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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In many counselor education programs the practicum, hopefully, is the culminating experience toward which previous didactic courses are directed. It is therefore of little surprise to acknowledge that the practicum program, at least in theory, has assumed a central position in the process of educating school counselors (Kirk, 1956; Cantrell, 1958, 1958, Norris, 1960; Munger and Johnson, 1960; Patterson, 1964; Sorenson, 1966). While the practicum experience has been viewed ideally as the central focus of counselor education programs, supervision has been identified as the major practicum activity.

Evidence for this major emphasis in the literature on supervision within the practicum setting can be seen from the increased support for the assignment of supervised counseling practice to a central position in school counselor education. Both the American Personnel and Guidance Association Policy Statement (1961) and the American Psychological Association Division 17 Statement (1952) on counselor education accord a major position to supervised practice. It is worthy to note that the APGA Statement calls for supervised practice ". . . to consume
approximately one-fourth of the entire counselor education program . . . ," while an earlier APA statement on counselor training states that, "The practicum is in some respects the most important phase of the whole process of training in counseling." Further support for supervised experience is provided by the Wrenn Report (1962), The American Personnel and Guidance Association Statement of Policy (1964), the Standards for Counselor Education developed by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (1964), and the Statement of Policy and Guidelines published by the American School Counselors Association (1964).

It has also been generally acknowledged in the literature, that supervisor-trainee interaction has exerted a greater influence on what practicum counselors learned than the number and variety of counselees with which they counseled or the intensity and duration of their work with counselees (Patterson, 1964; Pierson, 1965; Blane, 1968).

In sum, supervision, as the key practicum activity and the greatest potential influence on counselor learning, has been considered one of the cornerstones to the counselor education process, if not its foundation (Altucher, 1967).

It would seem important, therefore, to examine the nature of the supervisor-trainee interaction in order to further facilitate its potential to maximize the candidate's effectiveness.
Studies on the nature of supervision, while reflecting divergent points of view, generally acknowledge two major supervisor-trainee interactive aspects, namely, the relationship and the didactic dimension (Patterson, 1964; Hansen, 1965; Lister, 1966). This duality of supervisory character has been aptly noted by Miller and Oetting (1966):

Supervision is a relationship between two people, but one in which the student feels he is, in some respects, at the mercy of the supervisor. The student needs to feel that the supervisor values him as a person and as a counselor. He feels a strong need for active and continuing support. He also feels a need for structure. He wants the supervisor to be clear and specific, to evaluate the counseling effort and to make recommendations that he can follow (p. 74).

Relatively little research, on the other hand, has investigated the specific components of the supervisory interaction (didactic-relationship dimensions) and their reciprocating effects, that is, the convergence of supervisory didactic elements as they interact within the climate of the supervisor-trainee relationship. Greater understanding of the assumed relationship between both components could result in more effective training techniques and ultimately, more effective counselors.

This investigation then is an attempt to further explore possible connections between supervisory activity, notably the interview analysis, and the quality of the supervisory relationship.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to examine practicum supervisor-trainee perceptions of interview behavior and to determine the degree to which those perceptions were related to supervisor-trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

Questions

The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the nature of the perceived interview behavior between supervisor and trainee?
2. What is the nature of the perceived supervisory relationship between practicum supervisors and trainees?
3. What relationships, if any, accrue between perceptions of interview behavior and perceptions of the supervisory relationship of practicum supervisors and their respective counselor trainees?

Significance of the Study

The significance of practicum supervision and its impact upon trainee learning has been noted. It would seem that efforts to improve supervisory practicum could facilitate counselor effectiveness. To improve practicum supervision, however, suggests a need to understand the essential variables that constitute the essence of supervision. While critics are by no means in agreement as to the nature of
practicum supervision, there appears to be a general consensus that it is a communication process between supervisor and trainee characterized by the substance of the interaction (exchanging information, helping the trainee develop his skills and resources, and assessing progress), and the medium through which that substance transpires, namely, the face-to-face relationship.

While fitting and operational descriptors of the essence of supervision continue to evolve and fluctuate, empirical data on supervision also tends to be at a dissonance. Peters and Hansen (1963) noted that the large majority of writing devoted to counselor supervision concerned itself with techniques and procedures.

Cash and Munger, in the 1966 Review of Educational Research, found that very little basic or empirical research had been conducted in supervision in the preceding three year period. Whiteley in the 1969 Review of Educational Research found that most research approaches have centered on some effects of global supervisor interactions upon trainee perceptions and upon supervisor-trainee expectations.

Finally while an increasing number of relationship studies have been undertaken (Rogers, 1957; Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Hansen, 1963; Hansen and Barker, 1964; Carkhuff and Traux, 1966; Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Carkhuff, 1968), few connections have been made between
the relationship as a medium of supervision and the substance of supervision it encompasses.

From this brief resume of the literature and research on supervision, it appeared that there was a need for the present study. The data would contribute to a further understanding of the components of supervision. With the availability of such data, it was anticipated that counselor educators would be able to improve supervisory practice and ultimately improve the effectiveness of counselor candidates under their charge.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study was limited to four volunteer counselor supervisors and twenty volunteer trainees at a single university.

2. Two supervisors and ten trainees were working with continuing (third quarter) NDEA Institute practicum programs. The remaining two supervisors and ten trainees were working with the initiating (first four weeks) half of their practicum session.

3. The study focused on the verbal-nonverbal behavior of counselors as measured by the Counselor-Client Behavior Analysis Instrument (henceforth referred to as CCBA) and the relationship qualities between supervisors and their trainees as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.
4. Identification of relationship qualities as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory was taken upon completion of each of the supervisory sessions.

5. All interviews were held in an on-campus practicum laboratory and were video taped behind one-way mirrors.

6. Coding of counselor interview behaviors as measured by the CCBA system was limited to twenty (20) video taped observations of twenty (20) subjects enlisted in the study.

7. Each interview ranged from twenty to forty minutes in length, and approximately twenty to thirty minutes of counselor behavior was coded from each of the video taped sessions.

8. Orientation in the use of the CCBA System was provided by this investigator and was given to both practicum groups and their supervisors. Instruction totaled approximately nine hours.

9. Students interviewed by trainees represented both sexes from seventh grade through seniors in college.

Definition of Terms

Instrument Terminology

A. The Counselor-Client Behavior Analysis Training Instrument (CCBA):

Communicative Events—Communicative events in this study can be defined as a sequence or cycle of counselor-client responses, specifically messages, interactions, and
relationships, which are related to a perceived counselor or client subrole or subroles and which are separated or set off from preceding and succeeding sequences of events by naturally occurring boundaries. An event would suggest a specific time dimension (short or long) in that it is an occurrence or functional act designated by such shifts as: (1) a variation or change in direction of a counselor or client's communicative verbal-nonverbal behavior, (2) a change in the counselor's or client's behavior toward a new interaction, (3) the occurrence of a significant or potent act which appears influential, and (4) social intervention in which an interruption is initiated by either a counselor or a counselee.

Interactions—Interactions refer to reciprocal verbal-nonverbal communicative responses between counselor and client.

Nonverbal Behavior—Nonverbal behavior in this study will refer to overt action, gestures, postures, positions, and facial expressions by either pupils or counselors. The term also includes intonation, volume and character of vocal expression as opposed to content of verbal message.

Relationship Quality—Expanding and Contracting: Relationship quality will refer to the climate communicated by counselor or client as inferred through observable verbal-nonverbal behaviors. Relationship quality as employed in the CCBA Instrument will be viewed from two
dimensions:

a. **Expanding** relationship quality will refer to that communicative verbal-nonverbal climate which tends to foster a positive, open or accepting atmosphere.

b. **Contracting** relationship quality will refer to that communicative verbal-nonverbal climate which tends to foster a negative, closed or restraining atmosphere.

**Subrole**--Subrole will refer to an adjudged response or a set of responses (verbal-nonverbal) which describe the counselors or counselees general purpose or intention. Subrole differs from specific counselor or counselee response in that it is more encompassing in terms of what it is that the counselor-counselee is broadly trying to accomplish for a particular period of time during the interview. Thus the specific nature of the counselor-client response may vary, but if they have a general commonality of purpose, they fall under the category of subrole.

B. The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory:

**Level of Regard**--Level of regard refers to the overall level or tendency of one person's affective response to another. It is the composite "loading" of all the distinguishable feeling reactions of one person to another.

**Empathic Understanding**--Empathic understanding refers to the extent to which one person is conscious of the immediate awareness of another. It is a condition of
being one with another.

**Congruence**—Congruence is that quality which may best be described as being at one with one's self, that is, congruence is the absence of conflict or inconsistency between one's primary experience, one's conscious awareness, and one's overt communication.

**Unconditionality of Regard**—Unconditionality of regard refers to that condition which leads to receiving another as he is and being able to reveal this to that person.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter I of this study included an introductory statement, a statement of the problem, questions to be dealt with, a brief discussion of the significance of the study, an indication of the limitations of the study, a definition of terms, and an outline of the total organization of the study.

Chapter II of this study contains a selected review of research relevant to the topic of this study.

Chapter III provides a description of the instruments employed in the study, procedures used, and the statistical treatment of the data.

Chapter IV presents the results and discussion of the investigation.

Chapter V includes the summary, conclusions, and implications of the investigation.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Several dimensions of the supervisor-trainee interaction have been noted, namely, the instructional-like encounter and the relationship in and from which that encounter ensues. This present study chose to investigate these two facets of supervision. Specifically, the possible influences of supervisor-trainee perceptions of counselor candidates interview behavior (as the key supervised encounter activity), to supervisor-trainee perceptions of their respective supervisory relationship climate.

This particular research emphasis on practicum supervision appears to be somewhat unique. Studies in the last three years have concentrated their focus in three broad areas, namely, supervisor's expectations and perceptions of their role, perceptions and expectations that counselors have of their supervisors, and the relating of change in supervisee behavior to the approaches to supervision (Whiteley, 1969).

In the area of interpersonal relationships, most of the research is related to the counseling relationship. Implications from these studies on the counseling relation-
ship and their application to supervision, however, can be made.

The research to be reviewed in this study will be conducted in the following areas: (1) the nature of the supervisory relationship and (2) the impact of supervision on trainee learning.

**Nature of the Supervisory Relationship**

The relationship established between a counselor and his client has received more priority than counseling techniques (Rogers, 1961 and 1962; Arbuckle, 1963 and 1965; Carkhuff and Traux, 1966; Kell and Mueller, 1966; Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). Rogers (1957) has discussed what he considered the necessary and sufficient conditions for a helping relationship. These conditions include: (1) the therapist must be "congruent" in the relationship, (2) the therapist must experience unconditional positive regard for his client, (3) the therapist must experience an empathic understanding of the client's internal frame of reference, and (4) the therapist must communicate both his empathic understanding and his unconditional positive regard to the client and the client must perceive these.

Barrett-Lennard (1962) conducted a study to show the effect of the counselor variables represented by Roger's necessary and sufficient conditions. It was hypothesized that each of five aspects of the therapist's attitudes and responses, as experienced by his client, are influential in
the process of therapeutic change. Two variables include: "level of regard" and "unconditionality of regard" (divisions of the concept of unconditional positive regard). The three other variables are "empathic understanding" "congruence," and "willingness to be known."

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

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

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

To test these hypotheses, Barrett-Lennard developed a questionnaire called the Relationship Inventory which measured the five therapist dimensions. These Relationship Inventory scores were then compared with measures of client change and with therapist expertness. The obtained results supported both of the experimental hypotheses in four of the five variables. Empathic understanding, level of regard, unconditionality of regard, and congruence were each significant at the .01 level. In a subsequent revision of the inventory, the "willingness to be known" variable was deleted. It was also found that the better adjusted a client is upon entering therapy, the more liking and respect he perceives in his therapist's response to him and the more secure and integrated or congruent his therapist appears to him.

Barrett-Lennard makes the following interpretations from the results: The results of a split-half reliability assessment and inter-correlation of the relationship scales are consistent with viewing each measure as a distinct aspect of the perceived relationship. Support of the first hypothesis is interpreted theoretically to mean that four of
the relationship measures, from the client's perception, are indices of primary change-producing influences. Support of the second hypothesis implies that constructive personality change depends on how much the therapist's actual response causes his client to experience him as empathically understanding, congruent, and positive and unconditional in his regard. This study lends strong support to Rogers' theoretical formulations of the effect of counselor's attitudes on the nature of the relationship and the effect of this relationship in producing positive therapeutic changes.

Other more recent studies have pointed out the efficaciousness of the "helping relationship." Truax (1966) and Carkhuff (1967) have indicated that therapists have (level three or more) in communicating the helping conditions, that is, empathy, warmth, and genuineness, are effective because they themselves are personally more potent reinforcers and because they elicit positive effect in their clients. By contrast, therapists who are low (level two or less) in communicating these facilitative conditions are less effective and produce negative or deteriorative change in their clients.

As in the Truax and Carkhuff studies, Kell and Mueller (1966) also attest to the potency of a relationship to positively or negatively influence another's behavior. Since these authors believe that the essence of therapeutic change lies in the interaction between counselor and client,
the therapists and client's relationship must be examined in light of the communicative interaction: "... the value of a close relationship is only potentially therapeutic because the intensity of a relationship can at once be its strength and its weakness. The potency of a relationship resides in the commitment and affective involvement of the client and his counselor" (p. 20).

From studies like the preceding ones, there is a substantial body of evidence growing to indicate that a central core of facilitative conditions exist which can elicit the greatest client process involvement and ultimately the greatest constructive gains (Carkhuff, 1966).

These findings, have serious implications for all interpersonal relationships, including the practicum supervisory one. In general, the facilitating conditions indicate that persons at higher levels of functioning (level three or more) can help persons at lower levels (level two or less) to achieve higher levels (Paget, Carkhuff, and Berenson, 1967; Carkhuff, 1968a). In turn, Carkhuff (1968b) maintains that persons at lower levels are not likely to have significantly facilitative effect upon persons at higher levels. In addition, Carkhuff's (1968a) research indicates that extended contacts with retarding individuals who are significant power sources in the relationship, that is, those designated as "more knowing," account for the
deteriorative effects found in the "less knowing" persons:

At "minimally facilitative levels," the "more knowing" person demonstrates an ability to be "with" the "less knowing" person, to be able to share his experiences fully, and to be able to communicate this understanding with respect. . . . At less than minimally facilitative levels (level two or less) the "more knowing" person, due to distortions of his own perceptions and communications . . . communicates a lack of respect, understanding, and genuineness. Here, on empathy, the "more knowing" persons' communications will . . . continually subtract from those of the "less knowing" person (p. 253).

The direct implication of the preceding research for practicum supervisors are as follows:

1. It cannot be assumed that supervisors, as the "more knowing" persons, are functioning at minimally facilitative levels in their vital relationships with the "less knowing" trainees.

2. Interpersonal learning resulting from supervisor-trainee interaction can have a constructive or destructive consequence for the trainee.

3. High level functioning supervisors can assume, early in their supervisory encounter, that an effective communication process with high-level supervisees.

4. With low-level functioning candidates, the supervisor must make a greater effort to build communication by increasing the trainees' interpersonal skills.

5. The low-level functioning supervisor cannot do anything with either the high-or-low level functioning trainee and both high-and-low level functioning-trainees
deteriorate in their level of functioning with him. "The pattern of the low-level functioning person over counseling and therapy, and, we believe all interpersonal learning experiences is, over time, . . . one of continuous deterioration of the levels of the conditions which he offers" (Carkhuff, 1968a, p. 255).

If one accepts the preceding data, it can readily be seen that supervisors in the low ranges (levels 1 and 2) offer very little prospect for gain to his candidate. Furthermore, his longer term relationship with higher level trainees promise some deterioration for the supervisee. The higher level supervisors (levels 3 and 4) offer great prospect for gain and, at the minimum, offer little opportunity for harmful effects.

Having studied the differential effects of high and low functioning helpers, Carkhuff (1968a) notes implications for the effect of: (a) the role model which the higher level person presents for more effective functioning and (b) the lower level person's experience. Specifically, Carkhuff (1968a) indicates that "we must work . . . toward higher level programs in which . . . differential attention and treatment is accorded the individual student" (p. 259). Translated into supervisory practice, one could suggest that practicum supervisors ought to attend to the particular level of the trainee's psychological development, that is, how he interacts with supervisees may be influenced
mainly by the candidates level of personal functioning. Hogan (1964) also believes that supervision needs to be appropriate to the level of development in the candidate. The author then goes on to discuss four levels of development in the trainee and the models of supervision appropriate to each level.

The preceding studies seem to suggest that the relationship between two parties is a major factor in facilitating growth. Patterson (1964) noted that supervision, while not therapy, should be, like all human relationships, therapeutic:

The supervisory relationship should be one in which the student is not threatened, but is accepted, respected and understood, so that he may be free to analyze and explore his relationships with his clients and to modify and grow in such relationships (p. 53).

Traux, Carkhuff, and Douds (1964) see the relationship as an essential part of any training program:

Central to the program is the interaction of trainee and supervisor. The supervisor in his interaction with the trainee attempts to provide the therapeutic conditions of empathic understanding, non-possessive warmth and transparency, so as to facilitate self-exploration on the part of the trainee (p. 244).

Hansen (1965) found that although trainees do not expect the atmosphere and conditions that educators deem necessary in a good supervisory relationship, they actually experienced much better relationships than they had expected. This shows that supervisors can and do provide the conditions necessary for a productive relationship (high
level of regard, congruence, empathic understanding, and unconditional regard). Hansen, however, feels that the trainees' lack of a clear-cut understanding of the nature of the supervision is a widespread source of distorted expectations of the supervisory relationship. Although it is hard for the trainee to understand the nature of supervision, supervisors should attempt to prepare the trainee in some way for such a relationship.

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

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

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

In the preceding section, we have attempted to review one dimension of the supervisor-trainee interaction, namely, the relationship element. A review of the literature reveals that the effectiveness of supervision would seem to depend in large measure upon the atmosphere (relationship quality) within which the supervision occurs. As Hansen (1965) has aptly phrased it:

The essence of supervision then comes in the conference between the trainee and the supervisor as they discuss the client, the trainee's counseling skills, his sensibility and understanding. In the supervisory relationship, significant learning may take place as the supervisor tries to clarify what meaning an experience has for the trainee and attempts to clarify that experience for himself and the trainee. Supervision is instructional, but it goes beyond that; it is focused on the personal feelings of the trainee (p. 75).

This next section shall review the research pertinent to the impact of practicum supervision on trainee learning.
Implications that supervisor-trainee perceptions of supervisory activities might be related to a measure of the quality of their respective relationship can be made.

