turn related to grades.
Studies using single predictors

Reid and Snyder (1947) investigated the relationship between the recognition of feelings and its importance to counseling competence. Their method included the presentation of sound recorded interview excerpts and excerpts of typescripts to 15 students taking a class in nondirective counseling. The subjects were asked to designate the feelings expressed. Using rating by the class instructor as the criterion, correlations of .70 were reported between the criterion and the closeness with which the student came to the modal designation of feelings for the sound recorded excerpts. The correlation dropped to .49 when typescript excerpts were used.

Using staff judgements of satisfactoriness as the criterion, Snyder (1955) attempted to make predictions for clinical students using items from the MMPI and special scales developed for the MMPI. On the basis of that analysis Snyder gave the following description of good clinical students: possessing intellectual and scientific interests, gregarious and non-stereotyped in behavior, independent, energetic, good self-concept, confident, unorthodox in religious beliefs and practices, and unconventional in moral ideals relative to sex and justice for minorities. Poor students were described as having fewer scientific interests, feeling inferior, and possessing conventional religious and moral attitudes. Since the author did not report on his statistical tests, the nature of the items, or the scales used, critical evaluation of
the study is difficult. The results sound more like one of the lists of ideal counselor characteristics published by professional associations than of exact empirical research. One might well question if staff favor is a good predictor of later performance, and even if it is, this may not be independent of favorable work placement.

Hopke (1955) attempted to predict the attitudes which counselors will display in their interviews. Trainees were given 10 excerpts taken from typescripts of interviews with five alternative responses listed for each. Responses were then ranked in order of appropriateness. Each set of five responses was designed to represent five basic counselor attitudes -- evaluative, interpretative, supportive, probing, and understanding. The measures of interview performance included the percentage of remarks made of each of the five types, supervisor ranking of the frequency with which each attitude was evidenced by the counselor, and counselor ranking of the relative frequency with which each attitude was evidenced. Test rank and interview frequency rank yielded the highest correlations. These ranged from .80 to .97. Test rank correlated with supervisor rank .32 - .97. And, test rank with self-estimate rank correlated .60 - .97.

In terms of the design of the present study, the study by Hopke is a very interesting one in that responses to excerpts are used to predict characteristics of actual interviewing. However, one aspect of Hopke's design presents a rather radical limitation of its relevance to the present study. This limitation is shown
by the fact that Hopke attempted only to compare each counselor with himself rather than with other counselors, e.g. ranked attitudes in response to the excerpts are compared with ranked attitudes for that counselor in interviews. Thus, if one or two counselor attitudes tend to be displayed most frequently by all counselors in all counseling situations whether in actual interviews or in response to excerpts, this will assure that ranked correlations between excerpt attitudes and counseling attitudes are significantly related, without differentiating between counselors. Without showing, for instance, that counselors who choose interpretative responses to excerpts most frequently relative to other counselors, also use such responses more frequently than others in actual interviews, one really doesn't have much useful information.

The perceptual organization of effective counselors was investigated by Combs and Soper (1963) in a study utilizing 29 trainees from an NDEA institute. Trainees were asked to write human relations incidents which were later scored for dimensions of perceptual organization. The criteria were staff judgements of effectiveness in the practicum aspects of the institute. It should be noted that the study is only partially predictive in that the collection of predictive data overlapped somewhat the period in which the staff judgements concerning criteria were being made. Independent scoring of the human relations incidents on a number of perceptual variables yielded correlations with staff judgements of effectiveness ranging from .40 to .65.
Summary

When confronted by the wide array of predictors, criteria, subjects, and generally low predictions, the making of a succinct summary of relatively valid conclusions is difficult. In the light of the rather extensive effort that has been made, especially in the Kelly and Fiske study, it is disappointing indeed that so little prediction has been forthcoming. As with studies of counseling and psychotherapy in general, the criterion problem is very much an unresolved issue. And further, even when significant predictions have been made, so many correlations have been run and significant correlations have generally been so small, that nearly all the research needs to be replicated before much faith can be placed in the reported results.

Such significant prediction that has been made, has mostly been in line with good theorizing and clinical observation -- trainees with the best potential are more intelligent, sociable, tolerant of ambiguity, and less neurotic than others. However, our ability to discriminate between trainees of good or poor potential, remains very weak indeed.

In conclusion, we have some evidence for the predictability of counselor effectiveness, but almost no knowledge of the predictability of particular counselor behavior — how a given trainee will counsel or how his style will differ from another. It is in
an effort to make such predictions that a communications approach to the problem has been taken in the present study. The following chapter presents the methodology which has been followed in the attempt to make such predictions.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Introduction

The present study was designed with the goal of predicting counselor performance in a beginning training practicum. For purposes of prediction, interview excerpts were selected to which student counselors were asked to respond as if they were the counselor of the client making the statements in the excerpts. Actual performance in practicum counseling constituted the criteria. Dimensions used in analyzing both the responses to typescript excerpts and actual interviews were those common to the "communications approach" developed by Robinson and others. Information relative to the design and method of the study follows.

The subjects

The clients for the study were college students enrolled in the course, The Psychology of Effective Student Adjustment, offered at the Ohio State University during the Winter and Spring quarters of the academic year, 1964. Students taking this course do so ostensibly at their own choice. However, college advisors frequently recommend it for students with below average high school records or for students having difficulty with their college grades. Thus, although the students tend to be somewhat below the
average of their fellow college students in academic performance, the range of academic performance is rather great. Significantly, college entrance exams show the students to be of average ability as compared with the appropriate college norm groups. It has thus been inferred that as a group, such students tend to be under-achievers.

At the beginning of the quarter students are informed of the counseling opportunity and they are asked to express their preferences concerning this opportunity. Ordinarily anywhere from one-third to three-fourths of a particular class will express interest in counseling. In addition, students are asked to indicate any particular problems for which they would desire help from a counselor. Since enrollment in the various sections of the class is usually in excess of 200, and as resources for counseling are relatively small, only a small percentage of those indicating an interest in counseling actually receive it.

As the course deals largely with techniques of effective study, it is to be expected that the problems discussed in counseling often involve the topic of academic performance. However, a rather small percentage of the counseling would be considered strictly tutorial in nature. Discussion covers a wide range of study skills, adjustment, and maturity problems.

The 18 counselors used in the present study were enrolled in the introductory practicum offered in the Counseling area during the Winter and Spring quarters of the academic year, 1964. They
varied considerably in age and experience, as well as in area of specialization. A minority were majoring in Counseling Psychology. In order to enroll in the practicum, graduate students are required to have taken an introductory course entitled, The Psychology of Counseling. Theories and techniques, as well as relevant research, are stressed in the course. The position presented in the course might be described broadly as "eclectic." Although movies and some role playing experiences are provided in the class, no formal laboratory experience is included, such that counselors coming to the practicum are often quite "inexperienced" in so far as actual counseling is concerned. Beginning with the Spring quarter, 1964, all students entering the beginning practicum were required to have taken a course in Counseling Diagnostics which, as the name implies, deals with the use of tests in counseling. Included in the course is a laboratory in which students familiarize themselves with commonly used tests and have supervised role playing experience in test interpretation. Thus, counselors in the two different quarters included in the present study had systematically varying backgrounds in so far as course requirements were concerned.

The course

The introductory counseling practicum is offered each quarter at Ohio State with a maximum enrollment each quarter of 10. Beginning the third week of each quarter, counselors have weekly conferences with each of two clients from the class in effective study. These conferences are usually 30 minutes in length, the remainder
of the hour being left for a supervisory conference concerning the immediately preceding interview. Counseling usually continues for eight consecutive weeks. Counselors are encouraged to continue with the same clients in so far as this seems feasible. However, the actual turnover rate varies considerably from one counselor to another.

Facilities for the conferences are provided by two adequately sized and well lighted rooms. The two counseling rooms are plain, but clean; and a table or desk and chairs are their only regular furnishings. Sound isolation is usually quite good with the exception of rather frequent noises from lowflying planes overhead. Both rooms are equipped with microphones which are connected with a common listening room. One room is provided, in addition, with a one-way mirror which permits viewing from the adjoining listening room. Interviews are heard by the supervisors while they are in progress. The use of stereo equipment makes it possible for the interview to be recorded and at the same time permits the supervisor to record his comments about the interview on a separate track. In playing back the tape of his interview, the counselor may adjust the machines so as to hear both the conference and the supervisor's comments, or either of them alone.

Prior to counseling, class instructors explain that the counseling will be done by advanced graduate students under supervision and that the conferences will be recorded for purposes of supervision. The microphones are clearly visible and most students seem to be aware of the nature of the one-way mirror. It is felt that
these supervisory facilities are generally not detrimental to the counseling relationship. However, there is no systematic evidence for this assumption, and occasionally it will be obvious from client behavior that the recording and/or observation is disturbing to the client.

Each quarter supervision is provided by two full-time staff members and one part-time staff member working at the assistant instructor level, this position being filled during the time of the present study by the writer. Full-time staff members each supervise one-half of the practicum students and also conduct the weekly two hour seminar for those students. The assistant instructor supervises each practicum student for one conference each week and also assesses their case notes.

The development of the test

As was previously described the use of counselor responses to interview excerpts seemed to be a potentially useful means of predicting counselor performance in the interview. Such means have been used by Strupp (1955), Wrenn (1959) and Hopke (1955). In the work of all three investigators it is assumed that there is a relationship between the counselor's responses to the interview excerpts and his actual behavior in counseling. Responding to interview excerpts has also been used at Ohio State University and elsewhere (APA, 1952) as a technique in counselor training. However, the assumption of a relationship and the actual presence of one have often proven to be two different things in psychology. To that
extent, the present investigation represents one attempt to measure that relationship. Only the study by Hopke attempted to measure the relationship between typescript responses (in this case a ranking of responses already given) and performance in actual interviews. As was mentioned previously, Hopke's study did not attempt differential prediction among a group of counselors and thus its assistance in the issues raised in the present study are somewhat lessened. In the area of projective testing, perhaps one of the techniques most closely resembling the utilization of responses to interview excerpts is represented by Rosenzweig's Picture-Frustration Study. In this test, cartoons are presented of frustrating situations along with a completed balloon of what one person is saying. The subject is to fill in the blank balloon for the person being frustrated. In this test it might be assumed that what the person says in the balloon response would represent what he would be likely to say in a similar real-life circumstance. However, the use of the cartoon aspects, the type of situations represented, the different dimensions assessed and the general meagreness of validational evidence for the P-F Study, make an application to the use of interview excerpts almost impossible.

The use of excerpts might be thought of as standing somewhere between projective tests and work samples. The excerpts represent the structured stimulus of the projective test and provide for freedom of response, but lack the disguise of purpose which projective tests present. There is thus, less danger of responses being distorted
by minimal cues of which the examiner is unaware (cf., Rotter, 1954). Also, the motivations of the respondents, the conditions under which the excerpts were administered, and the standards of evaluation, would seem to have a high similarity to that involved in the practicum counseling. In this regard they are similar to work samples. However, it will be obvious that the moment-to-moment judgements and dynamic interrelationships involved in interviewing are considerably more demanding than writing down what a person thinks he would say in an interview. Some similarity is also seen to role-playing. Here again however, the excerpts involve less interaction but present a more structured stimulus. It has been the unstructured nature of the stimulus, in fact, which has plagued the use of role-playing as a predictive device (Rotter and Wickens, 1948).

In sum, there seems to be little experimental evidence to support the presumed relationship between responses to interview excerpts and actual counseling. However, the apparent similarities of stimuli, conditions for observation, expected standards for evaluation, and scoreability along similar dimensions would seem to warrant an investigation using this technique.

The selection of the excerpts

The selection of the interview excerpts involved several stages. Initially the writer formulated a list of those types of situations with which, on the basis of his observations of the practicum, beginning counselors seemed to have difficulty. This might be described as a list of critical incidents. In addition,
Principles and Procedures in Student Counseling (Robinson, 1950) was consulted for a list of mistakes made by beginning counselors. Those mistakes which would seem to be inferable from the responses to interview excerpts were especially noted, and an additional list was made of types of situations in which one might expect those mistakes to occur.

Using these lists as guides, the writer selected excerpts from the file of interview typescripts from several universities located in the Ohio State counseling psychology area. No effort was made to read a random sample of these typescripts nor to include excerpts from certain universities, counselors, etc. The only standard was to choose examples which presented a variety of situations with which beginners tend to have difficulty. Following the selection of these excerpts, brief introductions were written for each in order to locate that excerpt in the interview series and to present other relevant features of its context. Some additional excerpts with their introductions were selected from the list compiled by Wrenn (1959). Although that writer selected excerpts to discriminate between experienced counselors of different schools of counseling, some of his excerpts seemed to be relevant to the present study and were included. Wrenn's list of excerpts was also drawn from the file of typescripts at Ohio State.

After the formulation of this initial list, it was presented to three staff members in counseling for their reactions. As a result of these consultations, some revisions were made in the list
of excerpts and some introductions were rewritten. Finally, the list of excerpts was given to six, second and third year graduate students in counseling who had already completed the introductory practicum and these persons wrote their responses to the excerpts. Their responses were then scored by the writer along the dimensions of lead, core, content-feeling, and overall satisfactoriness. On the basis of this scoring, excerpts were evaluated for the spread in scores which they elicited. Because of low variability in responses which some of the excerpts elicited, these were dropped from further use and some others were added in hopes of increasing response variability. This, then, constituted the first stage in the development of the list of excerpts used in the test.

As a part of a pilot study this initial list of excerpts was administered to all of the counselors enrolled in the introductory practicum during the Fall quarter of 1963. These were to have been used to predict interview performance, but because of considerations of time, this data was not analyzed. The responses, however, were scored and a further evaluation was made of response variability. In general, it was concluded that all excerpts provided a satisfactory range of scoring on the dimensions used with the exception of the content-feeling dimension. Thus, all 12 of the excerpts were retained in the second revision, but six excerpts were added which were selected in an effort to introduce more content-feeling variability into the excerpt series. This is the test used in the present study and included in Appendix III.
Selection of the criteria

The criteria selected for use in the present investigation were the actual counseling interviews held in connection with the introductory practicum. It was felt that such interviews constitute a significant measure of trainee competence and also provide a rather logical estimate of longer range counseling performance. Although it is conceivable that practicum performance bears little relationship to later professional counseling, it would seem to be one of the best estimates we have.

A major issue relative to the use of counseling interviews as criteria has to do with the particular interviews to be selected for analysis. For obvious reasons of time, it was not feasible to use all of each counselor's interviews. The choice was guided by two considerations. First, it is possible that counselor performance may be predictable in initial interviews but not in later ones. Such may be the case if training tends to obliterate the effect of initial individual differences relative to counseling ability. On the other hand, it may be that individual differences in counseling ability are increased by the practicum experience such that performance later in the course is more predictable than is initial performance. Because of these considerations interviews from the first and fifth weeks were selected for analysis.

The choice of the fifth week represented a compromise between two conflicting values -- minimal client turnover versus maximal length of counselor training. Ideally interviews would be available
for the same counselor and client throughout the quarter. Thus, when interviews held the first week and those held the last week were compared a maximum amount of the difference could be attributed to the effects of the practicum experience. However, turnover of clients begins as early as the second week of the practicum. Further, counselors vary considerably in the number of interviews they have with clients. This being the case, it did not seem feasible to select only interviews of the same counselor and client. Though it might have been possible to find, for example, first and third interviews with the same two participants, this would have necessitated interviews coming from widely differing periods in the eight week practicum. Some third interviews would have come from the third week, some from the seventh, etc. So, in order to control for length of experience, interviews were selected from the first and fifth weeks regardless of the turnover of clients that had occurred. However, in order to minimize the effect of client differences, interviews with both clients for each counselor were included in the analysis of the weeks selected.

In the effort to keep the amount of time needed for analyzing the interviews within practical limits, it was decided that only the first 15 minutes of the interview would be used. This would usually represent the first half of the conference. Although it is known that the latter half of the interview differs in certain characteristics from the first half (Curran, 1945), there is little research to indicate that the dimensions selected for the present
study vary significantly within halves. Muthard (1953) has shown that fractions of interview series may be rated reliably and that no differences were noted in measures of immediate outcomes when scored for interview fractions versus scoring for other types of units. One gains the impression in observing these interviews that the basic relationships and counselor techniques are rather well evidenced during the first 15 minutes and that marked changes thereafter are not ordinarily seen. Thus, it was felt that fifteen minute segments of interviews offered comparable samples of the interviewing of each of the counselors. However, in the effort to increase reliability of judgments and to allow for more sensitivity to changes within the 15 minute segments, ratings of all dimensions except immediate outcomes were rated separately for each five minute period within the 15 minute interview segment.