**Impact of Supervision on Trainee Learning**

Weitz (1957), in referring to the counseling process, considers that the structure of the counselor and clients' personalities and the way these qualities are communicated will have a marked influence on the interaction. The counselor's personality traits in particular and the way these are communicated to his client are said to determine the effectiveness of the counselor. Transposed to the supervisory interaction process, one might conclude that the supervisor's personality traits (rather than his theoretical orientation or style) and the ways these are communicated, albeit interview analysis activity, et al., determine his effectiveness with the trainee.

Arbuckle's (1967) reference to counselor [supervisor] interactive influence aligns with Weitz's proposition, namely, that the kind and the purpose of change would appear to be determined more by the counselor [supervisor] than by any particular "kind" of counseling [supervising]. The various "kinds" of counseling [supervision] that have been described in the literature appear to be relatively meaningless and are probably more representative of the person who is involved in counseling [supervision] than they are of a unique and different system of counseling [supervising] (p. 222).
Significant qualities of that person are then summed up in the term "humanness":

... the kind of counseling [supervising] might be more generally described by the degree of humanness to which the counselor [supervisor] subscribes—the extent to which the humanness of the counselor [supervisor] and client [trainee] is the major factor in the relationship. What the counselor [supervisor] does, his techniques, his method, his various procedures, would be important only in the sense that they are reflective of the person of the [supervisor] counselor, and his objectives (p. 224).

Lister (1964), Shoben (1962), like Weitz (1957) and Arbuckle (1967), also view personality, built upon past experiences, as the key variable from which to view change. Lister (1964) notes that:

Each beginning counselor [supervisor] has spent years formulating, testing, and modifying hypotheses about himself and others and the nature of the world in which he lives ... [consequently] the counselor's [supervisor's] personal theory refers to the hypotheses he has come to view as reliable guides to personally effective and satisfying human relations. Although many such hypotheses are largely implicit and inarticulate, they nevertheless constitute patterns for counseling [supervisory] behavior (p. 209).

Lister then goes on to note a way of explaining "personal theories." Using the Combs (1961) perceptual framework, personal theories may be studied in terms of:

(1) general frame of reference, (2) perception of others, (3) perception of self, (4) perception of the helping task, and (5) perceptions of appropriate methods for helping.

It might be noted that this present study utilizes perceptual data as measured by a relationship inventory
and by an interview analysis system along items two through four (perceptions of self, others, and the helping task). Lister (1964), however, feels that "regardless of the conceptual framework used for studying personal theory, there is little doubt that it significantly influences the behavior of the beginning counselor" (p. 210).

Walz and Roeber (1962), on the other hand, identified a wide range of supervisory behavior and indicated that no two supervisors reacted to the same pattern of counselor/client statements or used similar wording or meaning in their statements. Such findings raise inquiries about the cause of trainee learning.

In a study reported by Stewart (1958), practicum counselors were encouraged to develop their own approach to counseling. Stewart stressed that there were no "inducements, course requirements or variables identified or discussed" that would stimulate counselors to emulate their supervisor's approach to counseling (p. 275). Practicum counselors, nonetheless, were more like their supervisors, in terms of the counseling approach, at the end of the practicum experience than they were when it began. Change in counselor counseling orientation was attributed by Stewart to the influence of supervisors. Once again, however, there was no indication of specific causative factors such as relationship, personality, orientation, or strategy variables.
Demos and Zuwaylif (1962) studied the nature of responses that trainees used in their interview behavior as related to supervisors' counseling orientation, namely, (1) client-centered, (2) eclectic, and (3) directive. It appeared that the influence of one's supervisor, regardless of his orientation, affected trainees similarity, but not to the same degree. As a group, all counselors were less evaluative, less supportive, less probing, and more understanding and interpretive. The counselors of the client-centered supervisor were found to be significantly more understanding in their responses than were both counselors of eclectic and directive. However, movement by all the counselors, despite the theoretical position of supervisors, was essentially in the same direction. Thus the supervisor's general influence, apart from his theoretical style, was noted as significant.

There are some suggestions that behaviors ensuing from various interpersonal interactions are related to the relationship dimension.

Gysbers (1964), for example, hypothesizes that "the effectiveness of counselor candidates interview behavior is a function of the amount of threat he perceives is present in . . . supervisor-candidate relationships" (p. 149). Gysbers feels that this hypothesis has implications for supervisory methodology in terms of the strategies a supervisor employs to help trainees understand and accept
themselves as persons. The supervisory relationship must have an atmosphere of mutual trust, in which the two persons can communicate about the trainee's needs and behavior. He feels that the degree to which this relationship exists is directly related to the amount of trainee self-understanding and acceptance that will occur, and that as a trainee's self-understanding and acceptance increases, his counseling interview behavior will also improve.

Grater's (1964) and Bordin's (1955) studies on counselor-client interaction also have implications for supervisee change as a function of his relationship with supervisor.

Grater (1964) examined client preferences for affective or cognitive counselor characteristics and initial interview behavior. The hypothesis that clients preferring affective counselor characteristics would differ from clients preferring cognitive counselor characteristics with respect to their focus on a discussion of personal-social problems during the initial interview was tested in this study. The preference of 86 clients were determined prior to the first session by use of an adjective check list (Cognitive-Affective Inventory). Following the initial interview, the counselor completed a form and indicated whether the session was primarily personal-social or educational-vocational. A chi-square analysis was employed to determine if first-interview behavior of the Cognitive-
Preference Group and Affective-Preference group differed. The difference between groups was significant at the .01 level. Clients preferring affective counselor characteristics focused more on personal-social discussions than those clients preferring cognitive counselor characteristics. Grater's study does suggest that client focus on problems is to some degree a function of the extent to which the counselor is perceived as possessing interpersonal relationship qualities such as warmth, friendliness, and acceptance.

Grater's results are consistent with earlier findings reported by Bordin (1955). Bordin concluded that clients who come expecting to talk about personal problems and about themselves . . . will be likely to see more personal characteristics of the counselor as an important part of the process (p. 20).

Both studies indicate that behavioral changes (type of discourse) were apparently a function of client perceptions of his relationship with the counselor.

Altucher (1967) suggests that a trainee's problems in learning how to counsel can in reality be a reflection of the supervisory relationship:

Whenever repeated attempts to explore the counselor's difficulties with clients lead up predictable blind alleys, it is probable that the difficulty lies in the relationship between counselor and supervisor. In the circumstance discussed earlier, where the counselor is chronically unaware of his repeated errors and, in fact, sees nothing wrong with his behavior, and where the supervisor has encountered repeated frustration in his efforts to help him gain
greater awareness, it can be reasonably expected that the main source of difficulty lies in their relationship (p. 336).

To accept the Altucher assumption would give added weight to this investigator's research efforts. Should the supervisor-trainee activity in interview analysis be one of estrangement, possibly fewer agreements for example, it would follow that the indifferences or alienations would in reality reflect supervisor-trainee relationship discords. Altucher notes (1967) that concerns about supervision would not ordinarily be expressed directly, but take on a variety of indirect forms such as

beating the supervisor to the punch by being overly critical of oneself or trying to outguess him. Passive acquiescence and acceptance of everything the supervisor says is particularly common. This may have a semblance of reality for the beginner in that there are things he realistically cannot be expected to know. In addition it may fit in with any tendency on the part of the supervisor to be an expert or impress his supervisor with his knowledge (p. 169).

In any event, the important realization is that "some complementary version of the difficulty is being experienced by the counselor in the counseling relationship" (p. 169).

The idea that behavior is the result of how things seem to the behaver is a common dictum of perceptual psychologists. As an advocate of this school, Arbuckle (1965) notes that the way a person reacts [for example, supervisor-trainee in interview analysis activity] is ultimately based on the person's own perceptions of the relationship.
In an attempt to assess some of the important variables of trainee perceptions toward supervisors, a group of fifteen graduate students were asked to respond to a questionnaire regarding reasons for their pleasure or displeasure ensuing from a supervisory session (Miller and Oetting, 1966). Responses were classified into four variables: (1) the personality of the supervisor, (2) the supervisor's attitude toward his student, (3) the supervisor's professional competence and ability to be specific, and (4) the ability of the student to communicate his feelings to the supervisor.

It should be noted that the first three variables seem closely related to the relationship-instructional dimensions of supervision. The good personality characteristics were described as: "non-threatening," "tactful," "non-authoritarian," and "possessing a good sense of humor." Good attitudinal characteristics included: "supportive," "reassuring," "understanding and accepting," "expressed confidence in the student," and "made him feel at ease."

The latter variable, ability of student to communicate his feeling to the supervisor, acknowledges that a successful interaction is a two-way process and that ultimately responses are derived from one's perceptions of the situation at hand.

Immediate perceptions of the interaction characteristics would seem significant. Johnston and Gysbers (1967)
list some prescribed and ascribed boundary conditions to be considered within the supervisory content. Under "prescribed" characteristics, the supervisory process is established within the confines of an academic course which lasts for a prescribed time, carries credit, and if influenced by the expectations of students, counselor educators, and the institution. Any supervisory relationship, according to Johnston and Gysbers, must be developed within these confines.

Other characteristics classified as "ascribed" are said to "lend a distinctive character to the supervisory relationship" (Johnston and Gysbers, 1967, p. 336). These features include: threat, diagnosis, perception, instruction, and development. An instructional feature of supervision includes evaluation and as such must be considered a constructive or detrimental part of the relationship. Evaluation also presupposes diagnosis or analysis of counselor capabilities. To the extent that the supervisor must assess the trainee strengths and liabilities, the supervisor's role is diagnostic. Diagnosis, in turn, is founded on the supervisor's perception of the counselor's capabilities and as such can "seldom be objective." Furthermore, the meaning attached to the counselor's behavior by the supervisor depends on the "supervisor's past experiences" (Johnston and Gysbers, 1967, p. 337). The behavior will be seen in varying degrees of importance, none of which may he "ignored or
seen as meaningless" (Johnston and Gysbers, 1967, p. 337).

Finally, unless the supervisor simply stamps a candidate qualified or not qualified, the relationship is also instructional and developmental, that is, the supervisor must "help the candidate to perceive the direction in which growth is expected" (Johnston and Gysbers, 1967, p. 337). Hopefully, interaction between supervisor and trainee will "modify behavioral repertoires of both the supervisor and the counselor candidate and result in the formation of new perceptions" to facilitate counselor improvement in his counseling behavior (Johnston and Gysbers, 1967, p. 337).

It has been previously noted in section one of this chapter that Carkhuff (1967) and Traux and Carkhuff (1967) has shown that effective psychotherapy is contingent, at least in part, on the person's perception of the important other ("more knowing") as empathic, congruent, and having non-possessive warmth. In an effort to confirm this finding by utilizing the methodology of feedback, Reddy (1969) presented thirty-six male volunteer students to simulated films and asked them to respond to appropriate steps as empathically as they would if they were the therapist. Subjects of the immediate feedback group were immediately rated by their supervisors on an empathy scale, and these ratings were relayed immediately to the subjects. A second group followed the same procedure but received results in a delayed fashion. A third control group received no feedback. A
high empathy response was defined in terms of a subject's responding to a client's full range of feeling in their exact intensity (Traux, 1961).

Results of the study showed that by giving feedback to subjects, they learned the verbal tools of making empathic statements. Subjects in the immediate group were reported to have responded more completely than the delayed or the control group at a significantly higher level of empathy.

Implications of the study suggest that the most intensive perceptual changes in students occurred as a result of wanting to please the supervisor in which case, supervisor personality, attitude, professional competence, relationship, and communicative skill variables (Miller and Oetting, 1966, Arbuckle, 1967, Lister, 1965; Shoben, 1962; Hansen, 1967) may have been significant. Likewise, expectations (students, supervisors, institutional), and the diagnosis and evaluation role (Johnston and Gysbers, 1967) would also seem to be important contributing considerations. In addition (Traux and Carkhuff, 1967), state that one of the keys to the successful use of empathy may well be in the trainee's attentiveness upon the client. Supervisors' instructional-relationship interaction requiring students to attend to people seems to be relevant. Smith (1966) found that the more training that requires students to attend to people, the more effective will be their judgments. Ivey
et al. (1968) found that utilizing micro-counseling techniques, attending behavior could be taught and integrated by the students as "real interaction" (p. 10). Knower (1945) found a correlation of .55 between the ability to perceive feelings and to accurately express those feelings.

The utilization of media devices, particularly video tape, must also be contended with as a behavioral influence with or without the intervention of supervision.

Kagan, Krathwohl, and Miller (1963), for example, employed video tape in an interpersonal process recall methodology. Through didactic encounters with interrogators and playbacks of their interviews, subjects were encouraged to describe their feelings, interpret statements, and translate body movements. Observing one's self in various interpersonal tactics with the help of a skilled interrogator enabled the subjects "to reveal at length and in depth much of the subtle or semi-conscious meanings in the interview" (p. 239).

Thorensen (1966) also noted the mediating influence on perceptions of video playback and supervisory intervention. Seven college instructors viewed, with a counselor, video-taped excerpts of their own classroom discussion sessions. Instructors reported that video-playback counseling was very helpful in changing their behaviors in the classroom and that they became more aware of how verbal and nonverbal cues influence student behaviors.
In a 1963 study, Walz and Johnson were concerned with changes in counselor self perception as a result of viewing their video taped interviews. As a measure of self-perception, an interview check list was filled out by the subjects (independent codings by trainees, clients, and supervisors) after an interview and again after viewing the interview on video tape. From this study, the following conclusions were formulated: (1) changes in perception accompanied viewing a video tape of one's interview; (2) the perceptual changes seemed to include counselors' greater confidence in their interviewing, greater awareness of personal qualities, increased desire for self-study, and less counselor positive description of themselves; (3) change was more in the direction of the supervisor's perception than the client's, and (4) personality variables may be predictive of the impact video viewing has on a given individual.

Several interesting implications of the preceding study seem pertinent: (1) Unlike the Kagan et al. (1963), and Thorensen (1966) studies, perceptual changes did not result from supervisory intervention, and (2) lacking the mediating influence of supervisors, counselors moved more in the direction of the supervisor's perceptions than the client's perceptions of the interview.

In order to determine the effects of didactic and experimental treatments on sensitivity to non-verbal cues, sixteen graduate students were asked to rate filmed
emotional scenes (Delaney and Heimann, 1966). The didactic group sensitization was characterized by a formal teacher-student relationship with little opportunity given for teacher-student interaction and no opportunity for student-to-student interaction. The study for the didactic group was directed exclusively to the study of emotional cues in others. The results of the experiment demonstrated that this group changed in their perceptions of the person communicating non-verbal cues.

The experimental group sensitization was characterized by an informal atmosphere with ample opportunity for student-leader and student-to-student interaction. The study of non-verbal cues was directed toward the cues as communicated by oneself, leading to exploration and discussion of these communications by the group as a whole. This experiment tended to show that the group changed in their perceptions of the emotions communicated by non-verbal means.

It is therefore conceivable to expect to be able to prepare counselors to codify and interpret emotions communicated non-verbally but, unfortunately, it is not clear whether the resultant changes ensued from the kind of treatment, or the focus of the treatment. If the experimental group, for example, was directed to a study of emotional cues in others, would results differ?
In another study utilizing the media of video tape, Poling (1968) sought to examine three possible critique situations. Each of the ten counselors enrolled in a first level counseling practicum were required to conduct three 20-minute counseling interview sessions which were video taped. Each counselor had one individual critique session of his first video taped interview. Two weeks later each counselor observed his interview in a small group critique consisting of two supervisors and five trainees. The final video taped interview was examined in a total group of two supervisors and ten counselors after another two-week interval. Three generalizations from the study seem pertinent to this investigator's research. First, it was noted, as in the Walz and Johnston study (1963), that counselor perceptions of a counseling interview have a slight tendency to resemble more closely supervisory ratings after video tape viewing by the counselor. Possible explanations for this, however, were not discussed. Could it be that trainee pre- and immediate practicum expectations accounted for this movement? Second, first video taped critiques seemed to have limited value for counselor self growth. There apparently is a tendency for counselor candidates to focus "upon overt manifestations of behavior rather than the effect of the behavior upon the client or process" (p. 37).

Third, Poling (1968) found that if trainees reviewed their video tapes prior to an individual supervisory session,
counselor and supervisor ratings of interviews were more congruent than they were when audio-tapes were used exclusively.

The preceding studies have described various uses of video tape with or without supervisory intervention. All these studies basically agreed that video tape recordings of counseling enhanced counselor learning significantly. The most outstanding of these is that video tapes enable the counselor to observe "minimal behavioral cues, nuances and shades of feelings expressed, facial expressions, posture and other non-verbal factors" (Demos, 1964, p. 705).

Little research, however, dealing with the effects of a recorder upon supervisor-trainee and their supervisory relationship, has been evidenced.

The Roux investigation is a notable exception. Roux (1969) sought to investigate the amount of threat perceived by counselors under four taping procedures: (1) the interview would be recorded followed by a supervisory critique; (2) the interview would not be recorded and no critique would be held; (3) the interview would be recorded followed by one's personal critique, and (4) the interview would not be recorded, but a critique would follow. Results of the Roux study indicated that tape recordings for supervisory purposes effected different psychological and physiological responses from different counselors. Indications of physiological stress were noted by increased
cardiac frequency with concomitant decrease in finger skin temperature. Psychological change was deduced as an occurrence derived from physiological movement.

The major conclusions seemed to suggest that tape recordings used for supervisory purpose were more anxiety producing within the counselors. The group as a whole, however, reacted differently to each of the four supervisors—perhaps suggesting a differential perception of the relationship. Secondly, the amount of anxiety generated within the counselor seemed to be dependent upon the particular counselor-supervisor combination. On the other hand, "the factors which determined the amount of anxiety experienced by the counselor seemed to lie within the techniques of supervision employed by the supervisor" (p. 204). It would seem, then, that the use of tape recording, not the recordings per se, account for significant changes in psychological-physiological measures. Perhaps, as Clark (1965) has observed: "The anxiety experienced by trainees in regard to supervisory evaluation is not primarily a response to the content of the valuation but instead is a reaction to the attitudes in which the content is embedded" (p. 67). Roux's study, then, suggests definite connections between amount of anxiety and the supervisory dimensions of relationship and instruction. Five other studies have particular relevancy to the twin supervisory elements (didactic-relationship dimensions).
Hansen and Barker (1964) studied the influence of supervisors on the quality of counselor learning. A relationship was established between the counselor's perception of the quality of the supervisory relationship, as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, and his level of experiencing. Generally, the data indicated that the better the relationship, as perceived by the counselor, the higher the level of experiencing. Likewise, the better the relationship, as perceived by the supervisor, the higher the level of experiencing by the counselor. Conversely, it was determined that the greater the perceptual discrepancy in the supervisor-trainee relationship, the lower the level of experiencing and learning by the counselor.

Blane (1968) conducted a study to investigate one aspect of the supervisory process: "The immediate effect of positive, negative, or no supervisory experiences [style] on the measured empathic understanding of counselor candidates" (p. 39). The following conclusions were posited: (1) A positive supervisory experience significantly increases the level of empathic understanding a counselor is able to offer his client; (2) the level of empathic understanding does not change without supervision during the time interval investigated, and (3) receiving a negative supervisory experience does not significantly increase a counselor's level of empathic understanding (p. 43).
Demos and Zuwaylif (1962) attempted to ascertain if changes in counselor attitudes (in an intensive 6-week counselor training program) were related to the theoretical positions of counselor-supervisors—specifically, client-centered, eclectic, and directive approaches. Generally, it appeared that the influence of one's supervisor, regardless of his theoretical position, affected all trainees but not to the same degree. Counselors from client-centered supervisors were found to be significantly more understanding in their responses than were counselors of the eclectic or directive supervisors.

Davidson and Emmer (1966) also sought to examine the effects of supervisory orientation on counselor behavior. It was hypothesized that a counselor candidate's focus of concern would shift more toward himself (and away from his client) when the supervisor used chiefly nonsupportive techniques than where the supervisor used chiefly supportive techniques. Supportive techniques were to emphasize positive aspects of counselor-client relationships and non-supportive techniques were to emphasize evaluative, didactic or negative aspects of a counselor's interview performance.

Results indicated that the hypothesis was supported, that is, when the supervisor uses non-supportive techniques, a candidate's focus of concern will shift more toward himself (and away from his client).
Payne and Gralinski (1969), like Davidson and Emmer (1966), Demos and Zuwaylif (1962), and Blane (1968) also sought to study the effect of supervisor style (technique and counseling type) on counselor perceptions. In addition, however, they also sought to measure the effect of supervisor empathy upon counselor behavior. The Payne-Gralinski approach is interesting in that a particular aspect of supervisory relationship quality (empathy) is viewed together with aspects of supervisory performance (instructional-relationship dimensions), specifically, a non-directive and didactic approach.

In both approaches, positive and high interpersonal relationships were sought. Supervisors in the non-directive style, however, avoided negative evaluations of counselor performance and direct suggestions for improvement. In the didactic or technique style, the counselor's effectiveness in offering empathy and a discussion of his counseling techniques were introduced. Specific examples of more empathic responses were also given. Two experimental groups were employed. Following an experimental interview each counselor in the experimental group was given a 20-minute supervisory interview—one group the counseling type and the other group the technique approach. Control counselors were not given supervision. Measures of empathy from supervisors and trainees were taken. In addition, counselors were asked to rate their own empathy, supervisor
empathy, reactions to participation, reactions to supervisor, and self-assessed understanding of the meaning of empathy.

Significant results can be summarized as follows:

1. The effect of supervisory style on counselor perceptions was modest (p. 560).

2. The effect of supervisory empathy on counselor perceptions were slight (p. 562).

3. Counselors in the didactic group did not perceive supervisors as more critical, less empathic, or more tension producing.

4. There were no differences in self-assessment of learning by both experimental groups, but by objective measures, the didactic and the control group learned more.

Thus, a number of dilemmas are raised. Supervisor empathy, contrary to Traux's findings (1963), seemed to have little effect upon counselor perceptions. However, it must be noted that only one, 20-minute supervisory session was held. Perhaps more time is needed to establish a meaningful relationship to effect perceptions significantly.

Second, too much empathy can be seen as somewhat threatening if trainee expectations focus on structure and direct suggestions. Thus the more empathic the supervisor, the less was the counselor's perception of learning. Third, perhaps the goal of establishing a non-threatening relationship may not be as crucial a problem as supposed. Could this be related to Clark's view (1965) that anxiety results not from
the content of evaluation but from the attitude from which it ensues (p. 67). Lending support to Clark's view, Demos and Zuwaylif (1962) have observed that a "directive" approach can be an accepting, warm, and understanding one (p. 12).

The need for instruction and evaluation and the need for an accepting climate, therefore, does not necessarily have to be a source of conflict (Traux, Carkhuff, and Douds, 1964; Carkhuff and Traux, 1965; Gysbers and Johnston (1965). Traux, et al. (1964), advances the idea of an integration of the didactic and "experiential" (relationship stress) dimensions of the supervisory process:

... supervision ... as a learning process ... takes place in a context of a deep and meaningful relationship which facilitates this learning. This deep and meaningful relationship is a product of a stimulus complex of therapist offered conditions. ... Within the context of the stimulus complex, many learning approaches, including even more didactic approaches attempting to "shape" behavior, are most effective (pp. 242-243).

Summary

The foregoing studies cited in Chapter II have attempted to survey the nature of the supervisory relationship and the supervisory impact upon trainee learning. Research studies do suggest that the quality of the supervisory relationship and the kind of instructional experience encountered by the counselor candidate are important variables to be considered but they are not the only variables nor necessarily the
most potent or influencing ones. However, evidence is unbalanced and conflicting. Supervisors exhibit varying degrees of influences upon what counselors learned in a practicum setting. Their precise impact and the specific causative factors are less easily definable, especially when learning, similar to that attributed to supervisors, is associated with other individuals, media devices, and activities. In the following chapter (Chapter III), a discussion of the procedures utilized in this investigation will be presented.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

A review of the related research pertinent to this study has indicated that the nature of supervision, while remaining questionable, nevertheless can be viewed from a didactic (instructional) and/or relationship dimension. This study attempts to investigate both of these areas. Specifically, the problem of this investigation has been to examine practicum supervisor-trainee perceptions of interview behavior and to determine the degree to which those perceptions were related to supervisor-trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

As was previously indicated, a unique approach toward the investigation of the dimension of interview behavior has been the development of a new interaction tool by which supervisors and trainees may view, code, and critique video taped interviews during a supervisory session. Appendix I describes in detail the operational use of this new interaction technique.

The dimension of the supervisory relationship, on the other hand, will be measured by the use of a Relationship Inventory. In this chapter both of these instruments
will be described as well as the procedures utilized in this study for their employment.

Selection and Description of the Instruments

The Counselor-Client Behavior Analysis Training Instrument: CCBA

The CCBA Training Instrument (see Appendix A), developed by this investigator, is an interaction method to quantify broad qualitative aspects of interview verbal-nonverbal communicative behavior between counselor or client. Specifically, it permits analysis of spontaneous communication along four dimensions: (1) verbal-nonverbal interaction (Appendix G), (2) verbal-nonverbal subroles (Appendix F), (3) verbal-nonverbal relationship qualities: "expanding" and "contracting" (see Chapter I, Definition of Terms), and (4) verbal-nonverbal communicative events (see Chapter I, Definition of Terms). As used in this study, supervisors and trainees employed the CCBA training tool as their vehicle to analyze results of the candidates video taped interview.

On the CCBA Training Instrument, eight separate categories of verbal-nonverbal interactions are described and these in turn help identify an inventory of eight corresponding counselor client subroles. In addition, one category is provided for "unclear" or "uncertain" counselor-client intentions (subroles).
Subrole behavior is also viewed as either "expanding" or "contracting" the relationship quality. General criteria to identify these two dimensions of the relationship are listed for each of the eight subrole classifications.

In addition, the instrument divides interactions, subroles, and relationship qualities on an Indirect (I)—Direct (D) continuum, referring to the general degree of active engagement on the part of the counselor or client. The numerical ranking of categories also suggests the general process of interview development. It is acknowledged, of course, that counseling is a dynamic and flexible process that is different for each counselor. Furthermore, each counselor will work in a way that is uniquely his own. With these cautions in mind, the counselor may gain a mental picture of a process that may have certain emphases at certain times and that may proceed somewhat along the lines discussed.

The CCBA Training System

The CCBA System as devised by this investigator, consists of the training instrument and a coding sheet.

The coding sheet (see Appendix B) provides a means to plot sequential verbal-nonverbal subrole behavior, verbal-nonverbal relationship qualities, communicative events, and to record supervisor-counselor-client comments (or any combination therein). The data accumulated thus becomes the basis for analysis and discussion of the interview.
The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory

Supervisor and trainee perceptions of the relationship following the interview analysis were measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. The inventory, as developed by G. T. Barrett-Lennard (1962) is an objective measure of the "necessary and sufficient conditions" of the helping relationship as postulated by Rogers. The construction of the scale was an attempt by its author to give operational expression to theoretical relationship statements espoused by Rogers. Specifically, these statements have been translated into four subtests: level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence, and unconditionality of regard. There is also a total score. The present study utilized total relationship inventory scores.

The current form of the relationship inventory includes 64 items (see Appendix D), 16 of each of the 4 dimensions, each of which is responded to on a 6-point scale (ranging from +3, "Yes, I strongly feel that is true"; to -3, "No, I strongly feel that it is not true"; there is No 0 response. The instrument is so designed that it can be used to describe any two-personal relationship; the items have general applicability to interpersonal interactions with the specific relationship to be evaluated by the examiner.

Validation procedures. Content validity of the scale was determined by a panel of five judges and by a form item
analysis (1962). Concerning the Relationship Inventory, Barrett-Lennard states (1962)

Apart from the procedures used in developing and refining the instrument, the evidence for or against validity lies (as I view it) in the obtained association between the R.I. scales and other theoretically or assumptively relevant variables (p. 7).

Reliability. The split-half reliability of the four subtests as reported by Barrett-Lennard (1962) and by Snelbecker (1961) ranges from .75 to .94, indicating that the subtests have a marked amount of internal consistency. That there has been no definitive study of the test-retest reliability of the instrument is in part because relationships themselves are often changing in degree and intensity. One elliptical reference to the stability of the test over time (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p. 12, footnote) suggests that the reliability is quite adequate; that is, for a sample, the size of which is not reported, the reliabilities of the subtests over a 4-week period range from .84 to .90.

The instrument has been found to be useful in a variety of situations. Its initial value in assessing the effects of psychotherapy (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Snelbecker, 1961; Van der Veen, 1961), has been extended to other areas of human interaction, for example, parent-child relationships of juvenile delinquents (Rosen, 1961), mother-daughter relationships (Thornton, 1960), and teacher-pupil relationships (Emmerling, 1961).
There is some question, nonetheless, concerning the relationships between the four subtests themselves. The subtests were derived by using a combination of item analysis, and rational/theoretical considerations. A careful attempt has been made, within the basic bounds of Rogerian client-centered theory, to make the items within each subtest consistent both with the theory and with each other. Despite this item purification, the intercorrelation of the subtests has been reported as being positive and moderately high (Barrett-Lennard, 1962)—the intercorrelations for a therapist-client population range from .16 to .85. The absolute size of these correlations, most of which range from .40 to .60, suggests that there may well be a general factor which accounts for much of the variance for the entire instrument. The author of the test believes this not to be the case, however, and writes that, at least in the therapy situation,

The assessment of internal consistency of the variables, and association between them, exclude certain possible sources of invalidity. They show . . . that the scales are not measuring a general factor, such as the client's over-all satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the therapy relationship (Barrett-Lennard, 1959b, quoted in Snelbecker, 1961, p. 36).

Mills and Zytowski (1967), however, seriously question Barrett-Lennard's findings. Their studies report that "there appears to be a single dominant characteristic across all the relationships measured to which all four subtests contribute strongly" (p. 195).
Selection of Subjects

Supervisors

This study was limited to four supervisors and twenty counselor trainees at a single university. Two supervisors were working with continuing (third quarter) NDEA Institute practicum programs. The remaining pair were working with the initiating (first four weeks) half of their practicum sessions.

Trainees

Ten trainees in the continuing group were selected from an on-going (third quarter) NDEA Institute. The remaining ten candidates in the initiating group, were students beginning (first four weeks) their required practicum quarter prior to certification as school counselors.

Prospective practicum supervisors and trainees were informed of the exact nature of the study:

1. About nine hours would be devoted to learning the CCBA System.

2. At the conclusion of the supervisory session, a relationship inventory would be taken by trainees and supervisors within each of the four sections.

3. Each trainee would video tape one interview. The trainee and his immediate supervisor would jointly view the tape and code counselor behavior separately. Periodically (each two, four, or six minutes), they would compare and discuss their individual codings.
4. Results of the study would be made available to all participants.

5. Trainees would be asked not to plan to do anything "special" for the video taped interviews.

6. The purpose of the research would be to develop improved counselor supervisory techniques. There would be no attempt to evaluate trainees' academic marks from this study.

Counselees

Students interviewed by the initiating and continuing practicum groups were selected from the city school system. Student selection was based in part on practicum procedures and in part by trainee choice of counselees.

Setting

All interviews were conducted at a single university in a practicum laboratory setting. All participants were informed that the interview was being video taped and that observers would view the conference through one-way mirrors.

Equipment Used

Observation of interview verbal-nonverbal behavior can be conducted through on-the-spot observation accompanied by appropriate tallying of events and behaviors, or it can be conducted by observing and analyzing filmed or video taped segments of interview activities. The latter method offers the desirable features of permanency, opportunity
for repetition, and opportunity for application of several research techniques. Because of these factors, video tape was chosen as a tool for observing and recording counseling activities.

Portable half-inch video taping equipment was used in the investigation. While this equipment did not provide premium quality in either image or sound, its quality of picture and sound appeared adequate.

Procedures for Collecting Data

Orientation to the CCBA System

Once subjects were selected, the investigator, instructed three other supervisors in the use of the CCBA System. Each supervisor with the assistance of the investigator orientated their five trainees. About nine hours of instruction were provided in order to acquaint supervisors and trainees with the system and in order to expedite its actual use in a supervisory session.

Viewing the "live" interview

Supervisors viewed their respective trainees' interview through one-way mirrors during the actual interview in order to acquaint themselves with the dimensions of the total counseling session prior to specific analysis of the video taped playback.
Supervisory session: Phase 1

Investigator as independent observer.—Within one week after the taping, a supervisory session was held. The investigator, acting as a third party, was present at each of the twenty supervisory sessions in order to observe the operational utilization of the system, ensure procedural uniformity, and to maintain exact interval coding of behavior (see Appendix I: Operational Use of the CCBA System). During the investigator's supervisory sessions, one of the remaining three supervisors acted as the independent observer.

Utilization of the CCBA System: Coding and discussion procedures.—Supervisors and trainees coded only counselor trainee behavior. One page of the Coding Sheet (approximately two minutes of behavior) was marked independently by both supervisor and trainee. Both parties were permitted to have the CCBA Training Instrument before them. At the completion of the first page, the video tape recorder was stopped by the "observer" and comparisons of the data were made and discussed. Supervisors and trainees were encouraged to record the main elements of their dialogue relating to the reasons for agreement or disagreement as well as other explanatory remarks. No attempt was made by this investigator to define, classify, or clarify the CCBA categories thus permitting supervisors and trainees maximum opportunity to engage in and attempt
to resolve semantic or performance differentials among themselves.

When major discussion had ebbed, supervisors and trainees continued the same procedure as previously noted, that is, they continued to view and code subsequent behavior independently. When the video recorder was stopped, comparisons of each others results were made and discussed. Significant comments resulting from the discussion were reflected on the coding sheets.

Upon completion of sheet #1, counselor trainees' behavior was then coded without interruption for two, four, or six minutes (one, two, or three coding sheets) depending upon supervisor-trainee agreement as to their facility in handling the coding system. A total of about thirty minutes of counselor behavior was ultimately coded (approximately twelve coding sheets).

**Supervisory session: Phase II**

Phase I of the supervisory session has been presented. Essentially phase I utilized the CCBA System. Phase II of the supervisory session consisted of the administration of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory to supervisors and trainees upon completion of the twelve coding sheets. Results from coding sheets and relationship inventories were then collected by this investigator for further analysis.
Treatment of the Data

The problem in this study was to examine possible correlations between supervisor-trainee perceptions of the interview behavior and supervisor-trainee perception of the quality of their respective relationships. To reach this objective, an examination of Questions One, Two, and Three was made according to the following design:

Question #1: What is the nature of the perceived interview behavior between supervisor and trainee?

Interview behavior was examined relative to supervisor-trainee perceptions on nine variables by each supervisory group, by initiating-continuing groups, and by full sample.

The sought for data from the CCBA System of analysis of interview behavior included the following variables:

a. Length of run between all disagreements (LRBD).
b. Length of run between all unresolved disagreements (LRBUD).
c. Length of run between all resolved disagreements (LRBRD).
d. Total length of run—all disagreements (LRD).
e. Total length of run—all unresolved disagreements (LRUD).
f. Total length of run—all resolved disagreements (LRRD).
g. Total number of shifts to supervisor (S-S).
h. Total number of shifts to trainee (S-T).
1. Total number of shifts—both supervisor and trainee (S:S/T).

Definitional terminology of obtained data from interview analysis included the following terms:

a. "Length": "Length" constitutes a measure of distance, specifically, the successive amount of similar type intervals (spacing or cells) on the coding sheet, namely, agreements, disagreements, resolved and unresolved disagreements.

b. "Run": A "run" refers to a number (N) of "lengths" of the same type.

c. "Agreements"—refers to identical coding by supervisor and trainee.

d. "Disagreements"—refers to different coding by supervisor and supervisee. Disagreements are of two types:

   (1) "Resolved Disagreements"—refers to the settling of disagreements by all parties involved.

   (2) "Unresolved Disagreements"—occurs when supervisor and trainee do not immediately settle a point of difference.

Computational procedures relative to interview analysis involved the following steps:

a. Mean length of run, as illustrated below, is derived by dividing the total amount of lengths (Σ) by the total number (N) of runs.
b. Length of Runs Between All "Disagreements"—is derived by computing length of runs of agreements. Length of runs between all Disagreement is the major index of supervisor-trainee perceptions of interview behavior.

c. Length of Runs Between All "Resolved" Disagreements—is derived by computing length of runs of all agreements and unresolved disagreements.

d. Length of Runs Between All "Unresolved" Disagreements—is derived by computing length of runs of all agreements and resolved disagreements.

e. Length of Runs—Total Disagreements is derived by computing the sum (Σ) of lengths of disagreements.

f. Length of Runs—Total Resolved Disagreement is derived by computing the sum (Σ) of lengths of resolved disagreements.

g. Length of Runs—Total Unresolved Disagreements is derived by computing the sum (Σ) of lengths of unresolved disagreements.

Statistical treatment of the data was derived by obtaining means, standard deviations, and ranges on nine variables. Point biserial correlations were also computed.
in order to test for significance of difference between mean. Standard formulas for these computations were utilized.