Dimensions

Dimensions used in the present study are all derived from earlier studies in communications research described in Chapter 2. These include degree of lead, responses to core, and content-feeling responses. Both quantitative and qualitative scores are used in the study. In addition, a composite criterion for assessing the immediate outcome is described. For the analysis of test responses, an estimate of overall satisfactoriness is also included in the hope of including any source of variance the judge uses in evaluating the responses which is not covered by the specified dimensions. A description of the dimensions and the scales used for each is given below.
Degree of lead

Degree of lead is one of the most used and sensitive dimensions which have been used in communications research. For the instruction of the judges the following description of degree of lead was adapted from Carnes (1949):

The degree to which a response leads usually depends on two characteristics: (a) how far the content of the counselor's response seems to be ahead of the content of the client's last remark, and (b) the degree of pressure or definiteness in the counselor's response used to bring about client acceptance of new ideas. To illustrate, an acceptance remark adds no new idea and little pressure, (except, perhaps, to continue talking); tentative analysis brings in a new idea which logically follows but little pressure is exerted to accept it; an interpretation remark states a new idea with definiteness which indicates that the client is expected to accept, etc.

Scales and scoring for interviews. For the rating of interviews a 50 point scale with quartile divisions was developed. On this scale the judge compares a given interview segment with his conception of the amount of lead that would be used by the average student in the counseling practicum. Detailed instructions for rating the interview segments are given in Appendix II. The scale is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Md</th>
<th>3Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For purposes of prediction an interview degree of lead score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) The six degree of lead ratings for each week (2 clients x 3 five minute periods)
were summed for each counselor. (2) This total was divided by the number of interview ratings, i.e. 6, to yield an average interview lead score. Thus, each counselor received an average lead score for the first and fifth weeks.

**Scales and scoring for tests.** For the rating of degree of lead in test responses a somewhat different scale was utilized based on the work of Carnes (1949). The scale is as follows:

- Silence
- Acceptance
- Clarification
- General Lead
- Tentative Analysis
- Urging

**Little or no lead**
**Much lead**

It may be observed that this scale is graphic and has indicated average lead values for different types of counselor remarks. Using these typical lead values of different types of counselor remarks as guides each counselor response was rated for actual lead.

For purposes of prediction an average test lead score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) Degree of lead ratings for each response were summed for each counselor. (2) This total was divided by the number of responses given. (3) As lead values
were computed for both judges of each counselor, their two lead ratings were averaged to yield an average test lead score for each counselor.

It will be noted that average lead scores for tests differ from average lead score for interviews in the method of computation. Whereas the lead scores for interviews are based on estimates of lead in the five minute segments, the lead score for tests are composed of ratings of each counselor remark.

**Appropriateness of lead**

In addition to scoring actual degree of lead, an effort was made to estimate the appropriateness of lead. Using principles described by Robinson (1950) the following guide-lines were provided for the judges.

In addition to rating the actual degree of lead, the judge is to rate the appropriateness of lead. Several factors should be considered. One is the client's ability and background for understanding a point that is being made by the counselor. The counselor's remark should be relevant to the client's present thinking but should also represent the next step which he will understand immediately. Even more important in rating the appropriateness of lead is the factor of how much the client is willing to admit to himself. That is, if the counselor forces the client to face unpleasant facts about himself before he is ready to do so, the counselor is leading too much. The third point to be considered is leading too little. The counselor's remark may represent a point which the client has already passed in his thinking. Signs of client readiness for more lead are the asking of questions and the requesting of diagnosis or remedial help.

In addition to these principles, a description of situations requiring various amounts of lead was provided. This description
of situations as well as detailed instructions for ratings are given in Appendixes I and II.

**Scales and scoring for interviews.** In rating the appropriateness of lead for interviews the rating was made on the same scale and at the same time as the ratings for actual lead. Judges were instructed to rate the amount of lead that would have been optimal for that particular five minute segment of the interview.

For the testing of hypotheses a lead discrepancy score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) The number of dots separating the actual lead from the optimal ratings for each five minute segment were counted. This value, irrespective of direction, was considered to be a measure of the discrepancy between the actual lead used by the counselor and that rated as optimal by the judges. (2) Discrepancy scores for each week were summed for each counselor e.g. 2 clients x 3 five minute time periods. (3) This total was divided by the number of discrepancy scores summed, to yield a lead discrepancy score. Thus, each counselor received a lead discrepancy score for the first and fifth weeks of the practicum.

**Scales and scoring for tests.** Ratings of appropriateness of lead for test responses were made on identical but separate scales from those used to rate actual degree of lead. These ratings were made several days following the ratings for actual lead. This procedure was followed in view of the fact that excerpts presented the same stimulus to each counselor. It was thus unnecessary to make a separate rating of appropriateness of lead
(or optimal lead) for each counselor response rated. That is, within the limits of the scale's reliability, a judge's rating of optimal lead should remain the same for each excerpt independently of how many different counselor responses were rated for actual lead. For the testing of hypotheses an average test lead discrepancy score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) The rating of degree of lead for each counselor's response was compared with the rating of optimal lead for each interview excerpt and the number of dots separating the two were counted. This yielded a discrepancy score for each counselor response. (2) These discrepancy scores, irrespective of direction, were summed for each counselor. (3) This total was divided by the number of excerpts for which responses were secured. (4) As discrepancy scores were computed for both judges of each counselor, these two scores were averaged to yield an average test lead discrepancy score for each counselor. This score indicates how much a particular counselor differed from the lead judged optimal. The larger this score, the less optimal the counselor's responses to the test situations.

Core dimensions

Response to core, has been found to be significantly related to measures of interview outcome. Based on the work of Swearingen (1961), the following description was included in the manual for the judges:

Core. It is usually recognized that a client ordinarily attempts to express one central idea in his remarks. Even when the client says several things
in a remark, one idea or feeling is of primary importance. This main idea has been called the "core" of the client's speech, and the counselor usually attempts to respond to this core in the remarks he makes immediately following the client's speech. This response may be a simple restatement or clarification but a general lead, tentative analysis, interpretation or urging remark which deals with the main idea would be rated as a "core" response. In identifying a "core" response the main criterion to consider is whether the client will probably feel that the counselor is talking about what the client is primarily interested in.

Secondary. At times in the rapid exchange of remarks between a counselor and client the counselor may respond to an idea that is secondary to the problem as it is expressed by the client. Generally this will occur when one speech contains several problems.

New. Besides dealing with the core or secondary aspects of a client's speech, the counselor may deal with an entirely new idea or topic following a client's speech. This is particularly true when the counselor attends more to his own diagnostic process than to the client's remark.

Unclassifiable. A response which does not fall into one of the above categories is considered as unclassifiable. The most common type of response belonging to this category is the acceptance remark — mm hmm, yes, etc. On the basis of such responses it is not possible to determine core classification.

Two types of core measures were attempted in this study; core frequency and core quality. An explanation of each and a description of the scales follows.

Scales and scoring for interviews. For interviews the core dimension was dealt with in terms of satisfactoriness of core frequency. That is, compared with how often the counselor should have used core responses, judges were asked to indicate what
percentage of the time the counselor did, in fact, use them. For
the making of this rating of each five minute interview segment, the
following 50 point scale was provided.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the testing of hypotheses an average satisfactoriness
of core frequency was computed. The procedure was as follows:
(1) Satisfactoriness of core frequency ratings for each week were
summed for each counselor. (2) These totals were divided by the
number of interview segments rated for each counselor. This yielded
an average satisfactoriness of core frequency score for the first
and fifth weeks of his counseling in the practicum.

Scales and scoring for tests. For the scoring of test
responses a nominal scale was provided. On the scale C = Core,
S = Secondary, N = New, and U = Unclassifiable. Judges were in-
structed to classify each counselor response into one of these
categories.

An average satisfactoriness of core frequency score was
also computed for tests. However, for tests the score was derived
from separate classifications as to which type of response was
actually given and which type would have been optimal. Optimal
classifications were also made on the nominal scale described
above. On the basis of these two classifications (Actual Core
and Optimal Core) an average satisfactoriness of core frequency
score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) All responses in which actual and optimal classifications agreed were scored "X"; responses in which actual and optimal classifications were not in agreement were scored "0". (2) A percentage of agreement was computed by means of the following formula.

\[
\text{Percentage of Agreement} = \frac{\text{Sum of the "X's"}}{\text{Sum of the "X's"} + \text{Sum of the "0's"}} \times 100.
\]

(3) As percentage of agreement scores were computed for both judges of each counselor, these two percentages were averaged to yield an average satisfactoriness of core frequency score. It will be noted that the larger this score, the more the counselor's use of core responses approximates that judged as optimal.

**Quality of core responses**

The attempt to rate the quality of core responses had not previously been attempted. The following description for judges was prepared by the present author on the basis of general material which has been written about core responses and on the basis of his own observation of interviews and his rating of interview type-script responses.

It is acknowledged that counselor responses vary in core quality as well as in frequency. Thus, a counselor may give responses which indicate that he is, in general, talking about what the client wants to talk about; yet he may be making core responses of poor quality. An example follows.

**Cl.:** I don't like it here as well as I did in high school. The students are snobbish .... fraternities run the political organizations and discriminate against independent
students. And you ought to see the cheating that goes on during examinations. Course, students sort of have to cheat since you can't figure out quizzes questions. I think the instructors all have favorite students also.

Poor Quality Core

Co.- You don't like anybody — students or instructors.

Better Quality Core

Co.- At times you sort of get the feeling that the whole set-up is working against you.

It will be noted in the examples given that the poor quality core response is stated in terms which most people would find offensive to acknowledge about themselves. It is also stated in such a rigid manner that it invites disagreement. On the other hand, the other example is stated more tentatively and in terms that are more socially acceptable. The client may reject the statement without rejecting the counselor. Further, the statement is qualified in such a way that it represents a less extreme overgeneralization of what the client has said.

The rating scale used for interviews is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring for interviews.** Each five minute interview segment was rated on the above scale for core quality. On the basis of these ratings an average core quality score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) Core quality ratings for each week were summed for each counselor. (2) This total was divided by the total number of interview segments summed to yield a composite score of average core quality. Thus, each counselor received an average core quality score for the first and the fifth weeks.
A note on core quality for test responses. It was originally intended that an assessment of core quality would be made for both interviews and test responses. And, the original test manual and rating forms included scales for core quality. However, during the practice rating of counselor responses to test situations it was found that ratings for core quality were almost always identical to ratings for overall satisfactoriness (a dimension to be discussed later in this chapter). Following this observation it was decided that ratings for both core quality and overall satisfactoriness were unnecessary and subsequently the core quality scale was omitted from the rating forms. However, because of the close relationship of core quality and overall satisfactoriness, scores involving overall satisfactoriness may be interpreted as if they were scores for core quality. Further implications of this similarity between core quality and overall satisfactoriness are examined in chapter 4.

Content-feeling dimensions

Response to content versus feeling in interviews constitutes one of the oldest dimensions used in interview analysis and has been used widely as a meaningful and valid measure within interviews. Instructions for the judges were developed from the manual of Swearingen (1961) and are as follows:

One important issue in counseling is the orientation of the counselor to respond to content or feeling in the client's speech. A brief illustration is given below of the difference between responding to content and feeling. A client says,

Cl.- I really like art and I'm getting very good grades in my art courses .... but,
I don't know, I find I spend several hours a day in the gym swimming, or boxing, or playing handball ....... I know I put more time and energy into those things than art.

A counselor responding primarily to feeling will reply,

Co.- You are rather apologetic about spending so much time away from school work.

While a counselor responding to content will reply,

Co.- In spite of your interest in art, you are spending a lot of time in sports.

While responses to feeling may include the term "feel" in the counselor's remark, this is not always the case. The word "feel" is sometimes used as a synonym for "think" or "be of the opinion of," and such usage should be distinguished from an implied emotional reference.

Scales and scoring for interviews. For the content-feeling dimension an estimated ratio was made on the following fifty point rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C 100%</th>
<th>C 75%</th>
<th>C 50%</th>
<th>F 75%</th>
<th>F 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this scale C 100% indicates that all core and secondary responses were responses to content; F 100% indicates that all core and secondary responses were responses to feeling. Other ratios of content and feeling responses are indicated at intermediate points. Judges were instructed to make a separate rating for each five minute segment of the interview. In scoring, dots were counted from left to right. Thus, if 75% content responses had been used and a line had been drawn through the thirteenth dot from the left.
a score of 13 would have been recorded. Because of this procedure the content-feeling ratings may be thought of as simply feeling ratios. That is, the bigger the score the more feeling responses were given and the less content responses were given. The procedure for scoring was as follows: (1) Content-feeling ratio ratings for each week were summed for each counselor. (2) This total was divided by the number of ratings summed to yield an average feeling percentage.

Scales and scoring for tests. For the classification of counselor responses to tests on the content-feeling dimension the following scale was provided: C = Content, and F = Feeling. Judges were instructed to classify each core and secondary response into one of these categories. Detailed instructions to the judges for the making of classifications are given in Appendix I.

For purposes of prediction, an average feeling percentage was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) All the content and all the feeling responses given by each counselor were summed and a C-F ratio was computed. The formula was: $C-F \text{ ratio} = \frac{\text{Sum of feeling responses}}{\text{Sum of feeling responses} + \text{Sum of content responses}}$.

This value was converted into a percentage by multiplying it by 100. (2) Because there were two judges, there were two separate feeling percentages for each counselor. Thus, the two feeling percentages were summed and divided by two to yield an average feeling percentage for each counselor.
Appropriateness of content or feeling responses

Ratings were also made as to the appropriateness of content or feeling responses. The instructions to the judges were as follows:

Relative to the feeling-content dimension, one question centers around the counselor's tendency to give one type of response or the other. Another question has to do with the appropriateness of these two types of responses. In general, research would suggest the following guidelines:

(1) The response to feeling is to be preferred when the client is not able to identify his feelings, lacks clarity in understanding his interpersonal relationships, or lacks a consistent or healthy concept of himself.

(2) The response to content is preferred when the client seeks information of an objective sort, when the goal is the improvement of skills and techniques and when the goal of counseling is focused on relatively rapid behavioral change. Tutoring in study-skills would be one example of counseling directed toward these types of problems.

Scoring of interviews. Rating for content-feeling appropriateness followed the same general procedure described for degree of lead. Judges were instructed to indicate the ratio of content-feeling responses which would have been optimal for each five minute segment. This optimal ratio was indicated on the same scale and at the same time as actual ratio.

For the testing of hypotheses an average feeling discrepancy score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) The number of dots separating the actual ratio rating from the optimal rating for each five minute segment were counted. This value was considered to be a measure of the discrepancy between the feeling ratio actually
used by the counselor and that rated as optimal by the judges. (2) These discrepancy scores for each week were summed for each counselor. (3) This total was divided by the number of discrepancy scores summed to yield an average feeling discrepancy score. Thus, each counselor received an average feeling discrepancy score for the first and fifth weeks of the practicum.

**Scoring of excerpts.** Appropriateness of content-feeling responses was measured in the same manner described previously for core appropriateness. At the same time as the classifications of optimal core dimensions judges also made classifications as to whether content or feeling responses would have been preferred to each excerpt situation. Only excerpt situations in which core and secondary responses had previously been designated as optimal were classified as to the preferability of content or feeling responses. In the case of disagreements in which type of response would have been optimal, the two judges discussed these differences until a unanimous agreement was reached.

For purposes of prediction, an average feeling satisfactoriness score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) Instances in which a counselor gave a core or secondary response when the judges indicated that a core or secondary response would have been optimal were marked for further analysis on the content-feeling appropriateness dimension. Other responses were not included in the study of this dimension. (2) Of these responses selected for analysis, instances in which the type of counselor response agreed with the type chosen as
optimal by the judges was marked "I"; those in which disagreement in
the content-feeling classification were noted, were marked "0". (3)
The ratio of agreement was computed by the following formula:
Agreement ratio = \[ \frac{\text{Sum of the "I"s}}{\text{Sum of the "I"s"} + \text{Sum of the "0"s"}} \]. (4) This
value was converted into a percentage by multiplying it times 100.
This yields a percentage agreement score. (5) As percentage agreement
scores were computed for both judges of each counselor, these two per-
centage of agreement scores were averaged to yield an average feeling
satisfactoriness score for each counselor. It will be obvious that
the larger the value of the average feeling satisfactoriness score, the more appropriate the feeling ratio used by the counselor will be.