Question #2: What is the nature of the perceived supervisory between supervisor and trainee?

Relationship Inventory results were examined relative to supervisor-trainee dyad perceptions on one variable by each supervisory group, by initiating-continuing groups, and by full sample.

The sought for data from the Relationship Inventory included the total Relationship Inventory score.

Statistical treatment of the data was derived by obtaining means, standard deviations, and ranges on one variable. Point biserial correlations were also computed in order to test for significance of difference between means. Standard formulas for these computations were utilized.

Question #3: What relationships, if any, accrue between perceptions of interview behavior and perceptions of the supervisory relationship of practicum supervisors and their respective trainees?

Interview behavior and relationship inventory results were examined relative to supervisor-trainee perceptions of interview behavior and supervisor and trainee dyad perceptions of the supervisory relationship. Variables were examined by each supervisory group, by initiating-continuing groups, and by full sample.

Scores were treated statistically by obtaining means, standard deviations, and ranges in order to reveal congruous
and incongruous supervisory patterns among all supervisors and trainees and to reveal supervisory patterns as manifested by separate groups. Particular examination of this question was made by making specific comparisons between interview and relationship dimensions utilizing Pearson product moment correlation coefficients on all variables.

Summary

Chapter III has presented a discussion of the procedures utilized in this investigation, including selection and description of the instruments, selection of subjects, the nature of the setting, the equipment used, procedures for collecting the data, and the treatment of the data. Chapter IV contains the findings of this study and discussions relevant to an interpretation of the data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The problem in this study was to examine relationships between supervisor-trainee perceptions of interview behavior and supervisor-trainee perceptions of the quality of their respective relationships. Essentially this problem sought to answer three main questions: What is the nature of the perceived interview behavior between Supervisor and Trainee? What is the nature of the perceived supervisory relationship? What possible relationships accrue from a combination of the preceding two? An examination of these questions was made by reference to three statistical approaches: (1) means, standard deviations, and ranges, (2) Pearson product moment correlation coefficients, and (3) point biserial correlations. In this chapter each question shall be examined separately.

Question #1: What is the nature of the perceived interview behavior between supervisor and trainee?

Interview behavior will be reported relative to supervisor-trainee perceptions on nine variables by each supervisory group, by initiating-continuing groups, and by full sample. Statistical treatment of the data was derived by obtaining means, standard deviations, and ranges.
on nine variables (Table 1). Point biserial correlations were also computed in order to test for significance of difference between means.

TABLE 1
LEGEND: DESIGNATION OF VARIABLES

Variable # 5 Supervisors's perception—Total Relationship Inventory Score (SRI).

Variable #10 Trainees perception Total—Relationship Inventory Score (TRI) Supervisor-Trainee Perceptions:

Variable #16 Length of Run between All Disagreements (LRBD).

Variable #17 Length of Run between All Unresolved Disagreements (LRBUD).

Variable #18 Length of Run between All Resolved Disagreements (LRBRD).

Variable #19 Length of Run Total Disagreements (LRD).

Variable #20 Length of Run Total Unresolved Disagreements (LRUD).

Variable #21 Length of Run Total Resolved Disagreements (LRRD).

Variable #22 Shifts by Trainee to Supervisor (S-S).

Variable #23 Shifts by Supervisor to Trainee (S-T).

Variable #24 Shifts by Both Supervisor and Trainee (S:S/T).
A. Length of Run between Disagreements
(Variable 16):

From an analysis of separate groups, Table 2 reveals that Supervisory Group #1 had a significantly lower mean score on length of runs between disagreements (variable 16) from Group #3 (p = .05). A lower score on variable #16 indicates shorter length of runs between disagreements which, in turn, refers to fewer supervisor-trainee interview agreements. Groups #1 and #3's mean scores, however, were not significantly different from the mean scores of Groups #2 and #4. Thus on length of runs between disagreements, Groups #1 and #3's scores accounted for the major variability between separate supervisory groups.

B. Length of Run between Unresolved-Resolved
Disagreements (Variable 17-18):

Observing types of disagreements (Table 2--variables 17 and 18), it can be noted that in Group #1, mean scores were divided equally between "resolved" and "unresolved" disagreements.

Under "unresolved" disagreements (variable 17), Groups #2, #3, and #4 had considerably higher mean scores than Group #1, indicating longer or fewer length of runs between "unresolved" disagreements. Group means for #1, #3, and #1, #4 significantly differed (p = .05), but Group means for #2, #3 and #4 did not significantly differ from other groups. Consequently, on length of runs between
TABLE 2
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR EACH SUPERVISORY GROUP ON SELECTED VARIABLES
(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into four groups of five and assigned to one of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>Variables 16</th>
<th>Variables 17</th>
<th>Variables 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LRBD</td>
<td>LRBUD</td>
<td>LRBRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.900</td>
<td>10.054</td>
<td>10.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 SD</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>4.998</td>
<td>5.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>207-513</td>
<td>460-1700</td>
<td>663-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.572</td>
<td>31.888</td>
<td>5.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 SD</td>
<td>4.384</td>
<td>27.050</td>
<td>4.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>214-1300</td>
<td>753-7150</td>
<td>147-1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>6.618</td>
<td>23.758</td>
<td>10.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 SD</td>
<td>2.217</td>
<td>14.317</td>
<td>5.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>396-915</td>
<td>900-4733</td>
<td>477-1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.998</td>
<td>25.814</td>
<td>5.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 SD</td>
<td>2.691</td>
<td>14.553</td>
<td>3.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>335-1033</td>
<td>1064-4700</td>
<td>495-1280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Difference Between Means*

16
LRBD: \( \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_3 = 2.71^* \)

17
LRBUD: \( \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_4 = 15.76^* \)

** \( p .05 (df = 8) = .716 \)
* \( p .05 (df = 8) = .550 \)

aLegend: see Table 1.
"unresolved" disagreements, Group #1's score accounted for the major variability between supervisory groups.

Under "Significance of Differences Between Means" in Table 2 (variable 17), it should be noted that Group #2 had the widest mean variability only when matched with Group #1 ($X_1 - X_2 = 21.83$). No significant differences were indicated, however, because of Group #2's wide dispersion of scores (standard deviation) from the mean (27-050).

In Supervisory Groups #2, #3, and #4, mean scores "resolved" (variable 18) were lower than #1's, indicating shorter or more length of runs between "resolved" disagreements. However, no significant differences on length of runs between resolved disagreements were found between separate supervisory group scores.

Thus Groups #2 and #4 had similar supervisor-trainee perceptual patterns of interview analysis on: (1) length of runs between disagreements, (2) length of runs between "unresolved" disagreements, and (3) length of runs between "resolved" disagreements. Groups #2, #3, and #4 had similar perceptual patterns on: (1) length of runs between "unresolved" disagreements, and (2) length of runs between "resolved" disagreements. Finally, all groups shared similar perceptual patterns on only length of runs between "resolved" disagreements. Compared to Groups #2, #3, and #4, Group #1 had fewer interview agreements and
significantly more length of runs between more "unresolved" disagreements.

Examination of the preceding data by initiating and continuing groups, Table 3 reveals that the continuing Group (#3 and #4) had longer length of runs between disagreements, and "unresolved-resolved" types of disagreement. In other words, Group #3 - #4 had fewer disagreements of both types than the initiating group, but not to a statistically significant degree.

Based on the full sample, Table 3 reveals that of the two types of interview disagreements, all Supervisory Groups had lower mean scores on "resolved" vs. "unresolved" disagreements. In other words, Supervisory Groups collectively had more length of runs between "resolved" interview differences than "unresolved."

C. Length of Run—Total Number of Disagreements
(Variable 19):

From an analysis of separate groups, Table 4 reveals that Supervisory Group #1 had a significantly higher higher mean score on total number of interview disagreements than all other sections. A higher mean score indicates more total number of interview disagreements. Significant differences occurred in Groups #1, 2 (p=.05); #1,3 (p=.01), and #1,4 (p=.05). Group means for #2, #3, and #4, however, did not significantly differ from each other. Thus on
TABLE 3
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR INITIATING (#1 AND #2), CONTINUING (#3 AND #4), AND FULL SAMPLE SUPERVISORY GROUPS ON SELECTED VARIABLES

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into two groups of ten and assigned to two of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>16 LRBD</th>
<th>17 LRBUD</th>
<th>18 LRBUD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.736</td>
<td>20.971</td>
<td>8.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.145</td>
<td>20.650</td>
<td>5.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>270-1300</td>
<td>460-7150</td>
<td>147-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6.308</td>
<td>24.786</td>
<td>9.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.3481</td>
<td>13.6537</td>
<td>4.1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>335-1033</td>
<td>900-4733</td>
<td>477-1675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 8) = .716
*p .05 (df = 8) = .550

(Full Sample: Computations for the following, based on data from twenty trainees and four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>16 LRBD</th>
<th>17 LRBUD</th>
<th>18 LRBUD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.522</td>
<td>22.878</td>
<td>8.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.8195</td>
<td>17.7248</td>
<td>4.8199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>207-1300</td>
<td>460-7150</td>
<td>396-2100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 18) = .516
*p .05 (df = 18) = .378

aLegend: see Table 1.
TABLE 4

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR EACH SUPERVISORY GROUP ON SELECTED VARIABLES a
(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into four groups of five and assigned to one of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 LRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>77.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>40.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>37.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Difference Between Means*

19 LRD:
\[
\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 = 37.20^* \\
\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_3 = 40.00^{**} \\
\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_4 = 38.20^* \\
\]

20 LRUD:
\[
\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 = 32.20^{**} \\
\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_3 = 28.80^* \\
\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_4 = 32.00^{**} \\
\]

**p .01 (df = 8) = .716
*p .05 (df = 8) = .550

aLegend: see Table 1.
length of run—total number of disagreements, Group #1's score accounted for the major variability between separate supervisory groups.

D. Length of Run—Total Number of Unresolved—Resolved Disagreements (Variable 20-21):

Groups #2, #3, and #4 had significantly lower mean scores on total number of "unresolved" type of disagreements, that is, fewer total number of "unresolved" interview differences (Table 4). Significant differences occurred in Groups #1,2 (p=.01); #1,3 (p=.05), and #1,4 (p=.01). Group means for #2, #3, and #4, however, did not significantly differ from each other. Thus, on both length of run—total number of disagreements and total number of "unresolved" disagreements, Group #1's scores accounted for the variability between separate supervisory groups.

On length of run—total number of "resolved" disagreements (Table 4, variable 21), Groups #2, #3, and #4 had more interview differences "resolved" than Group #1, but not to a significant degree. In other words, all groups had similar perceptions of "resolved" interview differences.

Thus Groups #2, #3, and #4 had similar perceptions of interview analysis on: (1) length of run—total number of disagreements, and (2) length of run—total number of "unresolved" type of disagreements. Compared to Groups #2, #3, and #4, Group #1 had significantly more total number of
interview disagreements and more total number of "unresolved" type of disagreements.

It should be noted that generally length of run--total number of disagreements (variable 19) generally tended to reflect an inverse ratio from length of runs between disagreements (variable 16). Groups #1 for example, had significantly fewer interview agreements from Groups #3 (variable 16) and significantly more total number of interview disagreements than all other sections (variable 19).

With types of disagreements, length of runs between "unresolved and resolved" disagreements tended to approximate length of runs--total number of "unresolved and resolved" disagreements. For example, Group #1 showed about an equal number of both "unresolved and resolved" disagreements on variables 17-18 and as well as variables 20-21.

Comparisons of the two sections in Table 5 reveals that initiating subjects had more total number of interview disagreements and more total number "resolved" and "unresolved" types of disagreements than continuing members, but not to a statistically significant degree. Both initiating and continuing sections had most interview differences "resolved" rather than "unresolved." An examination of the full sample of subject in Table 5 reveals that most interview disagreements were "resolved" rather than "unresolved."
TABLE 5
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR INITIATING (#1 AND #2), CONTINUING (#3 AND #4), AND FULL SAMPLE SUPERVISORY GROUPS ON SELECTED VARIABLES

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into two groups of ten and assigned to two of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>19 LRD</th>
<th>20 LRUD</th>
<th>21 LRRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>29.800</td>
<td>22.637</td>
<td>14.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>14-111</td>
<td>1-74</td>
<td>13-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>13.663</td>
<td>11.785</td>
<td>8.5121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>20-55</td>
<td>3-34</td>
<td>10-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 8) = .716
*p .05 (df = 8) = .550

(Full Sample: Computations for the following, based on data from twenty trainees and four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>19 LRD</th>
<th>20 LRUD</th>
<th>21 LRRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full SD</td>
<td>24.575</td>
<td>19.035</td>
<td>12.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample R</td>
<td>14-111</td>
<td>1-74</td>
<td>10-58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 18) = .516
*p .05 (df = 18) = .378

*aLegend: see Table 1.*
E. Shifts to: Supervisor--Trainee--Both

Supervisor and Trainee (Variables 22-23-24):

Shifts in interview discussions refer to supervisor and/or trainee movement from an agreement-disagreement continuum or vice versa.

In Table 6, Group #1 had a significantly lower mean score on "shifts to supervisor" (variable 22), than Group #2 (p=.05). A lower mean score on variable 22 indicates fewer "shifts to supervisor" throughout supervisor-trainee interview critique. Groups #1 and #2's mean scores, however, were not significantly different from the mean scores of Groups #3 and #4. Thus on "shifts to supervisor," Groups #1 and #3's scores accounted for the major variability between supervisory groups.

On "shifts to trainee" (variable 23), all groups performed in a similar manner. "Shifts to both supervisor and trainee" (variable 24) indicated a wide pattern of differences across sections. Significant differences occurred in Groups #1, 2 (p=.01); #1, 4 (p = .05), and #2,3 (p=.05). Group means for #1, #3, and #4, however, did not significantly differ from each other. Thus, on "shifts to both supervisor and trainee," Group #2's score accounted for the variability between separate supervisory groups. Groups #1 and #2, however, manifested the highest score discrepancy (p=.01).
TABLE 6

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR EACH SUPERVISORY GROUP ON SELECTED VARIABLES

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into four groups of five and assigned to one of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S</td>
<td>S-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>7.200</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>3.271</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12.600</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>4.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9.154</td>
<td>2.490</td>
<td>2.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4-24</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>7.800</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.507</td>
<td>3.633</td>
<td>1.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7.200</td>
<td>6.500</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.969</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>2.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>0-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Differences Between Means*

22 S-S

\[ X_1 - X_2 = 8.20^* \]

24 S:S/T

\[ X_1 - X_4 = 4.00^{**} \]
\[ X_2 - X_3 = 2.40^* \]
\[ X_2 - X_3 = 2.80^* \]

** \[ p .01 \text{ (df = 8)} = .716 \]
\[ * p .05 \text{ (df = 8)} = .550 \]

*Legend: see Table 1.
Thus Groups #1, #3, and #4 and #2, #3, #4 had similar supervisor-trainee perceptual patterns on "shifts to supervisor."

Across "shifts" (variables 22-23-24), it was noted that supervisory Groups #1 and #3 had higher mean scores on variable 23, indicating more "shifts to trainee." Groups #2 and #4 shifted primarily to "supervisor."

Comparisons of both groups in Table 7 reveals more "shifts to trainee" in the continuing group (#3 - #4) and more "shifts to supervisor" in the initiating section but not to any significant degree. Viewing the whole sample, however, interview behavior was characterized by more "shifts to supervisor" than to "trainee" or "both supervisor and trainee" (Table 7).

Discussion

The following findings on the nature of supervisory interview behavior can be made at this time: (1) Within each supervisory section, all groups tended to function similarly on only 3 of the 9 variables, namely, length of runs between "resolved" disagreements, length of runs--total "resolved" disagreements, and "shifts to trainee; (2) generally, Groups #2, #3, and #4 tended to perform in a more similar pattern than Group #1; (3) Groups #3 and #4 individually, performed more similarly than subjects in Groups #1 and #2; (4) initiating and continuing group members did not reflect significant differences. As a general pattern,
TABLE 7
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR INITIATING (#1 AND #2), CONTINUING (#3 AND #4), AND FULL SAMPLE SUPERVISORY GROUPS ON SELECTED VARIABLES

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into two groups of ten and assigned to two of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-S</td>
<td>S-T</td>
<td>S:S/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>5.700</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># SD R</td>
<td>7.749</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>2.699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>3-24</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6.800</td>
<td>7.200</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># SD R</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>2.740</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 8) = .716
*p .05 (df = 8) = .550

(Full Sample: Computations for the following, based on data from twenty trainees and four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.650</td>
<td>7.450</td>
<td>2.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Sample SD R</td>
<td>6.089</td>
<td>2.982</td>
<td>2.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 18) = .516; p .01 (df = 18) = .516
*p .05 (df = 18) = .378; p .05 (df = 18) = .378

aLegend: see Table 1.
however, compared to the continuing group, initiating members had fewer length of runs between disagreements (fewer interview agreements), and fewer length of runs between "unresolved" and "resolved" type of disagreements (variables 16-17-18). Conversely, they had more total number of interview disagreements, and more total number of "unresolved" and "resolved" type of interview disagreements (variables 19-20-21). Finally, initiating members had more "shifts to trainee" than the continuing section.

Continuing members, on the other hand, had more length of runs between agreements (more interview agreements), and more length of runs between "unresolved" and "resolved" disagreements (variables 16-17-18). Conversely, they had fewer total number of "unresolved" and "resolved" type of interview disagreements (variables 19-20-21).

(5) As a full sample, all subjects had more "resolved" type of disagreements, and more "shifts to supervisor."

Thus on interview analysis patterns, significant variability is manifest across separate supervisory groups, but not across initiating and continuing members. That is, supervisory interview critique patterns between the four groups are significantly more dissimilar than alike; between initiating and continuing groups, no significant differences were found.
Question #2: What is the nature of the perceived supervisory relationship between practicum supervisors and trainees?

Relationship Inventory results will be reported in light of supervisor-trainee dyad perceptions on one variable (Table 1) by each supervisory group, by initiating-continu­
groups, and by full sample. Statistical treatment of the data was derived by obtaining means, standard deviations, and ranges on one variable. Point biserial correlations were computed in order to test for significance of differ­ence between means.

In general, Table 8 reveals that all supervisors had lower total Relationship Inventory scores (variable 5) than their respective trainees (variable 10). In other words, supervisor perceptions of the relationship were less favor­able than supervisee perceptions. All trainees, on the other hand, scored the total Relationship Inventory consist­ently higher than supervisors. Higher scores indicates that supervisees perceived their supervisory realtionship in a more favorable light than their respective supervisors.

From an analysis of separate supervisory groups, Table 8 (variable 5) reveals that Supervisor #2 had a signi­fificantly lower relationship score than other supervisor scores. Group means for #1, 2 (p=.01); #2,3 (p=.05), and #2, 4 (p=.05) significantly differed, but group means for #1, #3, and #4 did not significantly differ from each other. Thus, Supervisor #2's score accounted for the major vari-
TABLE 8
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR EACH SUPERVISORY GROUP ON SELECTED VARIABLES
(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into four groups of five and assigned to one of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRI</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>118.400</td>
<td>130.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>22.345</td>
<td>38.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>90-151</td>
<td>74-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>67.400</td>
<td>103.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>22.678</td>
<td>47.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>33-90</td>
<td>41-163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>98.200</td>
<td>146.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>20.933</td>
<td>39.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>74-124</td>
<td>106-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>96.800</td>
<td>138.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>22.924</td>
<td>31.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>70-126</td>
<td>104-170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Differences Between Means*

\[ X_1 - X_2 = 51.00^{**} \]
\[ X_2 - X_3 = 30.80^{*} \]
\[ X_2 - X_4 = 29.40^{*} \]

\[ p < .01 \ (df = 8) = .716 \]
\[ p < .05 \ (df = 8) = .550 \]

*Legend: see Table 1.
ability between separate supervisory groups. Supervisors #1, #3, and #4 were more alike than Supervisor #2, and Supervisors #3 and #4 tended to perceive the supervisory relationship more similarly than other supervisors ($\bar{x}_3 - \bar{x}_4 = 1.4$).

Trainees (variable 10), on the other hand, did not reflect any significant differences individually. That is, all trainees tended to perceive their supervisory relationship like one another.

Comparisons between initiating and continuing members did not show significant differences (Table 9). However, trainees in both groups score their relationship higher than supervisors. Supervisors in the continuing group, scored their relationship higher than initiating members. Finally, supervisors and trainees in the continuing group, scored their relationship higher than supervisors and trainees in the initiating section. As a total sample, Table 9 reveals that trainees scored their Relationship Inventory higher than supervisors.

Thus, the nature of the perceived relationship between practicum supervisors and trainees revealed favorable and more similar than dissimilar patterns. Generally, however, trainees tended to perceive the supervisory relationship somewhat more favorably than their respective supervisors.
TABLE 9

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR INITIATING (#1 AND #2), CONTINUING (#3 AND #4), AND FULL SAMPLE SUPERVISORY GROUPS ON SELECTED VARIABLES

(Computed based on data from twenty trainees divided into two groups of ten and assigned to two of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRI</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>TRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>92.900</td>
<td>117.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>34.248</td>
<td>43.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>33-151</td>
<td>41-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>97.500</td>
<td>142.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>20.222</td>
<td>34.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>74-126</td>
<td>104-192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 (df = 8) = .550

** p < .01 (df = 8) = .716

(Full Sample: Computations for the following, based on data from twenty trainees and four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>95.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>27.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>33-151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 (df = 18) = .378

** p < .01 (df = 18) = .516

aLegend: see Table 1.
Having examined interview and relationship dimensions of practicum supervision individually (Questions #1 and #2), a study across these dimensions will be made in Question #3.

Question #3: What relationships, if any, accrue between perceptions of interview behavior and perceptions of the supervisory relationship of practicum supervisors and their respective counselor trainees?

Interview behavior and Relationship Inventory results will be reported relative to supervisor-trainee perceptions of interview behavior and supervisor and trainee dyad perceptions of the supervisory relationship. Variables (Table 1) will be reported by each supervisory group, by initiating-continuing groups, and by full sample. Scores will be treated statistically by obtaining means, standard deviations, and ranges in order to reveal congruous and incongruous supervisory patterns among all supervisors and trainees and to reveal supervisory patterns as manifested by separate groups. Particular reporting of the data will be done by making specific comparisons between interview and relationship dimensions utilizing Pearson product moment correlation coefficients on all variables.

It has been noted that supervisory groups showed similar perceptions on supervisory relationships and idiosyncratic perceptual patterns on interview analysis. Findings from both these supervisory patterns show some general (not statistically significant) congruities. In
Table 2, Group #2's mean score on length of runs between disagreements (variable 16) was second lowest of all four groups. Consequently, interview agreements were second lowest compared to all other sections. Second, Supervisor #2 and his trainees, having the lowest mean relationship scores among all other groups (Table 8), rated their respective relationship with one another lower than other supervisors and trainees in this study.

Another congruous trend is noted with continuing members (Group #3 and #4). This group had the highest number of interview agreements compared to initiating members, that is, the longest length of runs between disagreements (Table 3), and the highest relationship rating among supervisors and among trainees as compared to initiating members (Table 9).

Group #3 had the most interview agreements (Table 2), the highest relationship rating by trainees (Table 8) and the second highest relationship rating by supervisors (Table 8).

A final possible congruence is noted in Tables 6 and 8. Group #2 had the highest number of "shifts to supervisor" and the lowest supervisor-trainee relationship rating among all supervisors and trainees.

On the other hand, the most striking inconsistency occurred in Group #1. While this group had the lowest number of interview agreements (Table 2), relationship
rating by supervisor was the highest among all other supervisors (Table 8). Relationship rating by trainees, however, was second lowest among all other trainees (Table 8).

Having reported congruities-incongruities among all supervisors and trainees, the supervisory patterns can also be reported by separate groups in the following manner:

Group #1: Among supervisors, Supervisor #1 perceived the relationship as the highest; among trainees, trainees in Group #1 perceived the supervisory relationship as third highest (Table 8); supervisor-trainees perceived the lowest number of interview agreements among all other sections, and conversely, the highest number of interview disagreements; the length of runs between "unresolved disagreements were lowest, and conversely, the length of runs--total number of "unresolved" differences were the highest; the length of runs between "resolved" disagreements were the highest, and the length of runs--total number of "resolved" disagreements were the highest (Table 2); "shifts to supervisor" were the lowest, with the second highest number of "shifts to trainee," and the lowest number of "shifts to both supervisor and trainee."

Group #2: Among supervisors, Supervisor #2 perceived the relationship as the lowest; among trainees, trainees in Group #2 also perceived the supervisory relationship as the lowest; supervisor-trainees perceived the third highest number of interview agreements among all other sections,
and the second highest number of interview disagreements; length of runs between "unresolved" disagreements were the highest, and conversely, length of runs--total number of "unresolved" differences were the lowest; the length of runs between "resolved" disagreements were the lowest and the length of runs--total number of "resolved" disagreements were second highest; "shifts to supervisor" were the highest, with the lowest number of "shifts to trainee," and the highest number of "shifts to both supervisor and trainees."

Group #3: Among supervisors, Supervisor #3 perceived the relationship as the second highest; among trainees, trainees in Group #3 perceived the supervisory relationship as the highest; supervisor-trainees perceived the highest number of interview agreements among all other sections, and conversely, the lowest number of interview disagreements; length of runs between "unresolved" disagreements were third highest, and length of runs--total number of "unresolved" differences were second highest; the length of runs between "resolved" differences were second highest, and length of runs--total number of "resolved" disagreements were the lowest; "shifts to supervisor" were third highest, with the highest number of "shifts to trainees," and the third highest number of "shifts to both supervisor and trainee."
Group #4: Among supervisors, Supervisor #4 perceived the relationship as the third highest; among trainees, trainees in Group #4 perceived the supervisory relationship as second highest; supervisor-trainees perceived the second highest number of interview agreements among all other sections, and the third highest number of interview disagreements; length of runs between "unresolved" disagreements were second highest, and length of runs--total number of "unresolved" differences were third highest; the length of runs between "resolved disagreements were third highest, and the length of runs--total number of "resolved" disagreements were also third highestest; "shifts" to supervisor were second highest, with the third highest number of "shifts to trainee," and the second highest number of "shifts to both supervisor and trainees."

By initiating and continuing groups, the following patterns emerged:

1. Among supervisors, supervisors in the initiating section perceived the relationship as the lowest. Among trainees, trainees in the initiating section perceived the supervisory relationship as lowest; compared to the continuing group, supervisors-trainees perceived the lowest number of interview disagreements, and the highest number of interview disagreements; compared to the continuing group, initiating members had more "unresolved" and "resolved" disagreements; compared to continuing members, "shifts to
supervisor" were higher; "shifts to trainees" were lower, and "shifts to both supervisor and trainees" were higher.

2. Among supervisors, Supervisors in the continuing section perceived the relationship as the highest. Among trainees, trainees in the continuing section perceived the supervisory relationship as the highest; compared to the initiating group, supervisor-trainees perceived the highest number of interview agreements and the lowest number of interview disagreements; compared to the initiating group, continuing members had more "unresolved" and "resolved" differences; compared to continuing members, "shifts to supervisor" were lower; "shifts to trainee," were higher, and "shifts to both supervisor and trainee," were lower.

As a full sample, supervisors perceived the relationship lower than trainees; supervisor-trainees perceived more "resolved" than "unresolved" differences (by "runs between" and by "total number"); "shifts," from highest to lowest rankings, were: "to supervisor," "to trainee," and "to both supervisor and trainee."

The findings relative to congruous-incongruous supervisory patterns among all supervisors and trainees and relative to supervisory patterns by separate groups has been presented. Particular reporting of the data relevant to Question #3 will be done by making specific comparisons between interview and relationship dimensions utilizing Pearson product moment correlation coefficients on all variables.
A. Length of Run Between Disagreements as Related to Relationship Inventory:

In Table 10 (variable 5-10), supervisor and trainee dyad perceptions of the supervisory relationship reveals that three out of the four separate groups indicated a positive (not significant) correlation (Groups #2, #3, and #4). In Table 11 (variable 5-10), both the initiating and the continuing groups perceived positive (not significant) relationships. Finally, Table 11 shows that, as a full sample, supervisors and trainees perceived their respective relationships positively and at a statistically significant level (p=.05). That is to say, all supervisors and trainees perceived positive and statistically significant levels of regard, empathy, unconditionality of regard, and congruence.

In Table 10 (variable 16), an examination of length of runs between disagreements as related to relationship inventory (variable 5-10) by each, by initiating-continuing, and by full sample reveals the following similar supervisory patterns:

1. As LRBD decreased, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4, compared to one another (by each, by pairs, and by full sample), perceived a more favorable relationship.

2. As LRBD increased, trainees, in Groups #2 and #4, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship.
TABLE 10

SUMMARIZING COEFFICIENTS OF INTERCORRELATIONS FOR EACH SUPERVISORY GROUP ON SELECTED VARIABLES

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into four groups of five and assigned to one of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisory Group</th>
<th>5 SRI</th>
<th>10 SRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 TRI</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 LRBD</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>-.790</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 LRBUD</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>-.675</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 LRB RD</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>-.774</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>-.495</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 3) = .934
*p .05 (df = 3) = .805

aLegend: see Table 1.
TABLE 11

SUMMARIZING COEFFICIENTS OF INTERCORRELATIONS FOR INITIATING (#1 AND 2), CONTINUING (#3 AND 4), AND FULL-SAMPLE GROUPS[^a]

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into two groups of ten and assigned to two of four supervisors) (Computations based on data from twenty trainees and four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>SRI</th>
<th>TRI</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SRI</th>
<th>TRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TRI #1-2</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>#3-4</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>.420*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LRBBD #1-2</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRBBD</td>
<td>#3-4</td>
<td>-.575*</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>LRBBD</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LRBUD #1-2</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRBUD</td>
<td>#3-4</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>LRBUD</td>
<td>-.265</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LRBRRD #1-2</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRBRRD</td>
<td>#3-4</td>
<td>-.614*</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>LRBRRD</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 8) = .716. **p .01 (df = 20) = .516
*p .05 (df = 8) = .550  *p .05 (df = 20) = .378

[^a]Legend: see Table 1.
3. Supervisors (by each group) in Groups #1, #2, and #3 tended to function in a similar manner as their respective trainees on LRBD and relationship variables.

Discussion

While comparisons between length of runs between disagreements and relationship variables reflected a variety of supervisory patterns, no level of statistical significance was reached by each, by initiating-continuing, or by full sample groups. It must be remembered, however, that variability among supervisors and trainees and the relatively small sample of subjects tended to limit probability of significance.

A number of generalizations, however, can be made. First, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4, compared to one another, individually, as a pair, and as members of the full sample, tended to function in a similar manner. Specifically, they tended to perceive shorter length of runs between disagreements (fewer interview agreements) with perceptions of a more favorable supervisory relationship. Second, trainees in Groups #2 and #4, compared to one another (across initiating and continuing members), tended to function similarly. Third, only supervisor and trainees in Group #4, compared to all other groups in length of runs between disagreements, lacked a corresponding pattern with one another.
B. Length of Run Between Unresolved—Resolved Disagreements as Related to Relationship Inventory:

In Tables 10 and 11 (variable 17-18), an examination of length of runs between "unresolved" and "resolved" disagreements as related to relationship inventory (variable 5-10) by each, by initiating-continuing, and by full sample reveals the following similar supervisory patterns:

1. As length of runs between unresolved disagreements increased, supervisors in Groups #2 and #3, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship.

2. As length of runs between unresolved disagreements increased, trainees in Groups #2 and 4, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship.

3. Supervisor in Group #2 tended to function in a similar manner as trainees in Group #2 on LRBUD and relationship variables.

4. As length of runs between resolved disagreements decreased, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4 compared to one another (by each and by pairs), perceived a more favorable relationship.

5. As length of runs between resolved disagreements increased, trainees in Groups #2, #3, and #4, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship.
6. Supervisor in Group #2 tended to function in a similar manner as trainees in Group #2 on LRBRD and relationship variables.

Discussion

On length of runs between "unresolved" disagreements, supervisors in Groups #2 and #3, compared to one another (across initiating and continuing members), tended to function similarly. Also, trainees in Groups #2 and #3, compared to one another on length of runs between "unresolved" and "resolved" interview differences, tended to function in a similar manner.

On length of runs between "resolved" disagreements, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4, compared to one another (as on LRBD), tended to function similarly. Specifically, they tended to perceive more "resolved" interview differences with more favorable supervisory relationships. Trainees, on the other hand, in Groups #2, #3, and #4, compared to one another, tended to perceive fewer "resolved" interview disagreements with more favorable supervisory relationships.

C. Length of Run—Total Number of Disagreements as Related to Relationship Inventory:

In Tables 12 and 13 (variable 19), an examination of length of runs—total number of disagreements as related to relationship inventory (variable 5–10) by each, by initiating-continuing, and by full sample reveals the following similar supervisory patterns:
TABLE 12

SUMMARIZING COEFFICIENTS OF INTERCORRELATIONS FOR EACH SUPERVISORY GROUP ON SELECTED VARIABLES\(^a\)
(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into four groups of five and assigned to one of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisory Group</th>
<th>5 SRI</th>
<th>10 SRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>-.817*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>-.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>.839*</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRUD</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.987**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>.805*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>.843*</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRRD</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>-.968**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>-.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>-.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)p .05 (df = 3) = .805

\(^**\)p .01 (df = 3) = .934

\(^a\)Legend: see Table 1.
TABLE 13

SUMMARIZING COEFFICIENTS OF INTERCORRELATIONS FOR INITIATING (#1 AND 2), CONTINUING (#3 AND 4), AND FULL SAMPLE GROUPSa

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into two groups of ten and assigned to two of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>SRI</th>
<th>TRI</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SRI</th>
<th>TRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 TRI</td>
<td>#1-2</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 TRI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.420*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 LRD</td>
<td>#1-2</td>
<td>.594*</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>19 LRD</td>
<td></td>
<td>.482*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 LRUD</td>
<td>#1-2</td>
<td>.672*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>20 LRUD</td>
<td></td>
<td>.495*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 LRBD</td>
<td>#1-2</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.517</td>
<td>21 LRRD</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.512*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 8) = .716
*p .05 (df = 8) = .550

Legend: see Table 1.

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees and four supervisors)
1. As LRD increased, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4 compared to one another (by each, by pairs, and by full sample), perceived a more favorable relationship. By full sample, a statistical significance was reached with this pattern (p=.05).

2. As LRD decreased, trainees in Groups #2 and #4 perceived a more favorable relationship.

3. Supervisors (by each group) in Groups #2 and #3 tended to function in a similar manner as their respective trainees on LRD and relationship variables.

Discussion

It has been previously indicated that length of run—total number of disagreements can be used to reflect an inverse ratio from length of runs between disagreement. Supervisors in Groups #3 and #4 have consistently revealed more interview disagreements (or fewer interview agreements) with more favorable supervisory relationships. Likewise, trainees in Groups #2 and 4 have manifest similar patterns on length of runs between disagreements and length of runs—total number of disagreements. Specifically, they have revealed fewer interview disagreements (or more interview agreements) with more favorable supervisory relationships.

It should also be noted that supervisors and trainees in Groups #2 and #3, on both length of runs between disagreements and length of runs—total disagreements, have mani-
fested similar patterns within their separate groups.

D. Length of Run—Total Number of Unresolved—Resolved Disagreements as Related to Relationship Inventory:

In Tables 12 and 13 (variable 20-21), an examination of length of runs—total number of "unresolved" and "resolved" disagreements as related to relationship inventory (variable 5-10) by each, by initiating—continuing, and by full sample reveals the following similar supervisory patterns:

1. As LRUD increased, supervisors in Groups #2 and #4, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship. By full sample, a statistical significance was reached with this pattern (p.=.05).

2. As LRUD increased, trainees in Groups #2, #3, and #4, perceived a more favorable relationship.

3. Supervisors (by each group) in Groups #2 and #4 tended to function in a similar manner as their respective trainees on LRUD and relationship variables.

4. As LRRD increased, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4, compared to one another (by each, by pair, and by full sample), perceived a more favorable relationship.

5. As LRRD decreased trainees in Groups #2, #3, and #4, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship. By full sample, this pattern attained a statistical significance (p.=.05).
6. Supervisors (by each group) in Groups #1 and #2 tended to function in a similar manner as their respective trainees on LRRD and relationship variables.

**Discussion**

A number of important disclosures are indicated by the preceding results. First, most trainees in this study perceived more favorable relationship with more "unresolved" disagreements, but not at a statistically significant level (item 2). Second, most trainees, at a statistically significant level (item 5), perceived a more favorable relationship with fewer "resolved" disagreements, a point also noted in length of runs between resolved disagreements (variable 18). Supervisors in Groups #3 and #4, unlike most trainees, perceived more favorable relationships with interview differences resolved (item 4).

Third, supervisor and trainees in Group #2, tend to reflect similar perceptual patterns on "unresolved" and "resolved" types of disagreements for variables 17-18 and 20-21.