Ratings of overall satisfactoriness

In addition to ratings of the various single dimensions pre-
viously described, ratings of overall satisfactoriness were made both
for test responses and for interviews. As will be seen, the overall
ratings for test responses are made on somewhat different standards
than those for interviews and thus the ratings will not bear the ob-
vious comparability as do the dimensions previously described. How-
ever, as will be seen, it should be that the two are related.

Outcomes of interviews. As described in chapter two, two
measures of immediate outcomes have been widely used and have given
evidence of being the most reliable of various measures of immediate
outcomes. These are, working relationship and client assumption of
responsibility. These two measures of immediate outcome served as the
primary measure of counselor effectiveness. They were rated separately, although the two scores were combined to yield a single criterion score for each interview.

Instructions to the judges for working relationship were prepared from the manual of Swearingen (1961) and are as follows:

A good working relationship between the counselor and client involves the presence of mutual respect and warmth, of respectful consideration for each other's ideas and suggestions, and of client willingness to explore problems. It also involves the absence of indications of resistance on the part of the client.

A poor working relationship in the client, then, is the inverse of the above. It is characterized by the absence in the client of positive signs of warmth, respect, and willingness to explore problems, and by numerous and/or severe symptoms of resistance on his part. These symptoms may consist of a belligerent rejection of the counselor's point of view, unwillingness as evidenced by frequent silences or monosyllabic responses or polite speech which remains superficial and unenthusiastic, attempts to close the interview, or other signs of obvious lack of cooperation.

In judging poor working relationship, it is necessary to consider both the severity and the frequency of resistance. Outright rejection of the counselor may be indicative of strong resistance; however, it should also be noted that a client may not be evidencing resistance to the counselor but may be confronted with a problem which it is difficult for him to face or verbalize. Silence or monosyllabic responses at one point may not be serious, but if present throughout an entire interview may indicate fairly strong resistance. Research evidence indicates that continued client apathy may be as indicative of a poor working relationship as is active resistance.

The fact that a client modifies or questions a counselor idea does not necessarily indicate a poor working relationship; it is sometimes a sign of a good working relationship that a client feels free to respond frankly. It must be judged from the client's manner whether he seems to be showing resistance to the counselor himself corresponding to the ideas. Also notice that a client response of "Mm hm" is not indicative one way or another; other factors must be
considered in making the rating.

The scale of working relationship is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Md</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Client interest in assuming responsibility.** Following Swearingen (1961) the judges were given the following instructions:

The progress of the interview is determined by the degree to which the participants assume responsibility for initiating or continuing the various events which occur during an interview. The degree of responsibility which a participant takes for the progress of the interview is a function of how much he wants to take and of what the other participant forces on him or permits him to take. A dominating counselor may have a client who appears satisfied to have him take complete charge of the interview, or he may have a client who tries himself to take a great deal of responsibility. In a like manner, a counselor who does not want to direct the interview may have one who, like himself, does not. We have here a problem of differentiating between the counselor technique and the client behavior.

The judge is asked to rate the amount of responsibility which the client appears willing to take. The counselor influences by his techniques the amount of responsibility that the client actually assumes, but discounting counselor techniques, how much responsibility does the client appear to want to take? In brief, this is a measure of client interest in initiating behavior.

The scale of client interest in assuming responsibility is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client desires</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Md</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Client desires to assume a great deal of responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no responsibility or even rejects it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below.
As mentioned previously, the two ratings for working relationship and client interest in assuming responsibility were pooled in order to yield a composite estimate of interview outcomes.

Ratings of immediate outcome were not rated for each five minute segment of the interview, but rather for the total 15 minute segment heard.

**Scoring of interviews.** For each of these scales the judges were asked to compare the given dimension with their conception of the average practicum interview. Detailed instructions to the judges are given in Appendix II.

On the basis of ratings for working relationship and client interest in assuming responsibility a **composite overall satisfactoriness score** was computed. The procedure was as follows. (1) An overall satisfactoriness score was computed for each interview by summing the responsibility and relationship scores and dividing by two. (2) For each counselor's two interviews held for each week in the study, an **average overall satisfactoriness score** was computed by averaging the two overall satisfactoriness scores.

**Overall satisfactoriness of test responses.** In addition to rating each excerpt response for the dimensions previously described, ratings were also made for overall satisfactoriness. By the use of this rating it was hoped that any source of qualitative variance in the responses would be covered, such that it would be possible to estimate how much of judged overall satisfactoriness the various separate dimension accounted for. In addition, it would seem logical to
suppose that there would be a stronger relationship between overall satisfactoriness scores and scores for interview outcomes than between the satisfactoriness measures for the separate excerpt dimensions and interview outcomes. It may be, however, that the overall rating, if considerably less reliable than the single dimensions, may lack the superior power of predictability.

Instructions to the judges follow:

It is assumed that the dimensions previously described will provide some measure of the overall adequacy of the counselor's response. However, it is acknowledged that the importance of these dimensions for effective counseling will vary from one situation to another. It is further acknowledged that other factors not previously described in this manual will enter into judgments of counselor competence. Some factors might be, acceptance attitude conveyed by the counselor, sensitivity to client feelings, implied division of responsibility in the remark, etc. Undoubtedly each judge will have his own implicit or explicit list of such standards and it would be unrealistic to attempt any complete list. However, in order that interjudge agreement may be maximized, it is assumed that the judges share a common familiarity with the "communications approach" to counseling.

The scale of overall satisfactoriness is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring of tests. Each counselor response to the excerpts was rated for overall satisfactoriness. Judges were instructed to compare the response with their conception of the average practicum student's response in terms of overall satisfactoriness. Detailed instructions
for judges are given in Appendix I. The scale is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counselor

For purposes of prediction an average overall satisfactoriness score was computed. The procedure was as follows: (1) The scores for each counselor were summed and divided by the number of responses rated. As there were two judges, each counselor had two such scores. (2) These two counselor scores were averaged to yield an average overall satisfactoriness score for each counselor.

A note on the independence of measures

One issue relative to the use of ratings of interview outcome and other dimensions bearing a "goodness-badness" connotation has to do with "halo" effect. In other words, it may be argued that raters respond to interview material in terms of a favorable or unfavorable reaction and that this reaction in turn is reflected in the ratings regardless of the definitions of specific variables being rated. That ratings of dimensions with evaluative connotations tend to correlate positively is rather well known. That this phenomenon should be labeled as "halo" and be considered a pitfall to be avoided, is another. It may also be argued that good things in the interview tend to occur together (relaxed atmosphere, positive regard for the client, genuine expression of feeling, client initiative, etc.) and that this fact gives evidence of a general factor of counselor competence (or divine providence). Evidence could probably be marshalled to support either
contention. On the basis of the data collected for the present study it cannot be determined with any precision whether the intercorrelations are a function of "bad" halo effect, or "good" general counselor competence. In other words, we don't know for sure whether the intercorrelations are a function of overlapping definitions, favorable-unfavorable rater bias, or generality of counselor effectiveness. In general, if correlations between measures were unusually high one would probably suspicion that they were measuring the same thing; if they were of moderate size one might be more inclined to attribute the overlap to general counselor competence. It will be obvious, however, that this constitutes no exact guide in settling the problem.

In the present study a number of procedures have been followed in order to minimize halo. Concerning the dimensions, it appeared that those chosen were conceptually independent and that each was defined as specifically as possible. To minimize halo on the criteria of immediate outcomes, two separate measures were utilized. For rating tests, responses to each test situation were put in random order and typed on a separate sheet. Responses were typed so that incidental cues such as handwriting style and ink color would not identify a counselor's responses from one test situation to the next. And, to decrease the likelihood that actual ratings would influence the making of optimal ratings, the latter were made the day after actual ratings had been completed. In the rating of interviews, dimensions for each five minute segment was rated. Thus, visual cues from previous ratings were avoided in the rating of subsequent segments.
Training of the judges for tests

For training the two judges in the rating of tests, two procedures were followed — one for optimal ratings and one for actual ratings of the various test dimensions. Manuals used in the training of judges are included in Appendix I.

For the training of judges in the making of actual ratings, responses obtained in the previously described pilot study were utilized. Responses were thus available for 12 of the 18 interview excerpts used in the present investigation. In the training, counselors’ responses were rated for the various dimensions, disagreements were discussed and more responses were rated. Training was continued until satisfactory reliability was evidenced.

Training in the making of optimal ratings followed training in the making of actual ratings for the various test dimensions. In the training of judges, the manual was read, principles involved in the making of optimal ratings were discussed, and practice ratings on additional interview excerpts were made. This training was continued until satisfactory reliability seemed to have been achieved.

Interjudge reliabilities for test ratings

Following the training of the judges, the data were scored and the ratings assigned by judge I were correlated with those assigned by judge II. Reliabilities for the various test dimensions are presented in Table 1. It is to be noted that these reliabilities are computed on a 100% sample in that scores assigned by both of the judges to all of the counselors on all of the dimensions were utilized. The
Table 1
Test Reliabilities
(N = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Dimensions</th>
<th>Uncorrected Reliabilities</th>
<th>Corrected Reliabilities (S-B Formula)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>.825**</td>
<td>.904**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-Discrepancy</td>
<td>.667**</td>
<td>.800**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Percentage</td>
<td>.436*</td>
<td>.607**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactoriness of Core Frequency</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.542**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Percentage</td>
<td>.720**</td>
<td>.837**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>.706**</td>
<td>.828**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
Spearman-Brown prophecy formula has been applied to take into account the combining of the ratings of two judges. These corrected reliabilities are given in the right hand column of Table 1.

It may be seen from Table 1 that corrected reliabilities for all of the dimensions are significant at the .01 level with the exception of feeling satisfactoriness. In fact, most correlations are considerably above the value \( r = .542 \) needed for significance at the .01 level. A discussion of these reliabilities for each of the dimensions follows.

**Lead.** The corrected interjudge reliability of .904 is the highest of any computed for the test dimensions. This value is consistent with previous reports of lead reliability.

**Lead-discrepancy.** The corrected reliability of .800 proved to be relatively high considering the fact that in its computation a double source of judgemental variance was involved — actual and optimal ratings. Of the discrepancy type scores computed for this investigation, the test lead-discrepancy dimension was by far the highest. The others did not reach significance at the .05 level.

**Core percentage.** The corrected reliability of .607 is somewhat lower than might have been expected on the basis of other studies. However, the design of the present study necessitated somewhat different computational procedures than those employed in former investigations. Thus, a direct comparison is somewhat difficult. Others (Elton, 1951, Wrenn, 1959, and Swearingen, 1961), calculated the percentage of the time judges agreed on item classifications into core and non-core dimensions. In the present study, responses classified
as core were summed for each counselor and this was converted into a percentage of core responses. As there were two judges, two percentages were computed for each counselor. These percentages were then correlated in computing reliabilities. This procedure was considered to be preferable since core percentages served as the basis of hypothesis testing.

Satisfactoriness of core frequency. It will be recalled that satisfactoriness of core frequency is a discrepancy type score and is based on the percentage of the time the counselor gave core responses when judges considered that type of response to be most appropriate. Since a common judgement served as the basis of the optimal classification, only the classifications of actual responses contained interjudge variance. The corrected reliability of .542 is somewhat lower than core percentage even though actual core classification is the only source of interjudge variance for this score. This may be accounted for by the fact that satisfactoriness of core frequency reflects the agreement of judges in making core-noncore classifications of each counselor response, whereas the core percentage scores were based only on the percentages of responses assigned to core-noncore classifications by each judge for each counselor. For this latter procedure it would be possible, though unlikely, that counselors would demonstrate almost no agreement in the classification of individual responses and still assign a similar proportion of core classifications to the same counselor.
Feeling percentage. The corrected interjudge reliability of .837 appears to be rather satisfactory even though the different computational procedure used here makes a comparison with previously reported reliabilities difficult. Judges noted that classifications were complicated by the frequent use of the term "feel" in contexts where either "feel" or "think" were possible interpretations.

Feeling satisfactoriness. Feeling satisfactoriness was computed in a manner similar to satisfactoriness of core frequency. These scores were computed as a percentage of the instances in which the counselors' content-feeling usage agreed with that classified as optimal by the judges. A common judgement as to the type of response which would have been optimal was used as a standard against which to compare ratings of actual content-feeling usage. As indicated on Table 1, the corrected reliability of .333 is quite low and does not reach significance at the .05 level. Apparently the fact that these scores were sensitive to item agreement reduced reliability. Also, in making ratings of optimal classification judges noted that for several test situations the response to feeling versus content was probably not important and this may have lowered reliabilities.

Overall satisfactoriness. The corrected reliability of .826 was considered to be rather impressive considering the rather global nature of the concept and considering the fact that such a dimension had not been included in previous studies. Two factors seem to have made this reliability possible. One was the availability of data from a pilot study for purposes of training. This pilot study included the responses of 8 counselors to 12 of the same test situations used in
the present study. The availability of this material for training purposes made possible the formation of an "implicit" manual for each of the 12 test situations. The good reliability was also achieved only after a rather extensive amount of training was devoted to practice on this dimension.

Although the attempt was made to describe some of the factors to be considered in making judgements of overall satisfactoriness, it is to be acknowledged that the two judges shared a common background of training and experience in the counseling and clinical areas at the Ohio State University. This similar training and experience may also have facilitated the achievement of common judgements over and above factors described in the judges manual.

Training of judges for interviews

Following the reading and discussion of the manual (Appendix II) five minute segments of recorded interviews obtained from the pilot study were heard, and actual and optimal ratings were made. For purposes of training, ratings of the two immediate criteria were made for each five minute segment, rather than for 15 minute segments as was done in the computation of interjudge reliabilities. Again, differences in ratings were discussed and more segments were rated until satisfactory reliability was evidenced.

It is to be noted that the second judge was utilized only for the purposes of testing interview reliabilities. In other words, the interjudge reliabilities for interviews represent the degree to which the system of scoring used by judge I was communicable to judge II.
Table 2

Reliabilities of Interview Ratings for Two Judges
25% Sample

(N = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Dimensions</th>
<th>Reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>.753**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-Di screpancy</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactoriness of Core Frequency</td>
<td>.487*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Quality</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Percentage</td>
<td>.738**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-Di screpancy</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Outcomes</td>
<td>.553**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.
For this purpose a 25% sample of the interviews (18) were rated by the second judge. However, these scores assigned by the second judge were not utilized in the testing of major hypotheses. It would seem reasonable to expect that intrajudge reliabilities would be considerably higher than the reliabilities reported here between judge I and judge II.

Reliabilities of interview ratings

**Lead.** The lead reliability of .753 is significant at the .01 level and is the highest value obtained for any of the dimensions here used in interview analysis. This finding is consistent with reliabilities reported in previous research, even though the procedure of rating five minute interview segments had not been previously followed.

**Lead-discrepancy.** Ratings for lead discrepancy were obviously unreliable (r = .027). As previously noted for discrepancy type scores, the double source of unreliability — ratings for actual and optimal lead — hindered the attainment of interjudge agreement.

**Satisfactoriness of core frequency.** Prior to the present study the core frequency dimension had been used in a remark by remark type of analysis only. Here it was rated on a global basis as well as in terms of satisfactoriness. Such an approach is understandably less exact and this would seem to account for the relatively low reliability of .487. This correlation is significant, however, at the .05 level. It was the impression of the writer that this dimension tended to be more difficult than some to keep in mind during the interview listening. Because of this difficulty, this writer kept a running
tabulation of the number of times the counselor gave core responses when he should have given them and of the times he missed giving core responses when they would have been appropriate. The other judge did not follow this procedure and this also may have lowered reliabilities somewhat.

Core quality. Since core quality is a dimension original with the present study there is no norm against which interjudge reliabilities reported here may be compared. The reliability of .387 does not quite reach significance at the .05 level. As with satisfactoriness of core frequency, this dimension also seemed to be somewhat difficult to keep in mind when the recordings were being rated.

Feeling percentage. The feeling percentage reliability of .738 is relatively quite high and is significant at the .01 level. In contrast to most of the other ratings for interview dimensions, the feeling percentage reliability is slightly higher for interviews than for the ratings of tests. Although the difference is slight, it is in the direction reported by Reid and Snyder (1947) in their study of feeling identifications. These authors found the identification of feelings to be easier with recordings than with typescripts.

Feeling discrepancy. The interjudge reliability of .223 is quite low and does not reach significance at the .05 level. Again, a double source of variance -- from actual and optimal ratings -- was involved. Another difficulty involved situations where little feeling was expressed by the client. On the one hand there was little feeling to which the counselor could have responded. On the other hand, had the counselor been more relaxed, accepting, etc., it often
seemed likely that the client would have expressed more feelings. Because of this situation, optimal ratings were complicated. Probably a more thorough discussion of this problem during the training of judges would have improved reliabilities.