**E. Shifts to: Supervisor--Trainee--Both Supervisor and Trainee as Related to Relationship Inventory:**

A final concern for possible relationships between interview behavior and supervisory relationships considered the area of "shifts" or changes by supervisor and/or trainees on interview agreement-disagreement dimensions.
An examination of Tables 14 and 15 (variable 22-23-2-4) reveals the following similar patterns by each, by initiating-continuing, and by full sample:

1. As "S-S" increased, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4, compared to one another (by each and by pairs), perceived a more favorable relationship.

2. As "S-S" decreased, trainees in Groups #2 and #3, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship.

3. As "S-T" increased, supervisors in Groups #2 and #3, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship.

4. As "S-T" decreased, trainees in Groups #2 and #3, compared to one another, perceived a more favorable relationship.

5. As "S:S/T" increased, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4, compared to one another (by each and by pair), perceived a more favorable relationship.

6. As "S:S/T" increased, trainees in Groups #3 and #4, compared to one another (by each), perceived a more favorable relationship.

7. Supervisors (by each group) in Groups #2 and #4 on "S-S" and relationship variables, tended to function in a similar manner as their respective trainee.

8. Supervisors (by each group) in all groups on "S:S/T" and relationship variables tended to function in
### TABLE 14

SUMMARIZING COEFFICIENTS OF INTERCORRELATIONS FOR EACH SUPERVISORY GROUP ON SELECTED VARIABLES

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into four groups of five and assigned to one of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisory Group</th>
<th>5 SRI</th>
<th>10 SRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>-.711</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-S</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>-.757</td>
<td>-.964**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>-.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>-.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-T</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>-.915*</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>.815*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:S/T</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>.913*</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 3) = .934
*p .05 (df = 3) = .805

aLegend: see Table 1.
### TABLE 15

**SUMMARIZING COEFFICIENTS OF INTERCORRELATIONS FOR INITIATING (#1 AND 2), CONTINUING (#3 AND 4), AND FULL SAMPLE GROUPS**

(Computations based on data from twenty trainees divided into two groups of ten and assigned to two of four supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisory Groups</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>#1-2</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3-4</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-S</td>
<td>#1-2</td>
<td>-.782**</td>
<td>-.672*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3-4</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>-.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-T</td>
<td>#1-2</td>
<td>.554*</td>
<td>-.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3-4</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:S/T</td>
<td>#1-2</td>
<td>-.607*</td>
<td>-.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3-4</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>-.247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>.420*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-S</td>
<td>-.502*</td>
<td>-.561**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-T</td>
<td>.436*</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:S/T</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-.356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01 (df = 8) = .716 **p .01 (df = 20) = .516
* p .05 (df = 8) = .550 * p .05 (df = 20) = .378

*aLegend: see Table 1.*
a similar manner as their respective trainees.

Discussion

Supervisors in Groups #3 and #4 revealed similar patterns on "shifts to supervisor" and "shifts to both supervisor and trainees." Statistical significance was reached only by the full sample of subjects: (1) as shifts to supervisors decreased, supervisors and trainees perceived more favorable relationships; (2) as shifts to trainees increased, supervisors perceived more favorable relationships.

Data has been presented relevant to interview and relationship comparisons. Supervisors in Groups #3 and #4 (by each), compared to one another, revealed similar patterns in seven out of ten variables, excluding only length of run between unresolved disagreements, length of run—total number of unresolved disagreements, and "shifts to trainee."

Trainees in Groups #2 and #4 (by each), compared to one another, revealed similar patterns in seven out of ten variables, excluding only "shifts to supervisor," "shifts to trainee," and "shifts to both supervisor and trainee."

Trainees in Groups #3 and #4 (by each), compared to one another, revealed similar patterns in five out of ten variables, excluding length of run between disagreements, length of run between unresolved disagreements, length of run—total disagreements, "shifts to supervisor," and "shifts to trainee."
The most similar patterns that occurred between supervisors and their respective trainees were as follows: (1) Supervisor in Group #2 has corresponding patterns with trainees in Group #2 in all ten variables, and (2) Supervisor in Groups #2 and #4 had corresponding patterns with trainees in Groups #2 and #4 in four out of ten variables.

In general, supervisors and trainees in Groups #1 and #2 (by each) performed less similarly than supervisors and trainees in Groups #3 and #4 (by each).

Finally, five patterns attained statistical significance (p=.05): (1) For supervisors, as length of run—total number of disagreements increased, they perceived a more favorable supervisory relationship; (2) For supervisors, as length of run—total number of unresolved disagreements increased, they perceived a more favorable supervisory relationship; (3) For supervisors, as "shifts to trainee" increased, they perceived a more favorable relationship; (4) For trainees, as length of run—total number of resolved disagreements decreased, they perceived a more favorable supervisory relationship; and (5) For supervisors and trainees, as "shifts to supervisor" decreased, they perceived a more favorable relationship.

Summary

This chapter has presented the findings and discussions of the data organized under variable headings. Analysis of the data utilized means, standard deviations,
ranges, correlation coefficients, and biserial correlations to examine and compare interview and relationship dimensions of practicum supervision. Chapter V contains a summary of this study, followed by conclusions and implications for future research and/or training practices.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This investigation was conceived primarily to study two broad dimensions of supervision, the supervisor-trainee interaction during interview analysis and the relationship between supervisor and trainee. The specific problems of this investigation was to examine practicum supervisory-trainee perceptions of interview behavior and to determine the degree to which those perceptions were related to supervisor-trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

The importance and theoretical background of the study were discussed by reference to the theory and research related to two areas: the nature of the supervisory relationship and the impact of supervision on trainee learning during interview analysis.

The nature of the relationship was discussed primarily in terms of the client-centered conceptions of the helping relationship as conceived by Rogers (1957) in his article on the necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Barrett-Lennard developed an instrument, the Relationship Inventory, to measure the level of positive regard, the degree of empathic understand-
ing, the conditionality or unconditionality of regard, and
the degree of congruence or genuineness. These four sub-
tests together, measure the total inventory of the inter-
personal relationship as reflected by a total inventory
score. The instrument may be applied to determine any
interpersonal interaction.

Other studies were cited to indicate the differential effects of high and low functioning persons and the
necessity to attend to one's level of psychological devel-
opment. Finally, studies were surveyed to point out the
appropriateness and relevancy of the supervisory relation-
ship as an important variable to improve supervisory
effectiveness.

One instructional aspect of supervision, namely,
interview analysis, was measured quantitatively by the
degree of supervisor-trainee 'agreement-disagreement', kinds
of disagreements (resolved and unresolved), and direction of
'shifts'(changes) ensuing from discussions and comparisons
of perceptual observations of the trainees' interview be-
havior. Use of the Counselor-Client Behavioral Analysis
System (CCBA), as developed by this investigator, and its
application as a training/research tool was described.

Other studies were cited which indicated that there
was a connection between training, learning, and super-
visory influence, but that many variables, in addition to
the quality of the supervisory relationship, could account
for trainee growth. Specification of clear-cut causative factors were lacking.

The problem of the study was stated in three questions which this investigation was designed to answer. These questions can be stated as follows: (1) What is the nature of the perceived interview behavior between supervisor and trainee? (2) What is the nature of the perceived supervisory relationship between practicum supervisors and trainees? (3) What relationships, if any, accrue between perceptions of interview behavior and perceptions of practicum supervisors and their respective counselor trainees?

The procedures used to test these questions were to have each of the four supervisors, with five trainees apiece, view, code, and discuss trainee interview behavior from one, twenty to thirty minute video taped interview. Comparisons of each others independent codings were made and reasons for discrepancies were noted.

Immediately after interview analysis, the twenty trainees were asked to rate the supervisory relationship with their supervisor on the Relationship Inventory. Likewise, the supervisors rated the relationship they had with each trainee.

Finally, data from the CCBA Instrument and Relationship Inventory were prepared for analysis on a Fortran computer. Means, standard deviations, ranges, biserial
correlations, and product moment correlations were conducted on all variables by each supervisory group, by initiating and continuing supervisory groups, and by all supervisory groups combined.

Conclusions

Question #1. What is the nature of the perceived interview behavior between supervisor and trainee?

On the nature of supervisory interview behavior, the following conclusions can be made:

1. Within each supervisory section, all groups tended to function similarly, that is, without any significant differences between groups, on only three of the nine variables, namely, length of runs—between resolved disagreements, length of runs—total number of resolved disagreements, and "shifts to trainee."

2. Generally, Supervisory Groups #2, #3, and #4 tended to perform in a more similar pattern than Supervisory Group #1.

3. Supervisory Groups #3 and #4 individually, performed more similarly than subjects in Supervisory Groups #1 and 2.

4. Initiating and Continuing Groups did not reveal any significant differences.

5. As a general pattern, initiating group members, compared to the continuing group, had fewer length of runs between disagreements (fewer interview agreements), and
fewer length of runs between "unresolved" and "resolved" type of disagreements (variable 16-17-18). Conversely, they had more total number of interview disagreements, and more total number of "unresolved" and "resolved" type of interview disagreements (variable 19-20-21). Finally, initiating members had more "shifts to trainee" than the continuing section.

Continuing members, on the other hand, had more length of runs between disagreements (more interview agreements), and more length of runs between "unresolved" and "resolved" disagreements (variables 16-17-18). Conversely, they had fewer total number of unresolved" and "resolved" type of interview disagreements (variable 19-20-21).

6. As a full sample, all subjects had more "resolved" than "unresolved" type of disagreements, and more "shifts to supervisor" than to "trainee" or "both supervisor and trainee."

Thus an interview analysis patterns, significant variability was manifested between separate supervisory groups, but not between initiating and continuing members. That is, supervisory interview critique patterns between the four groups were significantly more dissimilar than alike; between initiating and continuing groups, no significant differences were found. One of the primary findings in this investigation was the variability between
separate supervisory groups, a tendency also reported in
the Walz and Roeber study (1962).

Question #2: What is the nature of the perceived
supervisory relationship between practicum super-
visors and trainees?

The nature of the perceived relationship between
practicum supervisors and trainees revealed more favorable
and more similar than dissimilar patterns. Supervisors in
Groups #1, #3, and #4 perceived the relationship in a more
similar manner than Supervisor in Group #2. Between
individual trainees, no significant differences were found.
In other words, all trainees in this study tended to per-
ceive the supervisory relationship in a similar manner.
Also, trainees generally tended to perceive the supervisory
relationship somewhat more favorably than their respective
supervisors. A "halo effect" was cited as a possible ex-
planation for this tendency. A similar trend has been
reported by Stewart (1958), Reddy (1969), Walz and Johnson
(1963), and Poling (1968).

If trainees appeared to act less critically and dis-
criminately on perceptions of the supervisory relationship,
it may be, as Gysbers has suggested (1964), that trainees
were reacting to the amount of perceived supervisory threat.
Perhaps the tendency to "play it safe" particularly in a
systematic study such as the one they were exposed to,
heightens the probability of safeguarding the ego. It may
also be that an aspect of the "halo effect" relates to
supervisory expectations by trainees. If expectations approximate the student-teacher role as noted by Delaney and Moore (1966), Gysbers and Johnston (1965), and Walz and Roeber (1962), then trainee contacts with the "more knowing person" may be associated with higher perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

Question #3: What relationships, if any, accrue between perceptions of interview behavior and perceptions of practicum supervisors and their respective counselor trainees?

The following conclusions can be made on perceptions of interview behavior as related to perceptions of the supervisory relationship:

1. Between supervisors, supervisors in Groups #3 and #4 (by each and by pairs), tended to function more similarly than supervisors in Groups #1 and #2 in seven out of ten variables. It may be that these supervisors displayed similar patterns because of their close association as participants in a year-long NDEA Institute. It is also possible that they would have performed similarly in any kind of context or with any other kind of association.

2. Between trainees, trainees in Groups #2 and #4 (by each) tended to function more similarly than all other trainee combinations in seven out of ten variables.

3. Between trainees, trainees in Groups #3 and #4 (by each and by pairs) tended to function more similarly than other trainees in five out of ten variables.
4. The most consistent supervisory patterns between supervisors in Groups #3 and #4 (by each and by pairs) were as follows:

   a. With fewer interview agreements or more interview disagreements, more favorable supervisory relationships were perceived. Perhaps as members of the continuing group, supervisors may have felt more secure and comfortable enough in their supervisory relationship to disagree with trainees without fear or causing adverse effects.

   b. With more "resolved" disagreements, more favorable supervisory relationships were perceived. Thus, supervisors, as members of the continuing group, seemed to associate "closure" on interview differences with more favorable perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

5. The most consistent supervisory patterns between trainees in Groups #2, #3, and #4 (by each) were as follows:

   With fewer "resolved" disagreements, more favorable supervisory relationships were perceived. Most trainees in this study apparently did not feel threatened by "open-ended" interview differences. Perhaps their favorable perceptions of the supervisory relationship (higher than all supervisors) contributed to this occurrence. Perhaps, too, as a consequence of their relationship, trainees felt that improved learning would be derived more from interview differences "unresolved" than "resolved." In any event,
unresolved differences did not seem to pose any threat to their supervisory relationship.

6. Supervisor and trainees in Group #2 functioned alike on all variables. Supervisors and trainees in Groups #2 and #4 functioned alike on four out of ten variables.

7. Relationship scores (by each) for three out of the four supervisory groups were positively related. As a full sample, relationship scores were significantly related (p. = .05).

8. Statistically significant correlations were obtained by the full sample on five variables:
   a. As interview agreements increased, supervisors perceived more favorable relationships.

   b. As there were fewer "unresolved" interview differences, supervisors perceived more favorable relationships.

   c. As "shifts to trainee" increased, supervisors perceived a more favorable relationship.

   d. As there were fewer "resolved" interview differences, trainees perceived more favorable relationships.

   e. As "shifts to supervisor" decreased, supervisors and trainees perceived a more favorable supervisory relationship.
Implications

The following section will suggest some implications of this study.

1. Further investigation of the areas studied show promise for assessing supervisor-impact and trainee change over a period of time. However, it would be desirable to increase the population sample.

This study has demonstrated the utility of assessing interview and relationship qualities (by each, by groups, and by full sample) along the variables treated in this pilot study. Further efforts to confirm or invalidate trends cited could best be made over a longer period of time, utilizing a larger population sample and a larger sampling of successive counselor interviews. While a longitudinal sampling of interview behavior would provide a better index of candidate interview change, experience from this study indicates that small and random sampling from interviews provides a reasonably good index of the general characteristics of trainee behavioral patterns. It was found that within six to ten minutes of the interview (three to five coding pages), for example, trainee behavioral patterns became strikingly evident and stabilized. Thus successive ten minute samplings of interview behavior over the entire length of the practicum course could be collected and analyzed as a good index of counselor learning. Typical patterns of behavior might even be contrasted to samples
taken from practicing counselors. Awareness of typical counseling behaviors in pre-service and on-the-job settings would add to our knowledge about the dynamics of human interaction. Process studies could then better define desired product outcomes.

2. Use of an interaction system as a training or research tool offers significant possibilities in that verbal-nonverbal sequential behavior could be studied. 

This study has demonstrated one approach toward analyzing interview behavior. A number of other approaches are suggested in Appendix I: Instructional Manual: Operational Use of the CCBA System. A brief overview of these approaches suggest possibilities for future research. 

An item analysis of the "Coding Sheets," for example, could provide a rich array of data such as: type, number, and length of verbal nonverbal subroles; categorization of descriptive data from the "Explanatory Remarks" and "Nature of Disagreement" sections; type and quality of verbal-nonverbal relationship qualities ("expanding" and "contracting"), type and number of communicative events, and types of counselor-client multiple behavioral (subrole) patterns within each timed interval. Second, use of an interaction matrix (see Appendix H and I) would be especially valuable as an interaction schema for the study of separate behavioral patterns within each timed interval. Future research might better examine effects of interaction "happenings" over a
period of successive interviews. One approach, for example, might investigate the stability of counselor change over a period of time. In this manner, a better idea of the kind of learning (overt behavioral change vs. internalized learning) would be had.

There are some distinct benefits in a CCBA type interaction system, and it appears that there is a growing need for such a measuring approach (Mosher, 1967). It should be noted that, heretofore, supervisory investigation of counseling interview behavior has been restricted in four general ways: first, investigation has generally been derived from a study of fragmented elements of counseling behaviors obtained from written transcripts of interviews. Second, analysis has been mainly limited to verbal or talk responses. Third, little attention has been given toward viewing, analyzing, and discussing behavior as it unfolds in sequence. Finally, instruments used to analyze counseling behaviors have often tended to be data collection devices of post process recall by counselors or counselees, rather than broad time samples of behavior in context. Thus much of counseling research to date has not placed behavior analysis in larger contexts nor in sequential order, both elements of which could contribute to a more realistic analysis of interview "happenings."

Furthermore, studies of nonverbal behaviors have mostly been investigated either apart from the counseling
interview itself or out of context from their verbal counterpart. Technically, of course, video tape had not been readily available until recently as a means to analyze verbal/nonverbal behavior in configuration with each other.

The application of a verbal-nonverbal interaction training tool suggests a need for supervisors and trainees to explore with one another reasons for congruities or incongruities from their own perceptual frame of reference. This calls for the trainee and the supervisor to systematically become sensitive to themselves and to one another.

Thus what appeared to be needed was: (a) a training instrument to reflect a broad range of counseling behavior; (b) a training system to code, analyze, and discuss verbal/nonverbal sequential behavior; and (c) a training system to facilitate feedback of counseling behavior to permit systematic discussion between external (supervisor) and internal (counselor and/or client) observation of interview perceptions.

3. Further investigation of counselor-client interview perceptions of the interaction would be valuable.

One approach, for example, might investigate the effects of past counselor-client interaction patterns on present and future counselor-client processes and outcomes. The importance of longitudinal examinations of counselor-client interaction patterns has been poignantly described by Kell and Mueller(1966): "The recurring theme is that
everything that occurs in the counseling relationship is determined by the previous behavior of one or the other of the two interacting parties" (p. 18).

Second, although this study was concerned with counselor trainee interview behavior, the CCBA System could further investigate supervisor, counselor, and client perceptions of counselor-client behavior.

4. Supervisors might attempt to better establish a good working realtionship with trainees.

This study does indicate the importance of the supervisory relationship as a vital element influencing and being influenced by supervisory activity. It must be remembered that the supervisory relationship itself is a human interaction process and as such the dynamics of supervisor and supervisee are reciprocally affecting and changing each other. Accordingly, Kell and Mueller (1966) believe that supervisors ought to examine their own relationships to their supervisees:

He [the supervisor] may well find attitudes and behaviors of his own which have contributed to the counselor's inadequacy. . . . The supervisor should, we think, regard his behavior and its consequences as a valuable source of information which enables him to understand better himself, the counselor, their relationship, and the counselor-client relationship. The supervisor, too, can often begin to recall counselor behaviors and verbalizations which, while they may not have been explicable and usable at the time they were noted, can now be utilized. These recollections can facilitate supervisor-counselor exploration into the underlying nature of the counselor's own life with its conflicts, needs, and
dynamics. This exploration necessarily continues to the point where the counselor's feelings of adequacy and his understanding of himself and his client are sufficient for him to return to the counseling relationship and act to revitalize it (p. 128).

We need to know then more about the nature of the supervisory relationship so that we can relate it to outcome criteria. If the relationship is important to successful outcomes, it is necessary to examine carefully the conditions under which effective relationships are achieved in the process.

Further understanding of the supervisory relationship impact could ensue from a study of Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory sub-test results as well as total Relationship Inventory scores.

Second, supervisors might improve supervisory relationships by providing better structure to the supervisory sessions. Trainees ought to be clearly orientated to practicum and supervisory processes, goals, and purposes. Particular emphasis should be placed on the nature of supervision and its similarities to or differences from traditional supervision associated within the teaching-learning situation. Finally, as in the Gysbers and Johnson report (1965), supervisors could supply more directive help to trainees in initial contacts, in keeping with their expectations, and less direct assistance and structure with the passage of time and trainee level of readiness.
5. Supervisor differences could be studied.

This investigation has pointed out the heterogeneity among supervisors in this study, and therefore the necessity to assess supervisor and trainee performance individually as well as collectively. Reasons for these differences and the particular impact they have on trainees, needs to be studied. Observation and taping of supervisory sessions might be undertaken in much the same manner as this study was conducted.

Another important step would be to study the outcomes of different supervisory behaviors on trainee counseling behavior. One would hope that such research would lead to improved supervisor selection, better supervision of counseling practicum, and consequently, better prepared counselors.
# APPENDIX A

**CO-CL BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT (CCBA)**

## COMMUNICATIVE EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO or CL VERBAL-NONVERBAL INTERACTIONS</th>
<th>CO or CL VERBAL-NONVERBAL SUBROLE (Co-Cl Intention)</th>
<th>CO or CL VERBAL-NONVERBAL RELATIONSHIP QUALITY: Expanding +</th>
<th>CO or CL VERBAL-NONVERBAL RELATIONSHIP QUALITY: Contraction -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature, limits, goals of counseling; Administrative Arrangements; Setting up topic; Re-opening previous topic; Re-focus or Re-emphasis within established topic.</td>
<td>STRUCTURING</td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>perfunctory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-inforcing behavior; Establishing (receiving) rapport; Praising-Encouraging; Showing reception/understanding of content/feeling.</td>
<td>SUPPORTING</td>
<td>congruent</td>
<td>incongruent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building-facilitating content/fueling along an established topic; Obtaining background info and gen'l understanding of co-cl.</td>
<td>DEVELOPING AND INFO-SEEKING</td>
<td>implementing</td>
<td>impeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective/subjective exploring of possible alternatives/views; Objective giving of suggestion(s).</td>
<td>SUGGESTION/ALTERNATIVE GIVING</td>
<td>approving</td>
<td>non-approving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective giving of factual, authoritative data.</td>
<td>INFO-GIVING</td>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>inattentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective/subjective analyzing/interpreting; Pointing out or forming relationships; Making or forming inferences or insights.</td>
<td>DIAGNOSING</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting facts, opinions, or asking questions with intent to urce/persuade.</td>
<td>ADVISING-JUDGING</td>
<td>firm; warm</td>
<td>abrupt; harsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subrole behavior unclear—classification uncertain.</td>
<td>UNCLASSIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO and CL remain silent</td>
<td>SILENCE</td>
<td>comfort; accepting</td>
<td>discomfort; unaccepting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B

CCBA CODING SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOTAGE READING</th>
<th>CO-CL TALK VERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>CO-CL LISTENS NONVERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY REMARKS</th>
<th>NATURE OF DISAGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place minus symbol ( - ) after contracting subrole.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOTAGE READING</th>
<th>GO-CL TALK VERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>CO-CL LISTENS NONVERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY REMARKS</th>
<th>NATURE OF DISAGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Brief moment of silence)

Go shows supportive behavior; smiling; eye contact, etc.

Event: changed from small talk to main discussion topic.

Co began to develop main topic; (co states that he knew cl previous to interview)

Changed to co: supervisor over-reacts to co's real intention.

(audio not clear)

Place minus symbol (-) after contracting subrole.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOTAGE READING</th>
<th>CO-CL TALK VERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>CO-CL LISTENS NONVERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY REMARKS</th>
<th>NATURE OF DISAGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Note minus: support is superficial; entirely a cognitive response—bordering on being mechanical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td>(2's mostly uh, huh, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td>Leaning forward—supporting; shifts body position forward when ready to take initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td>Minor event—changed topic—perhaps main theme developing here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Added: Not sure about this, but co believes it is so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td>Second viewing; co taking more active role; co seems to doubt cl's word—not fully accepting (tone; inflection of voice, etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place minus symbol (-) after contracting subrole.
### CCBA CODING SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOTAGE READING</th>
<th>GO-CL TALK VERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>GO-CL LISTENS NONVERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY REMARKS</th>
<th>NATURE OF DISAGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 50 52 54 56</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Added: I still question this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 52 54 56 58</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bordering on rejection. Co not very accepting of cl's word—perhaps co's previous knowledge of cl's school record influencing co attitude.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 58 60 62 64</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Added: Co intended 6's—as a 6, 3 pattern, but I don't see this yet; perhaps a 3, 6 pattern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 64 66 68 70</td>
<td>7, 4, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Added: Still not clear on 6's. Is this Co non-verbal style?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place minus symbol (-) after contracting subrole.
APPENDIX D

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY--FORM OS-M-64
(Supervisor Form Applied to Male Trainee)

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.
Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with your counselee.
Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:
+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. I respect him as a person.

2. I want to understand how he sees things.

3. My interest in him depends on the things he says or does.

4. I am comfortable and at ease in our relationship.

5. I feel a true liking for him.

6. I may understand his words but I do not see the way he feels.

7. Whether he is feeling happy or unhappy with himself makes no real difference to the way I feel about him.

8. He feels that I put on a role or front with him.

9. I am impatient with him.

10. I nearly always know exactly what he means.

11. Depending on his behavior, I have a better opinion of him sometimes than I have at other times.
12. He feels that I am real and genuine with him.

13. He feels appreciated by me.


15. My feeling toward him doesn't depend on how he feels toward me.

16. It makes me uneasy when he asks or talks about certain things.

17. I am indifferent toward him.

18. I usually sense or realize what he is feeling.

19. I want him to be a particular kind of person.

20. He nearly always feels that what I say expresses exactly what I am feeling and thinking as I say it.

21. I find him rather dull and uninteresting.

22. My own attitudes toward some of the things he does or says prevents me from understanding him.

23. He can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of me without really making me feel any differently about him.

24. I want him to think that I like him or understand him more than I really do.

25. I really care for him.

26. Sometime I think that he feels a certain way because that's the way I feel.

27. I like certain things about him, and there are other things I do not like.

28. I do not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.

29. He feels that I disapprove of him.

30. I realize what he means even when he has difficulty saying it.

31. My attitude toward him stays the same; I am not pleased with him sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.
32. Sometimes I am not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.

33. I just tolerate him.

34. I usually understand the whole of what he means.

35. If he shows that he is angry with me, I become hurt or angry with him, too.

36. I express my true impressions and feelings with him.

37. I am friendly and warm with him.

38. I just take no notice of some things that he thinks or feels.

39. How much I like or dislike him is not altered by anything that he tells me about himself.

40. At times he senses that I am not aware of what he is really feeling with me.

41. He feels that I really value him.

42. I appreciate exactly how the things he experiences feel to him.

43. I approve of some things he does, and plainly disapprove of others.

44. I am willing to express whatever is actually in my mind with him, including any feelings about himself or about me.

45. I don't like him for himself.

46. At times I think that he feels a lot more strongly about a particular thing than he really does.

47. Whether he is in good spirits or feeling upset does not make me feel any more or less appreciative of him.

48. I am openly myself in our relationship.

49. He seems to irritate and bother me.

50. I do not realize how sensitive he is about some of the things we discuss.
51. Whether the ideas and feelings he expresses are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to my feeling toward him.

52. There are times when he feels that my outward response to him is quite different from the way I feel underneath.

53. At times I feel contempt for him.

54. I understand him.

55. Sometimes he is more worthwhile in my eyes than he is at other times.

56. He has not felt that I try to hide anything from him that I feel with him.

57. I am truly interested in him.

58. My response to him is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him.

59. He doesn't think that anything I say or do really changes the way I feel toward him.

60. What I say to him often gives a wrong impression of my whole thought or feeling at the time.

61. I feel deep affection for him.

62. When he is hurt or upset I can recognize his feelings exactly, without becoming upset myself.

63. What other people think of him does (or would, if I knew) affect the way I feel toward him.

64. He believes that I have feelings I do not tell him about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.
APPENDIX E

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY--FORM OS-M-64
(Tabulation Sheet: Subscores and Total Scores)

Name (SUPERVISOR): _______________________

Name (TRAINEE): ___________________________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub Total: 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub-Total: 2 |

EX(-1): Sub-
Total: 2

Grand Total (sub-total; 1 and 2): 129
APPENDIX F
DEFINITIONS OF CO-CL (VERBAL-NONVERBAL) SUBROLES

Subrole

A subrole is an adjudged response or a set of responses (verbal-nonverbal) which describe the counselors or counselees general purpose or intention. Subrole differs from specific counselor or counselee response in that it is more encompassing in terms of what it is that the counselor-counselee is broadly trying to accomplish for a particular period of time during the interview.

CCBA Category Numbers

1. STRUCTURING:

The co is expected and often does give explanation or definitions as to what may happen in the relationship. It is an orientation to what counseling is about and what takes place. In reality, responsibility for the structure is reciprocal in that both the co and cl have needs that determine structure and set in motion responses which the helping person must be prepared to meet. Structuring subroles generally apply to three main areas: (A) Nature, limits, and goals of counseling; (B) Administrative arrangements to include directions/instructions, and (C) Setting up a topic; Re-focus or re-emphasis within established topic.

2. SUPPORTING:

The co helps the cl feel more secure by reassuring the cl that their joint efforts will produce positive gains. Supporting subroles include re-inforcing leads in three major areas: (A) Rapport; (B) Praise-encouragement, and (C) Receiving-understanding.

3. DEVELOPING—INFORMATION-SEEKING:

The co uses the feelings and/or ideas of the cl to build discussion or to facilitate communication along the same topic area. In reaching this goal, the co responses are often directed toward obtaining specific background information about the cl, and toward obtaining a general understanding of the cl's concerns. The general intention of info-seeking is to inform the co without particularly furthering the cl's insights.
4. **SUGGESTION/ALTERNATIVE GIVING**:

The suggestion/alternative subrole goes a step further than the developing--info-seeking subrole. The co explores, along with the cl's active participation, possible solutions to the cl's problems or concerns. The co in this case is not urging or persuading but rather suggesting possibilities to probe or different approaches or views to consider.

5. **INFORMATION-GIVING**:

The co generally supplies factual and authoritative data to the cl about courses, subjects, rules, regulations, procedures, occupations, college requirements, or factual information about the counselee's problem. The co is merely attempting to provide the cl with objective information which may prove useful to the cl without applying immediate pressure for action. The cl usually asks for this information.

6. **DIAGNOSING**:

The co directs his statements towards drawing out information or ideas from the cl so that the co can infer what some of the cl's problems are and what the sources might be.
APPENDIX G

DEFINITIONS OF CO-CL (VERBAL-NONVERBAL) INTERACTIONS

Interactions

Interactions refer to reciprocal verbal-nonverbal communicative responses between counselor and client.

CCBA Category Numbers

1. STRUCTURING:

Indicates nature, limits and goals of the general counseling process and the particular relationship at hand. Often structure provides limits in four categories: time, action, role, and process or procedural limits.

Provides for administrative arrangements including directions/instructions.

Provides for setting up of topic. This is frequently done by using general lead questions such as: "What would you like to talk about today?" A re-focus is when the co aims at changing the direction of the discussion by re-opening a previously stated topic, or opening a new one. Example: "Let's go back"; "Have you thought of...?" "What do you think about that?" Transitional general lead questions are frequently used. Example: "Is there anything else you would like to discuss?" A re-focus on an established topic is where the co attempts to narrow the focus of a broad topic currently being discussed. Example: "What about school seems to be troubling you?"

2. RE-INFORCING:

Re-inforcing is accomplished by such interaction techniques as rapport-building, approval, assurance-reassurance, acceptance, clarification-summary clarification, and reflection.

a. Rapport: In rapport-building, the co often begins by the greeting itself: a firm handshake, calling the cl by name, or bring up a topic of common interest. From the initial greeting, the co engages in light conversation, friendly discussion, small talk, jokes, and the like, which require little attention and allows each participant to size up one another. Responses
may involve open-ended questions. Example: "How's everything going with you?"

b. Praise and Encouragement: Praise and encouragement are designed to counter feelings or overt expressions of inadequacy to prompt action. Behaviors may build upon the cl's ego-strength. Example: "That's fine; "You can do this easily"; "You will get along."
Jokes that release tension, nodding head, or saying "uhhah" are included. Two commonly used techniques include approval and assurance-re-assurance.

(1) Approval: In approval behavior some type of value judgment on the part of the co is being made. Technique is considered reinforcement because it tends to encourage the cl to continue along a course of action that seems good or desirable for him. Approval may be indicated by voice or gesture. Since cl has already expressed these ideas, he does not feel that undue pressure is being placed on him.

(2) Assurance or re-assurance: In assurance or re-assurance, the co attempts to restore the cl's confidence. Co goes beyond acceptance. Example: "Things could be worse"; "You're not alone...."; "You can do this"; "Everything is going to be all right."

c. Receiving-Understanding: Three commonly used techniques include: acceptance, clarification, and reflection.

(1) Acceptance: In acceptance or receiving behavior, the co indicates to the cl that he is being understood and received. While such responses also tend to develop or further discussion and elaboration by the cl, their chief aim here is to reflect understanding and acceptance of the cl's feelings and/or messages without actually interrupting the communication itself. Examples: "Mm-hm"; "Yes, I understand"; "I see"; "Well, that's an interesting point of view"; "I think I understand what you are saying"; "Take your time, there's no rush." Responses may also include a simple nod whenever the cl looks for some reaction from the co. Brief reflection of attitudes and feelings, and brief restatements or rephrasings of the cl's responses are frequently used leads.
Note: If communication between the co and the cl has ebbed or ceased noticeably, then the co may employ acceptance and reflection leads to facilitate further communication along the same topic area. Should this action take place, such leads would more appropriately be categorized under the "Developing--Info-Seeking" sub-role.

(2) Clarification: Clarification of feeling or content is an attempt by the co to make the cl's communication clearly understood to both participants or to pinpoint an exact meaning or give precision or simplification to the on-going discussion. Compared to reflection, the co goes slightly beyond what the cl expresses, but does not add to or interpret what the cl said or expressed. While a co may want to show the cl understanding and receiving behavior through acceptance, reflection, re-statement, and rephrasing, he may also want to help clarify the cl's thinking and/or feeling without having him feel that he is being pushed in any direction. In this situation, the co is careful to say only what is fairly evident in the cl's remarks but his precise simplification helps the cl to see more clearly what his problem is. The co may use clarification remarks in the form of questions or statements to describe the content of the cl's preceding speech more succinctly, or he may use it to bring out the cl's attitudes or feelings toward the topic.

Summary Clarification or reviews during the interview may serve the purpose of clarifying the preceding events and their meanings for the cl. At the end of a series of remarks on a topic, the co may wish to bring out succinctly what the cl has been saying in a roundabout way. If he wishes to organize and summarize, but not interpret what has been said, he would use a summary clarification response. This brief summary, leads the cl to see his problem more clearly, but because no new ideas are included and because the co deals only with the immediately preceding cl's speech, the co does not seem to be directing the discussion. Summary clarification then tends to close out discussion of a phase or topic. In a real sense, the effort of the co is to tie and connect unorganized and ill-arranged material from the client in order to focus on the basic theme or topic of his discourse. Examples of clarification: "In other words, it's this way...."; "In essence, you've said this...."; "You'd like it better if you were preparing for a specific job?" "So far, you've said this...."
(3) **Reflection:** Reflection of feeling is an acceptance lead but also serves to clarify the feeling tone of the cl. An attempt is made by the co, therefore, to express in fresh words, the essential attitudes—feelings (not so much the content) expressed by the cl. Reflection indicates the co's intent to show that he understands correctly what the cl feels or is experiencing. The co then is chiefly concerned with the emotional undercurrents of the cl's verbalizations. He reads between the lines, so to speak, and responds to the unexpressed attitudes and emotions underlying content. Rephrasing the core of the cl's emotions is a commonly used technique. Reflection, also like acceptance, can serve the effect of furthering discussion. When its major emphasis, however, is to receive and understand the cl, then it is classified as a re-inforcing interaction. Examples: "In other words, you feel...."; "There's no way out for you"; "You are not quite sure that I understand?"; "That seemed like a lot of time"; "Some people don't say nice things."

3. **DEVELOPING—INFORMATION-SEEKING:**

Developing—Information-Seeking is often accomplished through general lead questions. The co may use a number of techniques common to the "supporting" subrole such as reflection, clarification, and the like. When these leads are classified under the "Developing" subrole, however, there is a marked decline or cessation of communication between co and cl. In these instances, a co's next immediate interaction is to facilitate further discussion and elaboration on the same topic. Example: "What happened then?" "How do you mean?" "Will you tell me more about that?" "Why do you think he would do that?" "What kinds of things do you like to do best?" "What were your grades last term?"

4. **SUGGESTION/ALTERNATIVE GIVING:**

In the suggestion/alternative interaction, there is mutual give and take relationship. Both co and cl are actively attempting to find possible solutions to the cl's concerns. The co is not urging or persuading; he is suggesting alternative approaches or views on a subject. Example: "You might do this...." "I doubt that you would find as much trouble as this other boy did."
5. INFORMATION-GIVING INTERACTION:

Information-giving is characterized by objective presentation of factual, authoritative data. Example: "The facts are...": "Let's take a look at your test here. Uh ... your choice of college is going to require that you take both of the national testing programs available."