**Composite outcomes.** The composite outcomes reliability of .553, based on the average ratings of working relationship and client interest in assuming responsibility, is significant at the .01 level but it is somewhat lower than might have been expected. Previous studies of the two separate dimensions report reliabilities from .78 to .91. It was the impression of the judges that counselors included in the present study varied less in overall effectiveness than counselors in the pilot study. It will be recalled that interviews of this latter group of counselors were used by the judges for purposes of training. This more restricted variability of counselor effectiveness may account for the somewhat lower reliabilities.

**Summary and conclusions concerning test and interview reliabilities**

In general, interjudge reliabilities for the basic dimensions of lead, care, feeling, and immediate outcomes were close to those reported in previous studies. In addition it was possible to get rather good reliability for ratings of overall satisfactoriness for the test responses. On the other hand, discrepancy type scores computed from the differences between actual and optimal ratings of a given dimension had unsatisfactory reliability. Although it is well known that ratings involving implications of quality or "goodness" are more difficult to make with reliability than are ratings based on more
quantitative concepts, data in the present study would indicate that
the difficulty of making reliable qualitative ratings is in part a
function of the computational method. Discrepancy scores involve a
double source of variance — both from actual and optimal ratings —
and this seems to lower reliabilities. Because of this, simple ratings
of satisfactoriness for the different dimensions appear to be superior
to discrepancy type scores. Overall satisfactoriness ratings of test
responses, for example, were made with rather good reliability even
though the concept was the most global and least clearly defined of
the dimensions used. It thus seems reasonable to assume that reliabil-
ities could have been improved if single ratings of satisfactoriness
had been used in place of discrepancy scores.

Formal Hypotheses

As previously described, the present study was designed to in-
vestigate the predictability of practicum performance by means of coun-
selor responses to situations presented by interview excerpts. In order
to test the predictability of counselor performance, four hypotheses
were formulated. These hypotheses, stated as predictions were pre-
viously listed (Chapter 1, p. 10). For purposes of testing for statis-
tical significance these hypotheses are given below in their null form.
It will be noted that the first two hypotheses have to do with the pre-
diction of counselor style; the last two hypotheses have to do with the
prediction of counselor effectiveness.

1. There will be no significant relationships between scores of
counselor style for test dimensions and scores for comparable dimensions
obtained from interviews held during the first week of the practicum.
2. There will be no significant relationships between scores of counselor style for test dimensions and scores for comparable dimensions obtained from interviews held during the fifth week of the practicum.

3. There will be no significant relationships between any of the scores for test dimensions and criteria scores for interviews held during the first week of the practicum.

4. There will be no significant relationships between any of the scores for test dimensions and criteria scores for interviews held during the fifth week of the practicum.

For the testing of hypotheses, correlation coefficients will be computed and tested for significance. Correlations reaching the .05 level will be considered statistically significant.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

In the present study an investigation was made of the predictability of counselor style and effectiveness by means of responses given to excerpts taken from interview typescripts. For the testing of this predictability of counselor style and effectiveness, four hypotheses were stated. In the following chapter an examination will be given to the testing of these hypotheses and possible implications of the findings will be discussed. The outline will be as follows: (1) The question of "halo" — intercorrelations of dimensions within tests and within interviews, (2) the prediction of counselor style, (3) the prediction of counselor effectiveness, (4) secondary findings, and (5) suggestions for future research.

Intercorrelations of dimensions within tests and within interviews

In the preceding chapter the issue was raised concerning the independence of various dimensions utilized in the present study. There it was acknowledged that some "halo" or overlap seems to be unavoidable for most of the dimensions which have been used in communications research. In fact, moderately strong intercorrelations among dimensions would be expected if the concept of general counselor competence has construct validity. However, if correlations are too
high, one suspects that the scores for the various dimensions are simply different names for the same source of variance. Past studies utilizing dimensions in common with the present study have indicated that considerable overlap is to be seen. However, in general, overlap has not been so great as to suggest that a single source of variance is involved. An examination of the intercorrelations revealed by the present study follows.

Intercorrelations for test dimensions. It may be seen from Table 3 that a number of the test dimensions are significantly related. Among basic measures of counselor style (lead, core percentage, and feeling percentage) the lead-core correlation of .440 is statistically significant. For style appropriateness measures (lead-discrepancy, satisfactoriness of core frequency, and feeling satisfactoriness) only the lead-satisfactoriness of core frequency value of .482 reaches statistical significance. However, it may be seen that appropriateness correlations tend to be higher than those for the basic style dimensions. The correlations of the basic dimensions with their appropriateness counterparts (lead-lead discrepancy, etc.) give evidence of a qualitative or appropriateness factor in the basic dimensions themselves even though these basic dimensions were originally formulated to be strictly empirical in nature. Two of these three correlations are significant and the third approaches significance.

The correlations between various test style measures and the test measure of counselor effectiveness (overall satisfactoriness) are all statistically significant, with the exception of the correlations
for core dimensions. As might be expected, style appropriateness measures were the most strongly related to that of overall satisfactoriness. This seems reasonable since the overall satisfactoriness measure represents a composite of the counselor's skill in using various techniques (response to core, correct amount of lead, etc.) appropriately.

By way of summary, it is seen that counselor style measures have some overlap but that this overlap is not unusually high. Thus, some evidence is presented for the independence of style measures. The effectiveness measure of overall satisfactoriness is more similar to style appropriateness measures than to the basic style measures. This was expected since the overall satisfactoriness measure was intended as a composite of appropriate counselor use of various techniques.

**Intercorrelations for interview dimensions.** As is indicated on Tables 4 and 5, some overlap is to be seen for interview measures of counselor style. Lead correlates -.556 with feeling percentage for the fifth week of counseling and -.367 for the first week. The former value is significant at the .01 level. Of the six correlations for interview style appropriateness for the first and fifth weeks, two are significant — lead discrepancy-satisfactoriness of core frequency for the fifth week ($r = -.618$) and lead discrepancy-feeling discrepancy for the fifth week ($r = .520$). As was seen for test intercorrelations, some overlap is evidenced, but the intercorrelations are not extremely large.
Table 3

Intercorrelations of Test Dimensions
(N = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lead-D</th>
<th>Core%</th>
<th>Sat. Core Freq.</th>
<th>Feeling%</th>
<th>Feeling Sat.</th>
<th>Overall Sat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.440*</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>-.336</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.636**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-D</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>-.482*</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.387</td>
<td>-.675**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core%</td>
<td></td>
<td>.888**</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. Core Freq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.444*</td>
<td>.466*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.521*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lead-D</th>
<th>Sat. Core Freq.</th>
<th>Core Quality</th>
<th>Feeling%</th>
<th>Feeling-D</th>
<th>Composite Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>.446*</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-D</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>-.682**</td>
<td>-.498**</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>-.643**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. Core Freq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td>.439*</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>.510*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.641**</td>
<td>-.586**</td>
<td>.780**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.678**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level.
** Significant at the .01 level.
Table 5
Intercorrelations of Interview Dimensions - Week 5
(N = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lead-D</th>
<th>Sat. Core Freq.</th>
<th>Core Quality</th>
<th>Feeling%</th>
<th>Feeling-D</th>
<th>Composite Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>-.473*</td>
<td>-.556**</td>
<td>.514*</td>
<td>-.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-D</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.618**</td>
<td>-.628**</td>
<td>-.419*</td>
<td>.520*</td>
<td>-.776**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. Core Freq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.449*</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.597**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level.
** Significant at the .01 level.
Significant intercorrelations are also to be noted for interview style and interview effectiveness scores. For the basic style measure of leading, correlations with the two effectiveness measures (core quality and composite outcomes) for both time periods range from -.289 to -.473. Intercorrelations of feeling percentage and measures of interview effectiveness range from .539 to .765. Measures of appropriate style use (lead discrepancy, satisfactoriness of core frequency, and feeling discrepancy) are even more highly related to the interview effectiveness scores. Intercorrelations range from .269 to .846.

In general, patterns of intercorrelations for interview dimensions are similar to those seen for test intercorrelations. Some overlap is evidenced for the style dimensions, although correlations are not extremely high. As might be expected, measures of appropriate style use are more closely related to interview effectiveness measures than are scores for basic counselor style.

**Test of hypothesis 1 - the prediction of counselor style**

There will be no significant relationships between scores of counselor style for test dimensions and scores for comparable dimensions obtained from interviews held during the first week of the practicum.

Hypothesis 1 was formulated in order to test the predictability of counselor style during the first week of the counseling practicum. It may be seen from Table 6 that the null hypothesis may be rejected for only two of the six dimensions — both are measures of core responses. The counselor style measures of core percentage and
satisfactoriness of core frequency for test responses predict satisfactoriness of core frequency in interviews with correlations of .506 and .489 respectively. Both correlations are significant beyond the .05 level. Thus, of the three general dimensions of counselor style — lead, core and content-feeling — only core responses were found to be predictable from excerpt responses to actual counseling during the first week of the practicum.

In interpreting the test core percentage-interview satisfactoriness of core frequency correlation it should be kept in mind that test and interview scores, though similar, involve some conceptual differences. Test scores are based simply upon the use of core or non-core responses to the 18 stimulus situations presented. Interview scores, on the other hand, are based on ratings of the percentage of the time the counselor was using core responses in all situations when he should have been using them. Thus, interview scores carry an implication of appropriate use, whereas the test scores are based on numerical frequency of use. In spite of the differing implications of core scores in tests and interviews, it would seem that these differences in measurement approaches still give related results. This may be explained by the fact that core responses are generally considered to be the preferable type of response, especially for beginning counselors. In making their optimal classifications, judges in the present study classified only one excerpt situation of the 18 as requiring a non-core response. Thus, for the present judges at least, core responses and optimal responses are nearly identical. This fact is further
## Table 6

Correlations between test dimensions of style and comparable interview dimensions for the first and fifth weeks in the counseling practicum. (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Dimensions</th>
<th>Interview Dimensions</th>
<th>Correlations for Week 1</th>
<th>Correlations for Week 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-Discrepancy</td>
<td>Lead-Discrepancy</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Percentage</td>
<td>Satisfactoriness of Core Frequency</td>
<td>.506*</td>
<td>-.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactoriness of Core Frequency</td>
<td>Satisfactoriness of Core Frequency</td>
<td>.489*</td>
<td>-.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Percentage</td>
<td>Feeling Percentage</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>-.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling- Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>Feeling-Discrepancy</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at or beyond .05 level.
underlined by the high correlation ($r = .89$) between scores for core percentage and scores for satisfactoriness of core frequency in test responses (Table 3).

In the correlations between satisfactoriness of core frequency scores for tests and interviews, conceptual differences are minimized. Both sets of scores are defined in a nearly identical manner. However, some differences are to be noted in the computational procedures involved. For tests, a count was made of the number of times the counselor used a core response when judges thought he should have used one and this count was converted into a percentage agreement. For interviews, the percentage of the time the counselor used core responses when he should have used them was estimated on a global basis for each five minute segment of the interview rated. So, although different rating and computational procedures were involved, conceptually the two sets of scores are quite comparable. In any case, the data supports the prediction that those who use core responses more frequently to excerpt situations will also tend to use them more frequently in actual interviewing during the first week of the counseling practicum.

It is puzzling why interview core responses are predictable from the test scores and why the other interview dimensions are not. It does not seem to be a function of the superior reliability in the rating of core dimensions. In fact, core reliabilities are consistently lower than those for lead or feeling, e.g. satisfactoriness of core frequency reliability is .542 for tests and .487 for interviews; lead reliability, on the other hand, is .904 for tests and .753 for interviews.
The situation is further confused by the fact that scores for actual leading on the test provide rather impressive prediction of initial interview effectiveness (cf. Table 8). There is then a significant relationship between lead scores for tests and the effectiveness of early interviews; the problem is that degree of lead itself is not consistent from test responses to interview behavior. The data would seem to suggest that lead scores for tests have a different meaning from lead scores for interviews. One possibility is that the test contains many situations calling for counselor sensitivity to leading less — the less lead the more sensitivity. In any case it may be noted in Tables 3 and 4 that lead scores for tests are much more strongly related to test overall satisfactoriness scores than lead scores in interview to interview criteria. Test lead correlates -.64 with test overall satisfactoriness; interview lead, however, correlates only -.36 with interview core quality and -.29 with interview composite outcomes. Thus, low lead apparently indicates greater counselor competence on the test than low lead indicates competence in interviews. This is not surprising, especially for initial interviews, where a considerable amount of lead in information gathering and asking for elaboration of the problem may be appropriate. In contrast, strong lead for most of the test situations would be quite inappropriate and would seem to indicate counselor insensitivity. Thus, the assumption that strong leading on this particular test is indicative of counselor insensitivity is one possibility for explaining these unexpected findings.
Clues concerning the failure of test feeling responses to predict interview feeling scores are also offered by the data on Tables 3, 4, and 5. From these tables of intercorrelations it may be seen that feeling percentage and feeling satisfactoriness scores on tests correlate with criteria scores on tests .466 and .386 respectively. In contrast, correlations between feeling percentage and interview criteria are .641 and .678. Correlations of feeling discrepancy scores and interview criteria are -.586 and -.780. Thus, feeling responses in first week interviews seem to be more indicative of counselor effectiveness than feeling responses on tests are indicative of counselor effectiveness on tests. In other words, the test situations seemed to be such that the use of feeling responses rather than content responses was relatively less important than it was for first week interviews. The relative unimportance of feeling responses on tests was also noted in the pilot study. Additional test situations were added with the hope of giving more weight to feeling responses, but the data here indicate that the effort was only partially successful. Thus, the tendency to give feeling responses may be a function of counselor competence and the counseling situation. Only when the situation has a "pull" for feeling responses to be given, might it be expected that feeling responses would be predictable from tests to interviews.
Test of hypothesis 2 - the prediction of counselor style

There will be no significant relationships between scores of counselor style for test dimensions and scores for comparable dimensions obtained from interviews held during the fifth week of the practicum.

Hypothesis 2 was formulated in order to test the predictability of counselor style after experience in the practicum would have had a chance to affect that style. It may be seen from Table 6 that significance at the .05 level is not reached for any of the dimensions of counselor style and consequently the null hypothesis may not be rejected.

A partial explanation of the failure to predict counselor style later in the practicum is made possible by the data in Table 7. It will be seen that correlations for the various measures of counselor style between practicum counseling the first week and the fifth week are very low and none reach the .05 level of significance. Thus, one factor in the lack of success in predicting counselor style would seem to be the absence of stable characteristics of counselor style across interviews. Further elaboration of this problem is offered by McCormick's study (1951) and is described in connection with Hypothesis 4.

There are, of course, other possibilities. Counselors frequently overreact to the suggestions of supervisors. Thus, a counselor who has been leading a great deal may dramatically alter his pace and use mostly acceptance remarks. In sum, there are many possible explanations for the lack of predictability in counselor style later in the practicum. However, the low correlations for measures of style between the first and fifth weeks offer clues of an empirical nature.
Table 7

The Consistency of Interview Measures of Style.
Correlations of Interview Dimensions
for Week 1 and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Lead- Discrepancy</th>
<th>Satisfactoriness of Core Frequency</th>
<th>Feeling Percentage</th>
<th>Feeling- Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: None of the above correlations is significant at the .05 level.

Test of hypothesis 3 - the prediction of counselor effectiveness

There will be no significant relationships between any of the scores for test dimensions and criteria scores for interviews held during the first week of the practicum.

It will be recalled that Hypotheses 3 and 4 were formulated to test the predictability of counselor effectiveness by the analysis of test responses. Because counselor effectiveness was the goal of the prediction, all of the test dimensions were correlated with the two interview criteria measures. These correlations are given in Table 8.

It may be noted that the null hypothesis may be rejected for four of the 14 correlations — degree of lead and interview core quality, degree of lead and interview composite outcomes, feeling percentage and interview core quality, and overall satisfactoriness and interview core quality. The correlation of overall satisfactoriness
of test responses and interview composite outcomes \( r = .389 \) approaches significance at the .05 level (is significant at the .06 level) and may be considered a trend.