6. DIAGNOSING AND UNDERSTANDING:

The interaction is one of analyzing and interpreting. The co points out a relationship or a feeling which the co thinks can be inferred from the cl response although the cl did not specifically mention it. Because the point is stated positively, the cl feels that he is being asked to accept. The co may or may not bolster his observation with explanations, test results, or refer to research or authority. Interpretation and analysis do not include suggested solutions, urgings, or persuasions. Examples: "What seems to be operating here is..."; "Do you think that you might be disowning responsibility for what happened?" "Do you think, then, that you could become an engineer when your interest patterns tend to be markedly dissimilar?"

7. ADVISING-JUDGING INTERACTION:

In the advising-judging interaction, the co provides facts, opinions, recommendations, or asks questions intended to urge or persuade. Example: "I don't like what you are doing"; "You ought to do this..."

8. UNCLASSIFIED

Unclassified interaction is questionable or unidentifiable responses. Incoherent audio/video response is also included.

9. SILENCE

Silence interaction occurs when both co and cl remain silent for 10 seconds or more.
APPENDIX I

INSTRUCTIONAL MANUAL

OPERATIONAL USE OF THE COUNSELOR-CLIENT
BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS SYSTEM
(CCBA)

The purpose of this manual is to help supervisors, counselors, and other educators concerned with counselor education to understand more fully and to improve supervisor-counselor effectiveness. The manual describes some basic procedures found to be useful in the utilization of a new interaction schema. While these instructions will reflect the author's "modus operandi," they are only meant as one set of possible guidelines, not immutable rules. An advantage of the system is its simplicity and consequently its adaptation and modification to a wide variety of uses and settings. Users of the system, therefore, would be encouraged to operationalize CCBA in a manner that best fits their needs. The manual is based on the assumption that a counselor can be helped to more accurately define and operationalize his own concept of desirable or effective counseling behavior and subsequently modify his behavior accordingly. The following steps will outline major areas to consider when implementing the system.
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A. Designation of Observer(s) and Observation

In utilizing the CCBA instrument, designation of observer(s) and observation must be made. The following combinations are possible as illustrated in Figure 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Designated Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1. Views Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Views Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>3. Views Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Views Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>5. Views Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Views Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>7. View Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Counselor</td>
<td>8. View Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>9. Views Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Client</td>
<td>10. Views Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>11. View Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Client</td>
<td>12. View Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>13. View Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>14. View Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

B. Timing

In a "live" or video taped interview, the CCBA system is used in much the same way on Flanders' Interaction Analysis. Instead of the Flanders' 3 second interval coding, however, an approximate 10 second interval was
found to be quite manageable in terms of viewing and coding verbal and nonverbal behavior and also in terms of viewing a functional unit of behavior rather than just fragmentary portions of dialogue.

Ten second intervals from a video taped interview can be derived by viewing the footage meter on a video recorder. Each even numbered turn (using a GE or Sonie portable deck with half-inch tape) approximates 10 seconds. Exact interval coding should not be necessary for training purposes. For research use, however, several possible approaches can be cited: (1) An independent observer could be designated to call out even numbers from the footage meter. For the same person to view, code and monitor the footage meter is a difficult task unless the party is very familiar with the coding system; (2) A sound tape could be used containing 10 second chime intervals; (3) An automatic three digit numbering device could be placed inconspicuously at the interview table. The video tape operator would be free to activate numerals every 10 seconds. The numeral image at the lower portion of the monitoring screen as well as the subjects would be taped. This technique offers the possibility of exact recall of the data at any portion of the tape.
C. Type of Interaction Coded

1. Subroles (see Appendix F: Definitions of CO-CL Subroles)

Interview interaction is viewed in broad functional units of behavior designated as subroles. Nine basic subrole patterns and their corresponding interactions have been designated which reflect a typical range of counseling behavior. Subrole behavior is then coded by using the appropriate arabic numerals (see Appendix A: CCBA Training Instrument).

Coding of subrole behavior within each timed interval could involve three basic patterns. A means to facilitate these contingencies, therefore, has been devised.

Pattern #1: A single number within a cell (one spacing on the coding sheet) indicates a single subject's intention (subrole).

Pattern #2: A series of horizontal numbers within the same cell, separated by commas, indicates the subject's multiple intensions from primary (first number) to subordinate.

Pattern #3: A series of vertical numbers within the same cell reflects a variety of subrole behavior within the same time interval. In this case, a circle around one of the numbers within the same cell, indicates which of those behaviors was considered primary.
These patterns are illustrated below in Figure 2:

| Pattern #1: | 3,6,2 |
| Pattern #2: | 1,2,3 |
| Pattern #3: | 1,3,2 |

Figure 2

For exact sequential plotting of data (not necessary for general use) on a matrix, it is suggested that subrole numbers be placed in sequential order as illustrated by the arrows on the diagram (Figure 3):

Figure 3
2. Relationship Quality (See "Definition of Terms," Chapter I, p. 8)

The climate of the relationship is categorized as "expanding" or "contracting," and is symbolized by a plus (+) or a minus (-) sign, respectively. General indices of plus or minus values are listed on the CCBA Instrument (Appendix A). In the interest of conserving time, only the minus value need be utilized by recording a minus symbol (-) after those subroles considered to be "contracting" the relationship. Numerical subrole codings without the minus symbol will be assumed to be plus (+) (see Figure 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-CL</th>
<th>Subrole</th>
<th>3 is assumed to be a plus (+) subrole.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 is assumed to be a plus (+) subrole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4

3. Communicative Events (see "Definition of Terms," Chapter I, p. 7)

Operationally the identification of communication events involves the use of a straight bar (——) to indicate major shifts in events and a wavy bar (~~~) to indicate minor transitions (Figure 5):
Three kinds of interaction has been described (subroles, relationship quality, and events). In addition, many other kinds of information could be added such as: affective-cognitive level, initiator of topic, and theme, by adding symbols to represent these dimensions.

D. Coding Sheet

All coding is marked on the "Coding Sheet" (Figure 6). Each sheet is divided into 12 cells (spacings or intervals) with the half-way point (6 cells) marked by a double line across the sheet). At 10 second intervals, each page can plot two minutes of behavior. To record a 30 minute interval, 15 pages would be stapled together. Data recorded on these 8 1/2 x 11 sheets make retrieval of the data convenient and functional.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOTAGE READING</th>
<th>GO-CL TALK VERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>GO-CL LISTENS NONVERBAL SUBROLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY REMARKS</th>
<th>NATURE OF DISAGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place minus symbol (−) after contracting subrole.

Figure 6
The number of consecutive pages coded without interruption depends on the users' facility in handling the coding system. However, if the "Explanatory Remarks" section is used, it was found best not to code more than three pages at one time (6 minutes of behavior) since recall of specific aspects of behavior is difficult when learning the system. Those familiar with the system, however, often find time to write out brief phrases opposite subrole numbers as a means of recalling a specific behavioral interaction of importance. Continuous and uninterrupted coding, utilizing such an approach, would then be possible (see sample data plotted on coding sheet, Appendix C).

On the coding sheet, the "Explanatory Remarks" and "Nature of the Disagreement" sections are meant to provide an extension of the numerical coding by providing a space to record descriptive comments (clarifications, explanations, etc.). For example, the "Nature of the Disagreement" section encourages the observers to indicate the reasons for disagreement (semantic or performance). Further comments relating to these reasons are then summarized in the "Explanatory Remarks" section. Thus the CCBA can be used as an useful communication vehicle between supervisor and trainee and their written (descriptive) comments become an important adjunct to the quantified data. The coding sheet then becomes a record or diary of interview analysis for
future reference. Careful study of the progress of inter-
view behavior then becomes possible.

It has been acknowledged that the dialogue between
supervisor and trainee become the essence of supervision.
The coding sheet, as a mediating instrument, provides a
formal, systematic structure to supervisory discussion, more
systematic, for example, than a check list type of rating
scale. Descriptive information then is an important addi-
tion to the quantified data already present primarily be-
cause it literally forces observers to carefully put
"handles" on a complexity of behaviors through oral and
particularly written responses. Written responses do have
the advantage of sharpening ones thoughts.

It may be desirable for a supervisor to record
"shifts" on the coding sheet. A "shift" is a change from
one coding designation to another. A number "1" for example,
is changed to a number "3". Three types of shifts are
possible: (1) a supervisor shifts his marking to trainees'
codification; (2) a trainee shifts to supervisor, or (3)
both trainees and supervisors shift to new codifications.
The direction of the shifting can be indicated by crossing
out the original numerical coding as illustrated (Figure 7):
The preceding example indicates that in footage 20-22, counselor shifted his view in the supervisor's direction (from 3 to 2). In footage 22-24, the supervisor shifted to the counselor's position (from 2 to 3-). In footage 24-26, supervisor and counselor both shift positions to a new category (7 and 4--changed to 6). The comment section might have indicated that the first shift was the result of a semantic difference between supervisor and counselor as to the understood meaning of categories 2 and 3. The second shift might have resulted from the same problem or from the supervisor's simply not perceiving the counselor's real intention from the nature of the interaction. The third shift could have resulted from a semantic and/or performance difference. The video interval was repeated and through further discussion, the counselor's intention became clear although actual manifestation of that behavior was not
evident to an external observer. It should be noted that
a visual check can easily reveal the "initiator" of the
shift (whoever crosses out a number) as well as its "direc-
tion" (to supervisor; trainee; both supervisor and trainee).

The "Footage Reading" section on the coding sheet
enables observers to locate specific interaction for
further review and to indicate the approximate time in the
interval a designated interaction took place.

E. Coding Procedures--General

In Section C, coding procedures for different cate-
gories of interaction was discussed. In this section two
basic approaches to coding will be described.

One general approach to coding is to write out a
coding symbol a few moments after the interval begins.
Starting off on the "0--2" cell, for example, the coder
would wait until 0.5 or 1.0 and then record a symbol.
Should another interaction take place, a second or third
symbol would be recorded in a vertical direction as illus-
trated below (Figure 8):
F. Use of Video Tape

Portable video decks utilizing half inch tape has been found to be satisfactory with regular florescent overhead lighting. It is suggested, however, that a close-up lens be used in order to better observe non-verbal cues.

G. Approaches to Treatment of the Data

There are a number of ways to treat the data collected on an interaction (coding) sheet, but basically they involve the use of the Coding Sheet itself, or a specifically designed matrix. This section shall describe several approaches to data treatment utilizing Coding Sheet Infor-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footage Reading</th>
<th>CO-CL Subrole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8

A second procedure is to record a symbol as soon as the preceding interval is completed. For example, when interval "4-6" has ended and the "6-8" cell is just beginning, the observer codes the "4-6" cell.
mation. Sections H-K shall describe employment of a matrix approach.

1. Use of the Coding Sheet:
   a. Agreement-Disagreement Data
      (1) (Mean) length of run between all disagreements.
      (2) (Mean) length of run between all unresolved disagreements.
      (3) (Mean) length of run between all resolved disagreements.
      (4) Total length of run—all disagreements.
      (5) Total length of run—all unresolved disagreements.
      (6) Total length of run—all resolved disagreements.
      (7) Total number of shifts to supervisor.
      (8) Total number of shifts to trainee.
      (9) Total number of shifts—both supervisor and trainee.
   b. Definitional Terminology of Agreement-Disagreement Data
      (1) "Length": "Length" constitutes a measure of distance, specifically, the successive amount of similar type intervals (spacing or cells) on the coding sheet, namely, agreements, disagreements, resolved and unresolved disagreements.
(2) "Run". A "run" refers to a number \((N)\) of "lengths" of the same type.

(3) "Agreements"—refers to identical coding by supervisor and trainee.

(4) "Disagreements"—refers to different coding by supervisor and supervisee. Disagreements are of two types:

(a) "Resolved Disagreements"—refers to the settling of disagreements by all parties involved.

(b) "Unresolved Disagreements"—occurs when supervisor and trainee do not immediately settle a point of difference.

c. Computational Procedures Utilizing Agreement-Disagreement Data

(1) Mean length of run, as illustrated below, is derived by dividing the total amount of lengths \((\sum\)\) by the total number \((N)\) of runs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Mean length of Run} = \frac{\sum}{N} = 4.00\]

(2) Length of Runs Between All "Disagreements"--is derived by computing length of runs of agreements.

Length of runs between all Disagreement is the major index
of supervisor-trainee perceptions of interview behavior.

(3) Length of Runs Between All "Resolved" Disagreements—is derived by computing length of runs of all agreements and unresolved disagreements.

(4) Length of Runs Between all "Unresolved" Disagreements—is derived by computing length of runs of all agreements and resolved disagreements.

(5) Length of Runs—Total disagreements is derived by computing the sum (Σ) of lengths of disagreements.

(6) Length of Runs—Total Resolved Disagreement is derived by computing the sum (Σ) of lengths of resolved disagreements.

(7) Length of Runs—Total Unresolved Disagreements is derived by computing the sum (Σ) of lengths of unresolved disagreements.

2. Other Types of Data to be Derived from Coding Sheet:

a. Type, number, and length of verbal-non-verbal subroles.


c. Type and number of nonverbal relationship qualities ("Expanding" and "contracting").
d. The "Expanding/Contracting" Ratio.
e. Type and number of communicative events.
f. Categorization of behavioral multiple interaction patterns (Example: 3, 6, 2).
g. The "Resolved/Unresolved" Ratio (measure of subject's willingness to compromise).

H. CCBA Matrix

A unique and essential ingredient of Flanders' Interaction is the utilization of a ten-by-ten matrix into which primary coded behaviors are sequentially plotted. In addition to making various quantitative data easily accessible, this matrix allows the observer to note verbal emphases of instruction and verbal flow patterns during classroom interaction.

In order to preserve the capacities of the Flanders' matrix when plotting both verbal and nonverbal behaviors, a specially designed matrix approaching three-dimensionalism was developed by this writer.

The CCBA matrix is divided into four quadrants or areas (see Figure 9):

Area 1. Verbal to Verbal behavior patterns
   (quadrant I)

Area 2. Nonverbal to Nonverbal behavior patterns
   (quadrant III)

Area 3. Verbal to Nonverbal transitional behavior patterns (quadrant II)
Area 4. Nonverbal to Verbal transitional behavior patterns (quadrant IV)

It should be noted that in a matrix, only primary numbers from the coding sheets are used. For example, in a horizontal or multiple group of subrole patterns such as "2,1,3," only the "2" could be entered into a matrix.

I. Matrix Plotting Procedures

Once subroles have been recorded on the coding sheet, the user may wish to plot this data on the CCBA Interaction Matrix. Given a sequence of encoded counselor or client behaviors, the user pairs these on the coding sheet itself or on separate sheets of paper making the last number of the previous pair the first number of the succeeding one (Figure 10).

One important point should be mentioned at this time. Notice that each pair of numbers overlaps with the previous pair, and each number, except the first and last, is used twice. It is for this reason that a 9 is recorded as the first and the last number on the coding sheet. This number is chosen as it is convenient to assume that each interview began and ended with a brief moment of silence. This procedure also permits the total of each column to equal the total of the corresponding row.
Having paired the numerals, the user next plots these pairs on the matrix using the first number of the pair as a row designation and the second as a column designation. It is important to remember that verbal to verbal numerical sequence is plotted in quadrant I of the matrix (numbers
1-8); all other combinations are plotted in their respective quadrants as double numbers (11,12,13, etc.).

For example, the pair of numbers presented in Figure 10 would be plotted in the cells represented by the following intersections (Figure 11):

Pair a \( \begin{pmatrix} 9 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 19, Column 1 (Nonverbal to verbal)

Pair b \( \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 1, Column 1 (verbal to verbal)

Pair c \( \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 1, Column 1 (verbal to verbal)

Pair d \( \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 1, Column 3 (verbal to verbal)

Pair e \( \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 3, Column 12 (verbal to nonverbal)

Pair f \( \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 12, Column 12 (nonverbal to nonverbal)

Pair g \( \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 6 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 12, Column 6 (Nonverbal to verbal)

Pair h \( \begin{pmatrix} 6 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 6, Column 3 (Verbal to verbal)

Pair i \( \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \) = Row 3, Column 2 (Verbal to verbal)

Figure 11
(Tabulation of preceding data is shown in Figure 12.)

J. Tabulating Procedures
(Illustrated in Figure 12)

Once CCBA data is plotted into the matrix, the observer sums the behaviors in each column in each quadrant and also computes total behaviors in each column by the total matrix. By dividing these sums by the total behaviors exhibited by the counselor in each quadrant and in the entire matrix, the observer learns the percentage of behavior devoted to each category of the system under specific conditions of consistency and transition.

Next, the ratio appropriate to an interpretation of the data must be computed:

I/D (Indirect-Direct) Ratio (see Figure 12)
The sum of tallies in columns 1-3 (quadrant I) and 11-13 (quadrant III) divided by the sum of tallies in columns 4-7 (quadrant I) and 14-17 (quadrant III).

Second, the percentage of counselor and client response is computed (see Figure 12)

1. CO RESPONSE:
The sum of tallies in quadrant I divided by the sum of the total number of tallies in quadrant III.
## Sample Interaction Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMNS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Q1** - Total Q1 & Ill: 5 - 6-13%
**Total QII - Total Q1 & Ill:** 1 - 6-17%

**I/D Ratio:**
- **Indirect:** Q1(1-5) - QII1(11-13)
- **Direct:** Q1(4-7) - QII1(14-17) -.2

**Figure 12**
2. CL RESPONSE:

The sum of tallies in quadrant III divided by the sum of the total number of tallies in quadrants I and III.

K. Interpretation of Matrix Data

Interpretation of the matrix data provides the observer with two kinds of information. Purely quantitative information includes the percentages of behavior in each category and indications of the approximate balance of counselor response and client response in the interview and of the degree of directness or indirectness of influence exhibited in the behavior of the counselor or client.

Another kind of information concerning behavioral patterns becomes available with careful analysis of specific regions of the matrix. First, a survey of the four quadrants (see Figure 9) provides information about the basic nature of the counselor or client's behavior. A heavy loading of tallies in quadrant I suggests that the subject is essentially verbal in his/her behavior. Large numbers of tallies in quadrant III indicate consistent subject's restrictiveness of interaction. Heavy emphasis in quadrants II and IV suggest vacillation in the subject's behavior. However, it must be remembered that these are transition quadrants, and some use of them are to be expected.

Behavioral flow patterns can be traced from initiation to completion throughout the four quadrants of the
matrix so long as the observer remembers that such patterns always move in a clockwise direction.

Summary

This manual has described a system of counselor-client behavior analysis that can be useful to improve supervisor-counselor practice. Possible steps involved in the utilization of the CCBA system have been outlined in order to make the manual a practical guide to supervisors, counselors, and other educators considering a study of counselor-client interaction in a pre-service or an on-the-job setting.
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