Originally only one overall criterion score was planned for evaluating interview effectiveness — the composite outcomes score derived from pooling the ratings of working relationship and client interest in assuming responsibility. However, when practice ratings were being made in the training of judges for evaluating test responses, core quality ratings and overall satisfactoriness ratings tended to be nearly identical. Thus, ratings of core quality accounted for nearly all of the variance in ratings of overall satisfactoriness and separate ratings of the two dimensions for tests were considered to be unnecessary. It was in light of this very close similarity between ratings of overall satisfactoriness and core quality for tests that core quality in the interview came to be considered as an additional criterion of counselor effectiveness. As a criterion, core quality seemed to offer two particular advantages. One, it provides an estimate of counselor skill or performance which is less dependent upon the characteristics of the client than is the composite outcomes criteria of working relationship and client interest in assuming responsibility. This estimate of counselor skill independent of client characteristics seemed especially valuable in the present study where, for a given week, the counselor saw only two clients — a sample so small as to make for considerable unreliability. A second advantage of the core quality rating as a criterion lies in the observation that for beginning counselors the situations in which other
Table 8
The Prediction of Counselor Effectiveness

Correlations between all test dimensions and interview criteria for the first and fifth weeks in the counseling practicum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Dimensions</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>-.558**</td>
<td>-.516*</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Discrepancy</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Percentage</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactoriness of Core Frequency</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-Percentage</td>
<td>.456*</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfactoriness</td>
<td>.462*</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at or beyond .05 level.
** Significant at or beyond .01 level.
than core responses would be considered desirable, are infrequent. In other words, the ability to give core responses, especially good core responses seems to represent a first stage in the development of counselor effectiveness. Until this stage has been partially worked through, other counselor skills, such as the ability to intentionally ignore client core (sometimes useful in the overall management of the interview) cannot be used to advantage. In sum, core quality seemed to offer a criteria of particular usefulness which had not been used in previous studies and which had not been anticipated when the study was originally planned. Whether core quality will be judged in future research as a useful dimension remains to be seen. In any case, core quality was more predictable than the composite criteria of immediate outcomes. Considering the difficulty of making any predictions about counseling, the core quality dimension should warrant further investigation.

Of the significant correlations, the most surprising were the ones for test lead and the two criteria measures for interviews — core quality and composite outcomes. This relationship is particularly surprising in that test degree of lead scores did not provide any appreciable prediction for interview degree of lead scores themselves (cf. Table 6). Possible implications of this fact were previously discussed in the section on Hypothesis 1. Also surprising is the fact that degree of lead scores predict interview outcomes whereas lead discrepancy scores do not. The data seem to indicate that the greater the lead, the poorer the interview criteria measures, regardless of whether the judges considered a given amount of lead appropriate or not. One
possible explanation of this difference in predictive power is offered by the difference in the reliabilities for the two sets of scores. These uncorrected reliabilities are .825 for actual lead and .667 for lead discrepancy. It is to be recalled that discrepancy scores, being a function of both actual and optimal ratings, are subject to a double source of interjudge variance.

Regardless of the explanation as to why test lead predicts interview effectiveness and lead discrepancy does not, the negative relationship between test lead and interview outcomes does support the findings reported by Carnes (1949) that more successful counselors lead less. In so far as prediction is concerned, no support was given to Nelson's report (1949) of a curvilinear relationship between deviation of leading from optimum and interview outcomes. However, within the interview itself, scattergrams of leading and outcomes do follow Nelson's predictions (cf. Charts I and II).

To summarize, as a result of the present study, data have been presented indicating that counselors who lead less in test responses have better interviews the first week of the practicum regardless of the divergence of lead from that judged optimal. Thus, for test responses, higher amounts of lead appear to be bad, even if judges approve of it.

In addition to degree of lead, Table 8 shows prediction of one of the interview criteria (core quality) is also provided by feeling percentage. As described in chapter 2, the feeling percentage score indicates the percentage of instances in which feeling rather than content of the clients remark was responded to by the
Chart I

Scattergrams for Lead and Core Quality in Tests and Interviews

Scattergram of Test Lead and Interview Core Quality - Week 1

Scattergram for Interview Lead and Interview Core Quality - Week 1

Lead \( r = -0.558 \)

Lead \( r = -0.360 \)
Chart II

Scattergrams for Lead and Composite Outcomes in Tests and Interviews

Scattergram for Test Lead and Composite Outcomes for Interviews - Week 1

Scattergram for Interview Lead and Interview Composite Outcomes - Week 1

Lead  $r = -0.516$

Lead  $r = -0.290$
counselor. The correlation of feeling percentage and interview core quality of .456 is significant beyond the .05 level and is consistent with other studies of the relationship between the use of feeling responses and interview outcomes. Within interviews, measures of feeling percentage and composite outcomes were highly related (r = .679 for the first week and .539 for the fifth week of counseling). These correlations are close to the one reported by Swearingen (1961) for counselor response to client feeling and composite criteria of interview outcome (r = .52). Further, her composite criteria were the same ones used in the present study under the title of interview composite outcomes.

The failure of feeling satisfactoriness scores on the test to predict interview criteria is similar to that reported for other discrepancy type scores used in the present study. In this case the problem of low reliabilities should be considered as a possible explanation. The test interjudge reliability of only .333 is statistically insignificant at the .05 level.

We may summarize by saying that feeling percentage scores on the test predict interview core quality scores, whereas feeling satisfactoriness scores do not. It appears that those who use more feeling responses in tests have better interviews even if they sometimes use feeling responses in tests when they are judged to be inappropriate.

Prediction of interview criteria is also provided by test scores of overall satisfactoriness. As indicated in Table 8, the correlation between overall satisfactoriness and interview core
quality is .462 — a value which is significant beyond the .05 level. As was described previously, overall satisfactoriness is more directly comparable to the interview criterion of core quality than any of the test dimensions. It is thus encouraging that a test measure predicts an interview criterion with which it is most directly comparable. Because of this comparability of dimensions, the overall satisfactoriness—core quality correlation would seem to justify a greater confidence that the measured relationship is a repeatable one, not an artifact of some other source of variance which is little understood.

It may be noted also that the correlation between test overall satisfactoriness and interview composite outcomes is rather large. Although it does not reach significance at the .05 level, it would be considered significant at the .06 level. It seems likely that the effects of client differences may be responsible for this somewhat lower predictability of the composite outcomes criteria in contrast to the criteria of core quality. It would seem that the latter provides an estimate of counselor competence which is relatively more independent of client characteristics — client readiness, maturity, resistance, etc.

**Summary.** On the basis of the data presented it may be concluded that significant prediction of counseling effectiveness for the first week is provided by an analysis of test responses for three of the seven dimensions used. The null hypothesis may therefore be rejected for test degree of lead, test feeling percentage, and test overall satisfactoriness. It appears that discrepancy type scores such as
lead discrepancy, and feeling satisfactoriness have less potential for prediction. These scores proved to be particularly subject to problems of low interjudgemental reliability which in part accounts for this low potential. Of the four non-discrepancy type dimensions utilized, only test core percentage failed to predict at least one of the two interview criteria measures.

Test of hypothesis 4 - the prediction of counselor effectiveness

There will be no significant relationships between any of the scores for test dimensions and criteria scores for interviews held during the fifth week of the practicum.

It was the purpose of Hypothesis 4 to test for the predictability of counseling effectiveness after some of the effects of practicum training would have had time to be reflected in counselor performance (shown to happen in Table 7). From the information provided in Table 8 it may be seen that test responses on the various dimensions of analysis provided no significant prediction of such effectiveness. In contrast to interviews held the first week of the practicum, there is apparently no significant relationship between the predictors and counselor effectiveness during the fifth week of the practicum. Further, only 8 of the 14 correlations computed to test Hypothesis 4 are even in the predicted direction.

Various reasons might be given for the lack of prediction found in the testing of Hypothesis 4. One factor seems to be the low intercorrelations between measures of counselor interview effectiveness between the first and fifth weeks. From the data on Table 9 one may
note that even though correlations of .574 for core quality and .456 for composite outcomes reach significance at the .01 and .05 levels, they are not impressive in terms of criteria which are consistent across interviews. Although there is a tendency for counselors who have better interviews the first week to also have better interviews the fifth week of the practicum, this tendency is rather weak and accounts for a relatively small amount of the variance. Thus, the fact that a considerable amount of counselor change in interview effectiveness occurs between the first and fifth weeks seems to account for the lack of prediction between test scores and counselor effectiveness for the fifth week. Put another way, test scores and interview scores bear some similarities for the first week of counseling, but by the fifth week so much change has occurred in relative counselor effectiveness that test scores and counselor effectiveness scores in the interview are no longer significantly related.

The situation bears some similarity to McCormick's study (1951) of immediate criteria across discussion units. In that study rather high correlations were reported for criteria measures between the first and second time a specific topic was discussed and between the second and third. However, between the third and fourth discussions of a given topic these correlations dropped rather dramatically. It is not known from McCormick's data how much time had elapsed between these different discussion units. However, interview series extending over a six weeks period constituted the sample and the correlation of .42 McCormick reported for his composite criteria (client
Table 9

The Consistency of Interview Measures of Effectiveness.
Correlations of Interview Dimensions
for Week 1 and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Quality</th>
<th>Composite Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.574**</td>
<td>.456*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level or beyond.
** Significant at the .01 level or beyond.

growth, working relationship and responsibility taking) between the
third and fourth discussion units seems to have considerable simi-
arity to the present findings. It was presumed that the client had
gone on to a new or deeper aspect of the problem and that a different
situation existed. Of course one must not discount the effect of
some client turnover or of experience in the practicum, in assessing
the failure to predict fifth week counseling effectiveness in the
present study. However, McCormick's data gives some clue to incon-
stancy of criteria across interviews even when experienced counselors
working with the same clients and the same problems are studied.

Secondary Findings

Although it has been the primary aim of the present study to
predict counselor style and effectiveness on the basis of responses
to interview excerpts, some data are provided for answering certain
secondary questions. One question posed by some research is, "Do
counselors as a group use the same type of responses to excerpts of
interview typescripts as they do in their actual counseling?" It will be recalled from previous descriptions of the dimensions and their ratings that direct comparisons between tests and interviews are not possible for all dimensions. On degree of lead for instance, a graphic scale for the analysis of single counselor remarks was used for test responses, while a quartile scale was used for the global rating of interview segments. Although the relative use of lead among counselors may be measured by either scale, a comparison of the difference in average leading between tests and interviews for the whole group of counselors is not meaningful because of the difference in type of scales used. However, comparisons are possible for satisfactoriness of core frequency, core quality, and feeling percentage. Group means for the making of these comparisons are provided by Table 10. It may be seen that counselors as a group tend to use core responses with more satisfactory frequency, and give a higher percentage of feeling responses to test situations than they do to interviews. In general, then, counselors give "better" responses (more feeling, more core, and better quality core) to test situations than they do in their interviews. Several explanations may be offered for this. The test situations are undoubtedly nontypical of those arising in interviews -- more "critical situation" seem to be represented in the test. And, these situations seem to have more "pull" for feeling responses from counselors. Other possibilities are that the test situations present less distractions for counselors and thus make the giving of the "right" (e.g. feeling responses,) easier. One also gets the impression that
Table 10

A Comparison of Average Values Obtained from Tests and Interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Dimensions</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Interview Dimensions</th>
<th>Week 1 Average Score</th>
<th>Week 5 Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactoriness of Care Frequency</td>
<td>75.72%</td>
<td>Satisfactoriness of Care Frequency</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Percentage</td>
<td>47.52%</td>
<td>Feeling Percentage</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfactoriness (50 pt. scale)</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>Composite Outcomes (50 pt. scale)</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>24.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core Quality (50 pt. scale)</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>22.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the ineptitudes of beginning counselors tend to keep much of the conversation on a superficial level where little feeling is expressed by the client and consequently there is little feeling to which the counselor can respond. These finding offer some explanation to the discrepancy between feeling percentages reported by Wrenn (1959) for test responses and those reported by Elton (1951) and Swearingen (1961) for interview analysis. Wrenn's finding of 83% feeling responses contrasted sharply with the 11% reported by Elton and the 14% reported by Swearingen. On the basis of the present data it may be assumed that the explanation lies more in the differences between test and interview responses than between the characteristics of the different counselor samples.

This comparison between responses which counselors gave to test situations and those responses which the same group of counselors gave in their interviews thus reveals some similarities, but it also shows considerable differences. Because of these differences, the findings of the present study would seem to have implications for investigations reported by Wrenn (1959) and by Strupp (1955). It will be recalled that these investigators assumed that the responses of counselors to excerpts from interview type scripts were indicative of their responses in interviewing. On the basis of this assumed similarity, counselors of varying levels of experience, theoretical orientation, and professional affiliation were compared and differences were reported. It is to be acknowledged that these studies and the present one are not completely comparable. Most of the counselors in their studies were experienced and, especially in the case
of Strupp, different dimensions were used in the analysis of responses. However, the results of the present study would seem to imply that some caution should be used in making the assumption that test responses are strongly indicative of interview behavior. In the present study at least, there are some significant relationships, but these are far from unity.

Suggestions for future research

On the basis of the present investigation some suggestions may be offered concerning future research. One suggestion has to do with the development of a test for purposes of counselor selection. In this regard the present study has not been encouraging as no correlations reached significance beyond the first week of practicum counseling. However, all of the possibilities have not been exhausted. Other dimensions of analysis could be applied to the study of test responses as well as to interviews. It would also seem that more stable criteria of counselor effectiveness might be found. It is the impression of this writer that although change is to be seen in the interviewing skill of practicum counselors, the change does not seem to be as great as the instability of the criteria used here might suggest. Perhaps the assessment of interviewing in terms of counselor confidence or relaxation or acceptance of the client, might afford more stable measures.

In terms of the predictors, it may be that more satisfactory interview excerpts will be found. It should also be the case that the use of recorded or filmed interview excerpt situation would
provide better prediction by offering greater stimulus similarity between the test and actual counseling. In addition, counselor responses could also be recorded, thereby minimizing the opportunity of the counselor to "sit and think" of what the best response might be. Thus, in terms of the use of a work-sample type of test to predict counselor behavior, the present study seems to have been a first attempt and many refinements and variations are possible.

Aside from the possibility of counselor selection, counselor responses to these or other excerpts from interview typescripts might be useful in trying to factor out certain cognitive elements involved in counseling. By this approach it might be possible to obtain separate estimates of counselor cognitive ability in contrast to various noncognitive elements. The latter might be assessed by viewing or filming counselor interviews. Such an approach could be one way of dealing with the art or science controversy, and the debate as to whether one improves in counseling effectiveness by trying out various roles and thereby increases his behavior repertoire or whether one progresses by increasing his sensitivity in interpersonal relations, feeling congruence, etc.

The relationship between responses to interview excerpts and actual counseling could be further clarified by presenting the excerpts both before and after practicum training. At this point it is not known whether responses to interview excerpts stay approximately the same and interviewing behavior changes, or whether both change. And, whether they change in similar directions. Another question, closely related to the issue of change during training is that of
experience versus inexperience. Although Strupp (1955) has compared the responses to interview excerpts of counselors of various theoretical commitment, professional affiliation and length of experience, little is known of the relationship between the response of experienced counselors to this type of test and their actual interviewing behavior. It might be supposed that the similarities between test and interviewing would be greater and also more stable, but so far as this writer is aware, no work has been done along this line.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

The present study was designed to test the predictability of counselor performance in a beginning practicum. In the study the effort was made to predict not only counselor effectiveness but also characteristics of counselor style within the interview. For purposes of prediction a work sample type of test was developed which was composed of excerpts taken from interview typescripts. Counselors were asked to write in what their responses would have been if they had been the counselors in the excerpt situations. These responses were then analyzed according to dimensions previously used by Robinson and his students in their content-analysis studies of the interview. It was hoped that such an investigation would have potential usefulness in terms of counselor selection and in addition help clarify what, if any, aspects of counselor technique are relatively more predictable.

Method

The test used in the present study consisted of excerpts taken from interviews at various universities on file at Ohio State University. In the test, situations were presented with which beginning counselors seem to have particular difficulty. Introductions were written for each of the excerpts in order to summarize for the
counselor what had occurred previously in the interview. Excerpt situations ended with a statement by the client and a blank space was provided in which the counselors in the study were instructed to write what they would say if they were the counselor in the excerpted situation. These responses written by the counselors were then analyzed for purposes of predicting counselor style and effectiveness in the interview.

The eighteen counselors in the study were graduate students enrolled in an introductory counseling practicum. Their clients were drawn from an undergraduate course in effective study. As might be expected academic problems were frequently discussed in interviews but the range of topics was broad and many other problem areas were dealt with.

The performance of counselors in their interviews constituted the criteria for which predictions were attempted. Because it was anticipated that counselors might change in style and effectiveness relative to one another during the course of the practicum experience, interviews from both the first and fifth weeks were included in the study.

The dimensions used in the analysis of tests and interviews were primarily those common to the "communications approach" and included the dimensions of lead, core, content-feeling, and immediate outcomes. Besides actual counselor use of the lead, core and content-feeling techniques, judgments were also made as to what the optimal use of these dimensions would have been. On the basis of these two sets of actual and optimal ratings, measures were made as to the
appropriateness of the counselors' use of the various techniques.

In addition, core quality ratings were made for interviews. Core quality had originally been planned as a refinement upon the basic dimension of core frequency and had been intended as an additional measure of counselor style. However, experience in the training of the judges suggested that core quality was more appropriately thought of as a measure of general counselor competency. As a measure of counselor competency core quality offered the advantage of being relatively independent of client characteristics. A dimension on tests which appeared to be comparable to ratings of core quality was overall satisfactoriness.

In so far as possible, comparable dimensions were used in the analysis of test responses and practicum interviews. However, some dimensions varied slightly from the scoring of tests to the scoring of interviews because of the differences in the nature of the material being analyzed. For the analysis of test responses judgments were made on the following dimensions: lead, lead-discrepancy, core percentage, satisfactoriness of core frequency, feeling percentage, feeling satisfactoriness and overall satisfactoriness. For interviews the dimensions were: lead, lead discrepancy, satisfactoriness of core frequency, core quality, feeling percentage, feeling discrepancy, and composite outcomes (consisting of the pooled ratings for the immediate criteria of working relationship and client interest in assuming responsibility). All ratings for interviews were made on 50 point scales. For tests, 50 point scales were used for all ratings with the exception of the core and feeling measures. These were made on nominal scales.
In the computation of interjudge reliabilities for the various test and interview ratings, a 100% sample was utilized in comparing the ratings of two judges for tests. A 25% sample (18 interviews) was utilized in the computation of interjudge reliabilities for interview ratings. In general, the measures of judges' agreement for the basic dimensions of lead, core, feeling, and immediate outcomes were close to those reported in previous studies. In addition, it was possible to get rather good reliabilities for ratings of overall satisfactoriness for the test responses. On the other hand, the discrepancy type scores derived from separate ratings of actual and optimal usage were mostly unreliable. In part, this seemed to be a function of the computational method, since discrepancy scores involved a double source of variance. Single ratings of satisfactoriness seemed to be superior to discrepancy type scores in terms of interjudge reliability.

Results

The prediction of counselor style. Of the basic dimensions of counselor style (lead, core, and content-feeling) only the test core dimensions provided significant correlations with comparable interview dimensions during the first week of the counseling practicum. Test core percentage and interview satisfactoriness of core frequency correlated .506; satisfactoriness of core frequency for tests correlated with interview satisfactoriness of core frequency .489. Both correlations are significant beyond the .05 level. It is to be noted that core responses were chosen as being optimal by the judges for
17 of the 18 test situations. Thus, scores of test core percentage
and test satisfactoriness of core frequency correlate highly with one
another \( (r = .888) \) and are, therefore, nearly identical in meaning.
In sum, only the test scores for the core dimensions predicted com-
parable interview scores during the first week of the practicum.

No prediction of counselor style was found for interviews held
the fifth week of the practicum. A partial explanation for this lack
of prediction is offered by the finding that counselor style scores
for interviews held the first week were not significantly related to
scores for counselor style in interviews held the fifth week. Thus,
within the practicum, counselors seem to vary widely in their inter-
viewing style from the first to the fifth weeks. Because of this fact
the interview measures for which prediction was attempted do not pro-
vide a consistent criteria for which predictions can be made.

The prediction of counselor effectiveness. For testing the
predictability of counselor effectiveness, scores for all the test
dimensions were correlated with the two interview measures of coun-
selor effectiveness (core quality and composite outcomes). Of the
14 correlations computed to measure the predictability of counselor
effectiveness during the first week, 4 were significant at or beyond
the .05 level. These were: test lead-interview core quality \( (r =
-.558) \), test lead-interview composite outcomes \( (r = -.516) \), test
feeling percentage-interview core quality \( (r = .456) \), and test overall
satisfactoriness-interview core quality \( (r = .462) \).
It was surprising that test lead scores predicted both of the interview criteria for the first week, since test lead did not predict interview lead. The explanation was offered that test situations were such that low leading was indicative of counselor sensitivity whereas low leading was not so highly related to counselor sensitivity in interviewing. The correlations also indicated that counselors who respond more to feelings are more effective in their interviews the first week of the practicum. Similarly, counselors who give test responses of higher overall satisfactoriness have better interviews the first week in terms of the interview core quality criterion. None of the appropriateness type scores of test scores predicted interview effectiveness. This seemed to be in part explained by the low interjudge reliabilities reported for these measures.

As with efforts to predict style, so efforts to predict counselor effectiveness beyond the first week of the practicum were unsuccessful. Again, the problem seemed to be the changeability of the counselors themselves between the first and fifth weeks. The correlation between interview core quality the first and fifth weeks was .574. Scores for interview composite outcomes for these same periods correlated .456. Although these correlations are significant at the .01 and .05 levels respectively they do not indicate the degree of constancy that is desirable for criteria measures.

Secondary findings. It had been assumed by Wrenn (1959) and Strupp (1955) that the responses given by counselors to excerpts taken from interviews were indicative of the level of their actual behavior
in counseling. Comparisons in the present study made between average test values and average interview values for comparable dimensions cast some doubt on this assumption. It was found that counselors tend to use more core responses and more feeling responses on tests than they do in their actual counseling. Thus, for this set of interview excerpts at least, counselors give "better" responses to the test than they do in their interviewing. Because of these differences some caution must be exercised in using excerpt responses as estimates of the level of actual interviewing characteristics.

These comparisons between test and interview behavior offer some assistance in clarifying the divergent findings reported by Wrenn (1959) for tests and by Elton (1951) and Swearingen (1961) for interviews on the relative frequency with which counselors respond to client feelings. Wrenn had reported a large majority of feeling responses, whereas Elton and Swearingen had reported more responses to content. Data from the present study indicate that feeling percentage is, to a considerable extent, a function of the source of the data being analyzed. Counselors give many more feeling responses to tests than are seen in their interviews.

**Conclusions.** The findings reported for the present study indicate that the use of counselor responses to interview excerpts provides some, though meager prediction of counselor style during the first week of the practicum. More impressive results were accomplished in terms of predicting counselor effectiveness for the first week of counseling. Three of the 7 test dimensions predicted criteria of counselor interview effectiveness.
In contrast, no significant predictions were offered for either counselor style or effectiveness during the fifth week of counseling. One problem apparently was the inconstancy of the interview scores themselves between the first and the fifth weeks. Thus, in terms of providing any long range prediction of counselor performance which would be useful in trainee selection, the present study does not present encouraging results.

It was suggested that the type of test used in the present study might be useful in attempts to isolate certain cognitive elements involved in counseling. With this approach it might be possible to obtain separate estimates of counselor cognitive ability in contrast to various non-cognitive elements. This could be one way of dealing with the art or science controversy in an empirical manner.
APPENDIX I
JUDGES' MANUAL for RATING TEST RESPONSES

Introduction

In the present study counselor responses to interview excerpts will be used in the effort to predict actual counselor performance in interviews. Both excerpts and interviews will be judged on scales and dimensions as nearly comparable as possible. Judges are asked to make ratings of counselor responses to excerpts on the following dimensions: (1) degree of lead, (2) response to core of client statements, and (3) response to content-feeling aspects of client statements. Scales are provided for the rating of actual counselor performance and ideal counselor performance, relative to these dimensions. In addition, a global rating of overall satisfactoriness of the counselor response will be made.

Although each dimension used in this manual is described and examples are given, some general familiarity with the "communications approach" as it has been developed by Robinson and others is assumed. It is thus advisable that this manual be used by those familiar with with the "communications approach."

DEGREE OF LEAD

Amount of lead in counseling responses

The degree to which a response leads usually depends on two characteristics: (a) how far the content of the counselor's response
seems to be ahead of the content of the client's last remark, and 
(b) the degree of pressure or definiteness in the counselor's response 
used to bring about client acceptance of new ideas. To illustrate, an 
acceptance remark adds no new idea and little pressure (except, per­
haps, to continue talking); tentative analysis brings in a new idea 
which logically follows but little pressure is exerted to accept it; 
an interpretation remark states a new idea with definiteness which in­
dicates that the client is expected to accept, etc.

A previous study has indicated modal values of certain counse­
lor techniques and these are given as reference points for the rater. 
These reference points are given below.

Silence. At times following a client remark the coun­
selor is silent. There is no new idea in silence and generally 
no pressure. It is conceivable, however, that silence could 
mean as much pressure as is exerted by a rejection remark.

Acceptance. Following a client remark, the counselor 
may merely indicate that he understands and accepts what the 
client has said by "yes" or "mm mm" response. Such remarks 
usually lead very little.

Clarification. Following a remark by the client, the 
counselor rephrases the important ideas in more concise or 
clearer terms. A clarification leads slightly more than 
acceptance in that the counselor has done some selecting of 
the various ideas or emphases in the client's remarks.

General Lead. A request for the client to select a 
topic for conversation or to continue talking about a topic. 
It is of the type, "Will you tell me more about that?"

Tentative Analysis. The counselor presents an ad­
ditional aspect or a new approach to the problem being dis­
cussed, but in a purely tentative, nonforcing manner. The 
client feels free to accept or reject the idea. Frequently, 
it is in a question form.

Urging. Those instances in which the counselor puts 
considerable pressure on the client to accept an idea or course 
of action. It is characterized by the use of such devices as 
arguments for the action and occasionally even threats. Re­
jection of an idea would be an extreme form of urging.
Scoring degree of lead

Place a vertical line through the dot which best indicates the actual degree of lead used in the counselor response. It is to be noted that types of counselor remarks placed above the scale are to serve as reference points only. It may be that a particular clarification remark, for example, would lead considerably more or less than the reference point on the scale would indicate. The scale is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silence</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
<th>General Lead</th>
<th>Tentative Analysis</th>
<th>Urging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no lead</td>
<td>Much Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core**

It is usually recognized that a client ordinarily attempts to express one central idea in his remark. Even when the client says several things in a remark, one idea or feeling is of primary importance. This main idea has been called the "core" of the client's speech, and the counselor usually attempts to respond to this core in the remarks he makes immediately following the client's speech. This response may be a simple restatement or clarification but a general lead, tentative analysis, interpretation or urging remark which deals
with the main idea would be rated as a "core" response. In identifying a "core" response the main criterion to consider is whether the client will probably feel that the counselor is talking about what the client is primarily interested in.

**Secondary**

At times in the rapid exchange of remarks between a counselor and client the counselor may respond to an idea that is secondary to the problem as it is expressed by the client. Generally, this will occur when one speech of the client contains several problems. An example follows:

Cl.- Oh, I don't know, there's always quarrelling and fussing. Every time Dad comes home from work, why he tells Mother about everything that goes on at the plant, and she's really bored, because she doesn't understand what he's saying. And when I come home, she tells me all her day's activities, how much she's washed, ironed and all that. And my brother just talks about sports. When I come home, I'm tired, so tired of what everybody else is saying, it just ... I don't know, it just gets on my nerves sometimes, if I have any. It just seems ... I asked Mother last night: I said, "You can't have a good home environment." She said, "No."

**Response to core of client's remarks.**

Co.- You don't feel that you are treated right.

**Response to secondary aspects of client's remarks.**

Co.- When you get home from school you're too tired to listen to your family's conversation.

**New**

Besides dealing with the core or secondary aspects of a client's speech, the counselor may deal with an entirely new idea or topic following a client speech. This is particularly true when the counselor
attends more to his own diagnostic process than to the client remark. An example follows.

Cl.- I'm having a little bit of difficulty right now. We're getting into a little bit of chemistry that I don't feel sure of. I took chemistry in high school but I don't know much about it.

Co.- Are you taking any history courses now?

Unclassifiable

When a response does not belong into any of the above categories of core, secondary, or new, it is marked as unclassifiable. Probably the most common type response will be acceptance remarks such as "mm hm." The indication of silence on the excerpt sheet will also be included in the unclassifiable category.

Scoring

(1) Classify the counselor's response according to the categories named: C = core, S = secondary, N = new, U = unclassifiable. Write in the letter which best classifies the counselor's response.

CONTENT-FEELING DIMENSIONS

Counselor response to content or feeling

One important issue in counseling is the orientation of the counselor to respond to content or feeling in the client's speech. A brief illustration is given below of the difference between responding to content and feeling. A client says,

Cl.- I really like art and I'm getting very good grades in my art courses ... but, I don't know, I find I spend several hours a day in the gym swimming, or boxing, or playing handball... I know I put more time and energy into these things than art.
Counselor response to feeling
Co.- You are rather apologetic about spending so much time away from school work.

Counselor response to content
Co.- In spite of your interest in art, you are spending a lot of time in sports.

While responses to feeling may include the term "feel" in the counselor's remark, this is not always the case. The word "feel" is sometimes used as a synonym for "think" or "be of the opinion of" and such usage should be distinguished from an implied emotional reference.

Scoring

Classify counselor responses according to the following categories: C = content, F = feeling. Write in the letter which best classifies the counselor's response. Only core and secondary classifications above may be scored as to content or feeling. New and un-classifiable core designations above, will be considered as unclassifiable as to content-feeling.

OVERALL SATISFACTORINESS

It is assumed that the dimensions previously described will provide some measure of the overall adequacy of the counselor's response. However, it is acknowledged that the importance of these dimensions for effective counseling will vary from one situation to another. It is further acknowledged that other factors not previously described in this manual will enter into judgements of counselor competence. Some such factors might be, acceptance attitude conveyed by the counselor, sensitivity to client feelings, implied division of
responsibility in the remark, etc. Undoubtedly each judge will have his own implicit or explicit list of such standards and it would be unrealistic to attempt any complete list. However, in order that interjudge agreement may be maximized, it is assumed that judges share a common familiarity with the "communications approach" to counseling.

Scoring

Rate the overall satisfactoriness of the counselor's remark. In making this rating, compare the satisfactoriness of this counselor's behavior with your conception of the average practicum counselor. Place a vertical line through the dot which best indicates this overall satisfactoriness. The scale is as follows:

.................................!.................................
         1Q       Md       3Q
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt No.</th>
<th>Core Category</th>
<th>Content-Feeling</th>
<th>Overall Satisfactoriness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>( ) ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the stimulus presented by the excerpt remains the same regardless of the response which individual counselors make to it, it is not necessary to make a separate rating of what a response should have been each time a counselor response is rated or classified as to the actual behavior displayed by his remark. Thus, ratings or classifications as to what you, the judge, consider to be the optimal use of a given dimension will be made after all of the responses actually given by counselors have been assessed. For the making of these judgements as to what would constitute optimal responses to the excerpt situations, a blank booklet containing all the excerpts will be used. Each excerpt is to be judged for what the optimal response should be, before going on to the next excerpt. A description of the principles which should be used in the making of these judgements of optimal responses follows.

Degree of lead -- optimal

In rating the degree of lead which would be optimal for a given excerpt several factors should be considered. One is the client's ability and background for understanding the point to be made by the counselor (excerpts will vary, of course, in the extent to which this may be inferred). The counselor's remark should be relevant to the client's present thinking but should also represent the next step which he will understand immediately. Even more important in rating optimal lead is the factor of how much it would seem the client would
be willing to admit to himself. That is, if a remark forced the client
to face unpleasant facts about himself before he was ready to do so,
the remark would lead too much. The third point to be considered is
leading too little. The remark may represent a point which the client
has already passed in his thinking. Signs of client readiness for
more lead are the asking of questions and the requesting of diagnosis
or remedial help.

Scoring. Rate the degree of lead which you, the judge, feel
would represent the optimal lead for the excerpt. Place a vertical
line through the dot which best indicates this optimal lead. The
scale is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silence</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
<th>General Lead</th>
<th>Tentative Analysis</th>
<th>Urging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Much Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core dimensions—optimal

It is assumed that ordinarily it is most appropriate to respond
to the core of what the client is saying. There are, however, certain
exceptions to this general rule when other than core responses might
be most effective. A description of some of these exceptions follow.
Secondary. One group of exceptions to the appropriateness of core responses involve the response to secondary aspects of the client statement. Some examples are:

(1) Though the core of the student's statement might deal with an emotional problem, the counselor might respond to a secondary aspect having to do with study-skills because that topic might have more potential for development within the time limits available.

(2) In another case, the secondary aspect of a client's remark may seem to have more therapeutic potential. For example, the client might make a long and rambling statement in which he expressed dissatisfaction with school — long assignments, unfair exams, inconsiderate classmates and parents who don't understand. Here the core might be a feeling that his academic life is going badly. However, the secondary aspect of the statement — his dissatisfaction with his parents, might, in the total context of the interview, be judged as the most fruitful topic of discussion.

New Topics. Another group of exceptions center around the utilization of "new" responses. Some examples are:

(1) If the line of talk seems unproductive or if the client tends to perseverate, it will be appropriate for the counselor to introduce a new topic, which he feels the client may be able to deal with more productively.

(2) The client may be moving too fast and may be getting into threatening material before he is ready to handle it. Thus, although he may appear to be making very rapid progress, he may then become frightened and decide to discontinue counseling. In this situation also, the introduction of a new topic, rather than a core response would seem appropriate.

Scoring. Encircle the letter which signifies the type of response which would have been preferable for the given excerpt. In the classification, C = core, S = secondary, and N = new, U = unclassifiable.

Unclassifiable. If a response not belonging to the categories of core, secondary or new is preferable, the optimal response would be considered to be unclassifiable. An example might be the case where
the client is talking freely about a significant problem, in which case an "mm hmm" might be the best response. In the case where a client begins to cry, a silent response might be the preferred one. The indication of silence also would be placed in the unclassifiable category.

**Content or feeling responses — optimal**

Each excerpt is also to be judged as to whether a response to content or to feeling would be the optimal response. In general, research would suggest the following guidelines.

1. The response to feeling is to be preferred when the client is not able to identify his feelings, lacks clarity in understanding his interpersonal relationships, or lacks a consistent or healthy concept of himself.

2. The response to content is preferred when the client seeks information of an objective sort, when the goal is the improvement of skills and techniques and when the goal of counseling is focused on relatively rapid behavioral change. Tutoring in study-skills would be one example of counseling directed toward these types of problems.

**Scoring.** Write in the letter which signifies the type of response which would have been preferable for the given excerpt. In the classification C = content, F = feeling. Only core and secondary responses may be classified as to content or to feeling. If you scored the excerpt as requiring a new or unclassifiable response above, that excerpt will not be classified on the content-feeling dimension.
In the present study an evaluation of counselor performance will be made using dimensions common to the "communications approach" in counseling. These ratings will in turn be used as the criteria against which instruments designed to predict counselor performance will be tested. Judges are asked to make ratings of counselor performance on the following dimensions: (1) degree of lead, (2) response to core of client statements, and (3) response to content-feeling aspects of client statements. Scales are provided for the rating of actual counselor performance and ideal counselor performance, relative to these dimensions. Ratings will be made from tape recordings of interviews. These recordings will be stopped at five minute intervals and ratings will be made on each of the dimensions for each five minute segment of the interview. In addition, at the end of the 15 minute segment of the interview being judged, ratings will be made of the immediate criteria of working relationship and client interest in assuming responsibility.

Although each dimension used in this manual is described and numerous examples are given, some general familiarity with the "communications approach" as it has been developed by Robinson and others is assumed. It is thus advisable that this manual be used by those familiar with the "communications approach."
DEGREE OF LEAD

Amount of lead in counseling responses

The degree to which a response leads usually depends on two characteristics: (a) how far the content of the counselor's response seems to be ahead of the content of the client's last remark, and (b) the degree of pressure or definiteness in the counselor's response used to bring about client acceptance of new ideas. To illustrate, an acceptance remark adds no new idea and little pressure (except, perhaps, to continue talking); tentative analysis brings in a new idea which logically follows but little pressure is exerted to accept it; an interpretation remark states a new idea with definiteness which indicates that the client is expected to accept, etc.

Appropriateness of lead

In addition to rating the actual degree of lead, the judge is to rate the appropriateness of lead. Several factors should be considered. One is the client's ability and background for understanding a point that is being made by the counselor. The counselor's remark should be relevant to the client's present thinking but should also represent the next step which he will understand immediately. Even more important in rating the appropriateness of lead is the factor of how much the client is willing to admit to himself. That is, if the counselor forces the client to face unpleasant facts about himself before he is ready to do so, the counselor is leading too much. The third point to be considered is leading too little. The counselor's remark may represent a point which the client has already passed in
his thinking. Signs of client readiness for more lead are the asking of questions and the requesting of diagnosis or remedial help.

In addition to these general principles, specific situations may be described in which different amounts of lead are considered desirable.

Situations in which much lead would be appropriate

(1) The client has gross misconceptions of what is involved in the counseling relationship. In this case rapid structuring may be necessary for counseling to continue.

(2) The client asks for specific information which is appropriate for the counselor to give, e.g., time and place of the interview, whether tests are given as a part of counseling, etc.

(3) The client is a "talker" and attempts to dominate the relationship by means of a "filibuster" (a continual stream of talk with little organization or emotional involvement). In this situation a relatively high degree of lead such as an interpretation or structuring speech might be in order.

Situations in which a medium degree of lead would be appropriate

(1) In the case of tutoring, a give and take relationship is considered optimal. There is a sharing of responsibility and consequently an alternation of subroles — from advising and information giving to listening and general leads.

(2) Later in a series of interviews, when the relationship is strong enough to support it, tentative analysis and interpretation may be used by the counselor more frequently. Amount of resistance may be the guide here if the counselor is proceeding too rapidly.

(3) Often the client will begin making plans for future action. Although it may occur that the client has such reality testing and good judgement that it is necessary only for the counselor to listen, it is generally to be expected that the client will indicate some inaccurate information and unrealistic planning. At such times the counselor will by listening, asking questions, giving information, etc., work toward more appropriate planning.

Situations in which a low degree of lead would be appropriate

(1) The client is speaking of rather deep emotional problems.

(2) The client is stating his problem in an understandable manner and with good reality contact.
(3) The client is obviously thinking, but is speaking slowly and has difficulty in stating his thoughts.

Scoring degree of lead

Two ratings are to be made regarding degree of lead. (1) Rate the actual degree of lead. It will be noted that the scale is divided into quartile divisions.

For example, the middle line indicates that the counselor is using the same amount of lead as would the average practicum counselor; 3Q indicates that the counselor is using more lead than would 75% of counselors in the practicum, etc. In judging the counselor's use of lead for a given segment of the interview relative to practicum counselors, the judge is to disregard the relevance of the remarks to the particular situation. In other words, the judge is not asking, how does this counselor's use of degree of lead compare with the lead that a good counselor would use if he were in this situation with this client. Rather the judge is to use as his reference point his conception of the average amount of lead used by the average counselor in the practicum, regardless of the situation.

Place a vertical line through the dot which best indicates the actual degree of lead being used by the counselor.

(2) On the same scale as the one described above, rate the optimum degree of lead. For this rating you are to indicate what you judge that the degree of lead should have been for the particular segment of the interview tape you are rating. Circle the dot which best indicates this optimum degree of lead. If the counselor is using what you consider to be an optimum degree of lead, that dot on the scale will thus have a line through it and will also be circled.

CORE DIMENSIONS

Core. It is usually recognized that a client ordinarily attempts to express one central idea in his remark. Even when the client says several things in a remark, one idea or feeling is of primary importance.
This main idea has been called the "core" of the client's speech, and the counselor usually attempts to respond to this core in the remarks he makes immediately following the client's speech. This response may be a simple restatement or clarification but a general lead, tentative analysis, interpretation or urging remark which deals with the main idea would be rated as a "core" response. In identifying a "core" response the main criterion to consider is whether the client will probably feel that the counselor is talking about what the client is primarily interested in.

**Secondary.** At times in the rapid exchange of remarks between a counselor and client the counselor may respond to an idea that is secondary to the problem as it is expressed by the client. Generally, this will occur when one speech of the client contains several problems. An example follows.

Cl.- Oh, I don't know, there's always quarrelling and fussing. Every time Dad comes home from work, why he tells Mother about everything that goes on at the plant, and she's really bored, because she doesn't understand what he's saying. And when I come home, she tells me all her day's activities, how much she's washed, ironed and all that. And my brother just talks about sports. When I come home, I'm tired, so tired of what everybody else is saying, it just ... I don't know, it just gets on my nerves sometimes, if I have any. It just seems .... I asked Mother last night: I said, "You can't have a good home environment." She said, "No."

**Response to core of client's remarks**

Co.- You don't feel that you are treated right.

**Response to secondary aspects of client's remarks**

Co.- When you get home from school you're too tired to listen to your family's conversation.
New. Besides dealing with the core or secondary aspects of a client's speech, the counselor may deal with an entirely new idea or topic following a client speech. This is particularly true when the counselor attends more to his own diagnostic process than to the client remark. An example follows.

Cl.- I'm having a little bit of difficulty right now. We're getting into a little bit of chemistry that I don't feel sure of. I took chemistry in high school but I don't know much about it.

Co.- Are you taking any history courses now?

Exceptions to core responses

It is assumed that it is ordinarily most appropriate to respond to the core of what the client is saying. There are, however, certain exceptions to this general rule when other than core responses might be most effective.

Secondary. One group of exceptions to the appropriateness of core responses involve the responses to secondary aspects of the client statement. Examples:

(1) Though the core of the student's statement might deal with an emotional problem, the counselor might respond to a secondary aspect having to do with study-skills because that topic might have more potential for development within the time limits available.

(2) In another case the secondary aspect of a client's remark may seem to have more therapeutic potential. For example, the client might make a long rambling statement in which he expresses dissatisfaction with school -- long assignments, unfair exams, inconsiderate classmates and parents who don't understand. Here the core might be a feeling that his academic life is going badly. However, the secondary aspect of the statement -- his dissatisfaction with his parents, might, in the total context of the interview, be judged as the most fruitful topic of discussion.
New topics. Another group of exceptions center around the utilization of "new" responses. The following are two instances in which a new topic would be considered appropriate.

(1) If the line of talk seems unproductive or if the client tends to perseverate, it will be appropriate for the counselor to introduce a new topic, which he feels the client may be able to deal with more productively.

(2) The client may be moving too fast and may be getting into threatening material before he is ready to handle it. Thus, although he may appear to be making very rapid progress, he may then become frightened and decide to discontinue counseling. In this situation also, the introduction of a new topic, rather than a core response would seem appropriate.

Quality of core response

It is acknowledged that counselor responses vary in core quality as well as in frequency. Thus, a counselor may give responses which indicate that he is, in general, talking about what the client wants to talk about; yet he may be making core responses of poor quality.

An example follows.

Cl.- I don't like it here as well as I did in high school. The students are snobbish ... fraternities run the political organization and discriminate against independent students. And you ought to see the cheating that goes on during examinations. Course, students sort of have to cheat since you can't figure out quiz questions. I think the instructors all have favorite students also.

(Poor quality core)

Co.- You don't like anybody -- students or instructors.

(Better quality core)

Co.- At times you sort of get the feeling that the whole set-up is working against you.
It will be noted in the examples given that the poor quality core response is stated in terms which most people would find offensive to acknowledge about themselves. It is also stated in such a rigid manner that it invites disagreement. On the other hand, the other example is stated more tentatively and in terms that are more socially acceptable. The client may reject the statement without rejecting the counselor. Further, the statement is qualified in such a way that it represents a less extreme overgeneralization of what the client has said.

Scoring

(1) Rate the counselor's responses in terms of satisfactoriness of core frequency, i.e. compared with how often the counselor should have used core responses, what percentage of the time did he in fact use them? Place a vertical line through the dot which best indicates this percentage.

(2) Rate the quality of core responses. Place a vertical line through the dot which best indicates quality of core responses.

CONTENT-FEELING DIMENSIONS

Counselor response to content or feeling

One important issue in counseling is the orientation of the counselor to respond to the content or feeling in the client’s speech. A brief illustration is given below of the difference between responding to content and feeling. A client says,

Cl.- I really like art and I'm getting very good grades in my art courses ... but, I don't
know, I find I spend several hours a day in the gym swimming, or boxing, or playing hand-ball ..... I know I put more time and energy into those things than art.

A counselor responding primarily to feeling will reply,

Co.- You are rather apologetic about spending so much time away from school work.

While a counselor responding to content will reply,

Co.- In spite of your interest in art, you are spending a lot of time in sports.

While responses to feeling may include the term "feel" in the counselor's remark, this is not always the case. The word "feel" is sometimes used as a synonym for "think" or "be of the opinion of" and such usage should be distinguished from an implied emotional reference.

Appropriateness of content or feeling responses

Relative to the feeling-content dimension, one question centers around the counselor's tendency to give one type of response or the other. Another question has to do with the appropriateness of these two types of responses. In general, research would suggest the following guidelines:

(1) The response to feeling is to be preferred when the client is not able to identify his feelings, lacks clarity in understanding his interpersonal relationships, or lacks a consistent or healthy concept of himself.

(2) The response to content is preferred when the client seeks information of an objective sort, when the goal is the improvement of skills and techniques, and when the goal of counseling is focused on relatively rapid behavioral change. Tutoring in study-skills would be one example of counseling directed toward these types of problems.
Scoring

(1) Rate the counselor's tendency to use content or feeling responses. This rating is to be expressed in the form of a ratio. On the scale, C 100 indicates that the counselor has used content responses only. F 100 indicates that he has used only feeling responses. C 75 indicates 75% content and 25% feeling responses were used, etc. Place a vertical line through the dot most closely representing the actual ratio of content-feeling.

Responses used by the counselor

(2) On the same scale as the above, rate the ratio of content-feeling responses that you think should have been used in the interview section. Circle the dot which most closely indicates this optimum ratio of content-feeling responses.

MEASURES OF IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES

Counselor-client working relationship

A good working relationship between the counselor and client involves the presence of mutual respect and warmth, of respectful consideration for each other's ideas and suggestions, and of client willingness to explore his problems. It also involves the absence of indications of resistance on the part of the client.

A poor working relationship in the client, then, is the inverse of the above. It is characterized by the absence in the client of positive signs of warmth, respect, and willingness to explore problems, and by numerous and/or severe symptoms of resistance on his part.
These symptoms may consist of a belligerent rejection of the counselor's point of view, unwillingness as evidenced by frequent silences or monosyllabic responses, or polite speech which remains superficial and unenthusiastic, attempts to close the interview, or other signs of obvious lack of cooperation.

In judging a poor working relationship, it is necessary to consider both the severity and the frequency of the resistance. Outright rejection of the counselor may be indicative of strong resistance; however, it should also be noted that a client may not be evidencing resistance to the counselor but may be confronted with a problem which it is difficult for him to face or verbalize. Silence or monosyllabic responses at one point may not be serious, but if present throughout an entire interview may indicate fairly strong resistance. Research evidence indicates that continued client apathy may be as indicative of a poor working relationship as is active resistance.

The fact that a client modifies or questions a counselor idea does not necessarily indicate a poor working relationship; it is sometimes a sign of a good working relationship that a client feels free to respond frankly. It must be judged from the client's manner whether he seems to be showing resistance to the counselor himself corresponding to the ideas. Also notice that a client response of "Mm hum" is not indicative one way or another; other factors must be considered in making the rating.

**Scoring.** At the end of the 15 minute section, after the five minute segments have been judged for the dimensions previously described, rate the working relationship between client and counselor. In making
this rating compare the working relationship of this interview with your conception of the average working relationship in the counseling practicum. Place a vertical line through the dot which best indicates this working relationship.

**Client interest in assuming responsibility**

The progress of the interview is determined by the degree to which the participants assume responsibility for initiating or continuing the various events which occur during an interview. The degree of responsibility which a participant takes for the progress of the interview is a function of how much he wants to take and of what the other participant forces on him or permits him to take. A dominating counselor may have a client who appears satisfied to have him take complete charge of the interview, or he may have a client who tries himself to take a great deal of responsibility. In like manner, a counselor who does not want to direct the interview may have a client who seems willing to take primary responsibility, or he may have one who, like himself, does not. We have here a problem of differentiating between the counselor technique and the client behavior.

**Scoring.** At the end of the 15-minute section, rate the amount of responsibility which the client appears willing to take. The counselor influences by his techniques the amount of responsibility that the client actually assumes, but discounting counselor technique, how much responsibility does the client appear to want to take. In brief, rate the client interest in initiating behavior. In making this rating
compare client interest in assuming responsibility with the interest shown in the average practicum interview. Place a vertical line through the dot which best indicates this client interest.
INTERVIEW RATING SHEET

Counselor _____________

Interview No.__________

Five Minute Segment ____

Degree of Lead (Actual and Optimal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>3Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core

Satisfactoriness of Core Frequency

|         | 0% | 25% | 50% | 75% | 100% |

Quality of Core Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content-Feeling Ratio (Actual and Optimal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C 100</th>
<th>C 75</th>
<th>C 50</th>
<th>F 75</th>
<th>F 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria of Outcomes

Working Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Client desires
sires no
responsibility or
even rejects it

Client desires
to assume a
great deal of
responsibility
APPENDIX III
INSTRUCTIONS

You are asked to indicate on the last line of each of the following interview excerpts what you would say if you, as the counselor, were responding to the immediately preceding speech of the client. It is granted that ideally you will want more information about the client including observation of the client’s behavior and it is also granted that if you had been the counselor you would probably not have made some of the preceding counselor remarks. However, you are asked to use the information given by each excerpt to determine what you would probably say to the last indicated client speech if he made it when you were the counselor. Write this remark in the space provided. In each excerpt "C" refers to the counselor and "S" to the subject being counseled. The number of each remark indicates its place in the conference. It will be noted that excerpts taken from interviews with the same student have the same excerpt number. The letter following the number indicates the excerpt sequence. For example, all excerpts taken from interviews J will be designated as Excerpt #7-a, Excerpt #7-b, Excerpt #7-c, etc.

162a
This is the third conference with a female student in her late teens, and a male counselor. The client had been talking about some study problems and then began to talk about how "bad things were" at home. She feels that her father is rather shiftless and associates with the "wrong" people. Her mother is usually after her about something, and her brother always gets what he wants. The student has just explained that her brother will be allowed to go to the college he wants, while she says she was told where she was to go to college.

69. S- I say my brother gets everything he wants but he says I get everything I want. Sometimes I think about it, sometimes maybe I - I just might get a little of what he does, but it's very, very seldom. I mean, (pause) like when he might want to go out, or when he wants to go to a dance or to a party, or some game. He always goes. I mean he will do nothing at home -- he'll just -- all he talks about -- he just lives for sports. I mean, if he couldn't do -- if he'd break an arm or leg, I don't know what he'd do. He'd just probably have a fit. He usually goes anywhere he wants to, and does everything he wants to do, but I've got to be a sweet little thing that stays at home and be a perfect little angel all the time. Like I was telling my "big sister" the other day. I get so tired of being sweet and innocent, and it just disgusts me sometimes. I wish I could get out and have as good a time as other people do. (pause) And do some-- I mean, sometimes I think I'd like to do something devilish once in a while.

70. C-
This excerpt is taken from the first interview with a veteran who wants to continue schooling under the G.I. Bill. The veteran has just explained that he didn't do too well in high school but since he's been in the service (4 years), he feels he is a good bet for school because he is now married and has settled down quite a bit.

74. S- Of course, I've been in the service - I was in the service then and during those 4 years I went out with the fellows who - you know - drinking and stuff like that. (pause)

75. C- Um, How do you like to spend your off-time now - now that you're married and settled down?

76. S- Oh, home with my wife and dog (laughs) Uh - 've go out now and then - bowling, and to a show and things like that.

77. C- Um hmm. (pause)

78. S- But its mostly stay at home.

79. C- Um hmm. (short pause)

80. S- I wonder if I might smoke?

81. C- Go right ahead.

82. S- Would you care for a cigarette?

83. C- Thank you. (long pause)

84. S- To tell you the truth I don't know how to act in school any more. It's gotten me a little shaky.

85. C- You get kind of worried, you mean?

86. S- Yes, I do. Meeting new people. I've got - I think I've got an inferiority complex. I'm adjusted ------ but I have trouble meeting people. Like you, I was uneasy when I first walked in and I still have a certain amount of tension. People with authority, that is such as teachers, and that sort of thing and (coughs) your office here.

87. C-
This girl has come to a college counselor to talk over some personal problems. This is half way through the first session and the client is giving her interpretation of why she has always been a "quiet girl."

39. S- ....... and what it all is is a question of a kind of irrational fear. Do you want to know what it is?

40. C- If you would like to tell me.

41. S- My mother committed suicide -- (pause) one day when I was at school she turned on the gas at home. I was seven years at the time. (pause) Of course, I was just a child, and I don't suppose I understood the significance of what she did. I was scared and confused, of course, but I don't think it had any great effect on me. Nevertheless, it did tend to make me serious. So, I have never been able to talk about ... (eyes begin to water)...................It was.................. was..................it was..................oh God....

......my fault. (cries)

42. C-
This is a first interview with a female student. This is her first quarter at college. She began the interview with a general complaint about the bigness of the university and about the lack of concern which is shown for the individual. Just prior to this excerpt she has expressed concern about her choice of a major and her indecision as to future vocational plans.

67. S- I haven't really decided for sure....what to do....

68. C- Mm hm.

69. S- But...ah...I think one of the main things is....ah..to do something ...to be in a job where you can really help people.

70. C- Have you thought of any specific jobs along that line?

71. S- No.. well, yes.....I had thought about being a social worker. Of course, if I had the grades.... I think its really...really wonderful to be doing what you're doing. To...I mean..ah... really doing something to help people. I know how excited I was when I saw this movie about this person...girl who was all mixed up... and was, I guess you would call it a split-personality. She would be good one day and bad the next and.....didn't know what to do. And then she got help from this psychoanalyst. He hypnotized her....and found out what her problem was. I think she had to kiss her dead grandmother when she was very young... and she was so scared, I think that started her problem. But the psychoanalyst talked about her dreams and all...and finally she was cured. (pause) You are a psychoanalyst aren't you?

72. C-
This excerpt is toward the end of a second interview. The student has discussed his concern with making better grades and has reviewed some of the techniques which he has previously used in attempting to improve them. Most of the interview has dealt with course requirements and study skills.

188. C- Well, then for our next meeting next week, ah, should we ah, talk over the ah, pros and cons of this ah, pair of examinations that you have had between now and next Wednesday?

189. S- Uh-huh. Have them over with by that time.

190. C- Perhaps we can ah, gain some insight into ah, how these examinations work, because as of now, we haven't seen an examination in either of these two courses.

191. S- No, I was just wondering if ah, some people can go out and get drunk and take an examination and do good on it. I mean, I never tried it and I'm not going to, but I just wondered why some of them do that. One guy was very drunk.

192. C-
This is a first interview. The student is a sophomore in the college of Commerce. He describes himself as being a very slow reader. He says that he also has trouble following a time schedule because of the irregular demands of his part-time work in his family's business. Just prior to this excerpt he has been reviewing his performance in each of the courses required by his major.

108. C- How did you do in economics?

109. S- I didn't study very much. I started out...first quarter I flunked everything....second quarter I got D's...third quarter I got C's...I came back...and I got 2 C's and a B....and they let me stay in school. Then I got to make a 2 point this quarter or better.

110. C- Is this the quarter you have to make it?

111. S- Yes, should have made it last quarter.....but it was so close they let me stay.

112. C- Have you been able to figure out...what's ah...hindering you from making better grades?

113. S- Not exactly. Except that it seems to me that I am...just so nervous all the time....just a constant worry......and the doctor...I got sick.......my stomach wouldn't react right or anything...it just...I got sick for finals week..... It takes an awful lot for me to sit down and study.

114. C
This excerpt is later in the above interview. The student is
describing a recent quiz in Introductory Psychology.

175. S- Well...ah...the quiz is one of these...kind answer sheets...
and there's fifty questions...multiple choice...and...any one
of three answers could be right....but only one of five could
be right...there are two that are obviously wrong...the other
two must be slightly wrong because one's the right one....
Awfully tricky. The first quiz was tricky but the second one
wasn't quite so tricky. It was more straight facts.

176. C- Now what do you mean by a tricky question? How's a trick
question differ from an ordinary question?

177. S- Well now...now on these multiple choice..you...you were pretty
sure that....two of them are wrong. But...there's one of them
...of the other two......there's one, one of them that is more
right than the other one. But you don't know which one it is...
for sure. It could be one word in there that...throws the whole
meaning off. You must read it over and over.

178. C- In other words..ah...you have to read the thing carefully....to
find out what it means?

179. S- And even then you're.....even if you know the answer.......
you're liable...

180. C- Well, now is that a tricky question or is that just a question
that requires reading?

181. S- Careful reading, I guess, but I think you'll find...you'll find
that some of them are tricky. (Pause) It's a trick to get a
good grade on one of them. That's for sure. For me.

182. C-
In the third interview the same student has been discussing his use of time. He has mentioned how the frequent ringing of the telephone, his father's being ill, and other distractions made the following of a schedule difficult.

92. S- And those baseball games come up every week. (laugh) I'm right there. Couldn't help it, it was the Cleveland Indians.....But I know..I mean I...if...in the afternoon it turns up that I can study, I do. And in the evening I most always plan to study .....But somehow or other I just can't put down "study," and go and sit down and study. I mean I...have to more or less be in the mood to study or want to study before I'm going to do anything.

93. C- Mhmhm.

94. S- I know yesterday afternoon I wanted to and it was fine, I got a lot done. But ah..if somebody says this.."you've got to sit down and study," why it'd be about the last thing I'd do. I'd look like I was studying, but I....just, I just don't pay any attention to it.....

95. C-
This is the beginning of a first interview. It will be noted that the four following excerpts are taken from interviews with the same student.

1. C- I don't think that I know very much how you happened to come in -- I mean I don't know whether someone suggested you come see me or whether you had some things on your mind that you were disturbed about and wanted some help with.

2. S- I talked with Miss C.... at the Arts office and she suggested that I take the course. Then Dr. O.... told me I would see you, so I came.

3. C- That's how you came to take the course, because it was suggested to you.

4. S- Mm hm.

5. C- So I suppose that's why you came in to see me too. I mean that ---

6. S- Yes, Miss C.... suggested it to me. She didn't think my study habits were good. If they were good they didn't seem to be very beneficial on my grades and everything. So she thought that maybe if I'd get in this I'd learn better study habits and make better use of time and concentration, etc.

7. C-
Following a discussion of his reasons for taking the course in Effective Study, the student begins a review of his academic record.

23. S- Well, I don't know -- this past quarter I really did fall down and in the Spring quarter, I don't know I had such a load on my hands. I had an especially hard schedule. I don't know whether that pulled me down or what. My point ratio has fallen way down. I want to get it up real bad -- up where it was.

24. C- How high was your point ratio before this slump?

25. S- Mm, I think a -- mine was about a 2. It never was very good, I mean I want to get it up back to a 2 again. And this quarter I went way down to a 1.5 and the quarter before that about 1.7.

26. C- Mm Mmm.

27. S- So I want to get it up there again.

28. C-
At the beginning of the fifth interview the student has been reviewing some of his recent academic successes.

4. C- You feel that things are going pretty well.

5. S- Mm hm. And yesterday morning I went over and saw Mrs. C.... over at the dean's office and I brought my schedule for next quarter and she wants me to take another quarter in Fine Arts and then she thought genetics would be good for me (pause) history and appreciation of literature or something like that. It is 440 English. I don't know, I didn't know what to take, and I thought that I would go over and see her, so--that is what she advised. That--ah--genetics is 403 Zoology and I've had 401 and 402, and she thought that would make me a major in zoology and cause I like fine arts and because it uses both your hands and expression and everything, she thought that would help me. And this English literature would be more cultural than a direct help.

6. C- So you got a lot of suggestions from her?

7. S- Mm hm. That is what she advised me to take, and I don't know. (pause) Do you think college algebra is beneficial to a person. If it wouldn't be needed in your courses or anything, like, I know, I've had two quarters of physics that's 411 and 412 and there is a lot of math in there. I know it would have helped me in that but since I've taken that, I don't know whether it would be worth while to take a quarter of college algebra or not. In high school I had a great deal of difficulty with geometry and in algebra later on so I imagine I'll have a lot of difficulty with it, and I just wondered whether it would be beneficial or not, to take it.

8. C-
Later in the fifth interview the student has been telling of his confusion in making a vocational choice. A dentist whom he knows has encouraged his interest in that field.

70. C- So at the moment it is pretty difficult to know whether to try to follow that interest which he encouraged or to follow your uncle's idea or whether to follow the idea of the fellow's around home that think osteopathy would be good.

71. S- Mm hm.

72. C- And it is pretty hard out of all that to sort out what you really want and want to do, as opposed to what other people tell you you should do.

73. S- Mm hm. Well, I don't know, about music, my uncle, he is out here at City U., and he's head of education out there and he's also vice-pres. I guess, but anyhow he thought I ought to get in music so bad, my father runs a music store, and I've been around music all my life, well, I mean it's part of my background, and I play several different instruments. He just thought that's what I ought to go into, but I don't know, I just didn't see it as, as you know, music teacher. I just didn't see that as a vocation. But he thinks that I was just cut out to be a musician and that's what I ought to go into. (laugh) I don't know.

74. C-
This is a first interview with a male student. He has discussed some unhappy experiences he has had in dating and has expressed the fear that some of the old patterns may tend to repeat themselves.

84. C- The forces may still be there by themselves and still operating.

85. S- Well, that's the prospect that worries me a little bit. I'm always a little cautious about women (laughs). I always say, boy, you understand women. And then, afterwards I said, well, maybe you don't. So, I've always been a little cautious about it. And, this girl that I met up at school up there, she's very sincere, but (laughter) there's still this little idea, you know, that maybe you're going to get another fast shuffle. So, well, it's sort of a funny situation, but we were pinned. And, it was sort of a friendly pin, I mean, being unsettled like I was with the idea of getting pinned and then trying to see if things would work out. So, she went - she seemed hog wild on the deal.

86. C-
This is a second interview with the same student. He has discussed his relationships with girls extensively. For the most part these relationships have remained ambivalent and unclear. Just prior to the following excerpt he has been discussing a recent break-up and his subsequent "hurt pride."

80. S- Here's--ah--here's ah-the question that is something that has been bothering me. Ah--I--it might be classified as being conceited, but I don't know why I have the feeling at times when I walk down the street that people are looking at me--I don't know exactly what kind of a---especially females.

81. C- Mm Hm.

82. S- I have two aunts and all I used to hear about when I used to go out there to see them was what a fine boy I was and they used to introduce me around to all their friends and all that kind of stuff. And, I mean, I was wondering if that had any effect on me as far as, I feel that females are watching me when I walk down the street. Of course, they're actually not, probably. I mean, It's conceit or something, I think.

83. C-
The client is a first year graduate student in education and is working towards his master's degree. Since his graduation from college he has spent one year in elementary teaching. He has been receiving counseling at the university counseling center. There he has discussed his anxieties, his fear of failure in graduate school, and the loss of prestige which he has experienced in returning to school. The following excerpt is from the fifth interview. The student is trying to recall something which the counselor had previously said which seemed to "hit close to home."

120. S- You said it---and that seemed to be--I had the feeling that that's it.

121. C- Uh huh. Did it have to do with the feeling that maybe by your going into high school teaching that maybe you were running away? By wanting to prove to yourself that you could succeed in elementary---wasn't that the---

122. S- It was around there, I think-- around in there--I don't know if I can say that it was something--that maybe I felt that I wasn't living up to the expectations I set for myself. Now I don't know whether I had set them for myself or whether others had set them for me. I think that it was what I had set for myself.

123. C-
This excerpt is taken from the middle of the same interview described above. The client has discussed his self doubts and wonders if he can succeed in the teaching field. He is discussing his future goals and his desires to earn a doctorate.

132. S- And-ah-it seemed as I have mentioned before, that I have always visualized myself as eventually attaining that.

133. C- Uh huh.

134. S- And now I don't feel that I have the ability to get a Ph.D., and so I've had to lower my goal. 'Well, I told myself that I'd have to lower my goals, but I don't think I sold myself on it, and that may be where the trouble is.'

135. C-
This excerpt comes early in the sixth interview with the same student. He begins by saying that he can't think of much to talk about and has been considering termination. He is now evaluating the results of his counseling.

16. S—-ah—I feel that what—ah—we've done here has helped.

17. C—Um hm.

18. S—Now it would be just a matter of going over the same ground again. I think that I can more or less—well, I've clarified things in my own mind—to a degree now where I think I can—uh—rely on myself—uh—more than previously.

19. C—You feel—at this point—you really don't need any particular help toward moving along—that you've reached a point where you can handle things. (pause)

20. S—I hope so. I mean—uh—as I say—I'm afraid of this sort of thing becoming more of a—a crutch—and so that—and saying, "well, you don't have to worry about fighting it yourself—why—you can just go and pour out your troubles to the counselor."

21. C—
This is a first interview with a male student. He has reviewed his academic performance for his for his first two quarters. He has a C- average.

41. S- But...somehow it....I don't really think grades are the problem. I mean....Sure, if I could get them up...That's what I want to do. But.....

42. C- There seems to be something more important....than grades.

43. S- I think it's most....Well, for one thing there's that bunch in the dorm. I don't know how anyone could study in that place.

44. C- It's pretty bad.....

45. S- Yeah, it's really bad a lot of the time. One of the worst....What makes me maddest....they're always starting arguments. You can't say anything but they're trying to make a big deal out of it. I don't know how anyone could when they're trying to make you mad all the time.

46. C-
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