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CHAPTER I
Introduction

"Helping" relationships are here defined as those in which one individual, deemed as an expert, renders assistance to another individual who has been or who is in the process of being defined as in need of assistance. As such, these relationships are prevalent throughout our society, and a great majority of helping situations are formal dyadic relationships. A "helping" relationship can be construed then, to occur within the various spheres exemplified by clergy-man-parishioner, parent-child, teacher-student, doctor-patient, therapist-patient, counselor-client. In the field of mental health alone, it is estimated that some three-quarters of a million persons are currently employed as "helpers" to individuals defined as "emotionally disturbed" (Shepard & Lee, 1970). Helping, especially in the mental health professions, has become a complex institution encompassing myriad organizations and a conglomeration of training facilities needed to produce a variety of "healing" professionals.

Questions pertaining to the effectiveness of helping, the process of helping, and the personal characteristics of the participants involved in a helping relationship are important and have been investigated to some extent. However, there are some significant issues concerning "helping" in a generic sense that have not been pursued.
The present research has been undertaken to explore certain aspects of the relationship between a "helper" and a "helpee" that have been overlooked.

Under most circumstances, the participants in a helping relationship consider communication (the exchange of information) an essential ingredient. The present inquiry focuses on an analysis of the direction, type, and amount of verbal communication affected by an interpersonal relationship prestructured such that one participant is defined as a helper, and the other a helpee. There has been some discussion in the literature about the relation between the structure of interpersonal relationships and verbal communication (e.g., Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967), however, the specific question raised here with respect to helping relationships has not been explicitly considered.

Helping Relationships

Several authors have proposed definitions of helping relationships, or more particularly, psychotherapy. Among the many which have been offered, Frank's (1961) definition interprets psychotherapy as a form of help-giving in which a trained, socially sanctioned healer attempts to relieve a sufferer's distress by facilitating certain changes in the latter's feelings, attitudes, and behavior through the performance of certain activities with him. Eysenck (1961) has defined psychotherapy as that which meets the following criteria (Stieper & Wiener, 1965, p. 11):

1. there is an interpersonal relationship of a prolonged kind between two or more individuals
2. One (or more) of the participants has had special experience and/or has received special training in the handling of human relationships.

3. One (or more of the participants has entered the relationship because of felt dissatisfaction with his emotional and/or interpersonal adjustment.

4. The methods used are of psychological nature, i.e., involve such mechanisms as explanation, suggestion, and persuasion.

5. The aim of the process is amelioration of the difficulties which cause the patient(s) to seek help of the therapist(s).

Shoben (1953) defined psychotherapy as "... a certain type of social relationship between two persons who hold periodic conversations in pursuit of certain goals; namely, the lessening of emotional discomfort and the alteration of various other aspects of client behavior (Leifer, 1969, p. 147)."

The preceding seems to be a representative sample of proposed definitions of psychotherapy. Although there are many variations, there is general agreement about descriptions of the form of the relationship. Psychotherapy transpires within the context of a social relationship, as it denotes a process involving two or more individuals. Basic to most definitions of psychotherapy is also the notion that the relationship is intended to change attitudes, behaviors, or feelings. Individuals enter psychotherapy because they wish to alter a particular aspect of themselves or to change patterns of relating to others. The specific reasons motivating people to seek help are numerous and diverse, however, an important and common belief among
those who seek help is that they cannot cause the desired personal change alone. The therapist's purpose is to serve as a resource to facilitate change and most therapists and clients agree that the relationship between psychotherapist and patient is the medium through which change occurs. In addition, the majority of therapists suggest that desired change is brought about by the actions of the therapist in conversation with the patient. Consistent with this view, "helping" can be seen as a descriptive concept for relating change in attitude, behavior, or emotion of one participant (helpee) to the prior actions of his partner (helper).

Social Power

In conceptualizing and designing research concerning helping relationships, the concept of social power has been extremely useful. Social power is a sociological concept. As such it refers to relationships among individuals and not to psychological attributes imputed to exist within individuals. It refers to the relationship between one agent or set of agents (individuals, groups, organizations, or other aggregates of people) and another agent or set of agents. Social power cannot be observed directly; its existence, nature, and strength are inferred from its effects (Olsen, 1968, p. 172). As an explanatory construct, it has been used to account for changes in an interaction sequence. More specifically, it is often used to coordinate the changes in emotion, attitude, or activity observed to occur in one participant in response to the prior actions of his partner (Schopler, 1965). Although there are numerous definitions of social power they generally include reference to a relationship
in which one or more individuals motivate, modify, or change the behavior of another individual(s).

For the purpose of this research the definition and conceptualizations of social power proposed by French and Raven (1959) have been adopted. Their position is consistent with those interpretations presented within the cognitive-field-theoretical framework (e.g., Cartwright, 1959). Within the field-theoretical tradition, the definition of social power is a psychological one, as the influence relationship is defined in terms of the manner in which it exists for the persons involved. The definition is also a dynamic analysis in that effective influence is seen as arising from the tensions or needs which motivate the influencee to seek out such a relationship. Therefore, changes contingent on influence attempts are in the direction of minimizing or eliminating such tensions (Collins & Raven, 1964).

French and Raven's definition of social power is consistent with this view, has stimulated the greatest amount of empirical work in the social psychological literature, and is most relevant for a discussion of the concept within the context of helping behavior. They have defined social power as the potential influence of some influencing agent, \( O \), over some person, \( P \). Social influence is seen as any change in the cognitions, attitudes, behaviors, or emotions of \( P \) which can be attributed to \( O \). Power is defined as the potential influence which an agent \( O \) can exert on a person \( P \). In order for \( O \) to exert influence on \( P \), \( O \)'s actions must have some personal significance for \( P \), that is, they must fit, in some way,
within P's motivational system (for example, O might offer P assistance in reaching a goal which P wishes to achieve). Two important aspects of a social power relationship, then, include the influencing agent's properties or "resources" of power and the needs or values of the recipient, the "motivate base of power" (Cartwright & Zander, 1968, p. 217).

Recognizing the importance of these two components within social power relationships, several authors (Pepitone, 1950; Berkowitz, 1957; Stotland, 1959; Cohen, 1959) have conceptualized the process as one in which one individual has possession of valuable resources or maintains control over the means through which another can obtain satisfaction or goal attainment. Thus, an agent's social power or ability to exert influence can be seen as deriving from his/her possession or control of valued resources. Such resources of interpersonal power can include wealth, prestige, skill, knowledge, physical strength, or the ability to gratify others ego needs for such intangibles as recognition, affection, respect, and accomplishment (Cartwright, 1965).

The processes through which social power is exercised are often complex and not readily apparent in helping relationships. French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1965, 1971) have developed a schema specifying six major types or bases of social power. These types are distinguished by the nature of the relationship between two individuals. They propose the following bases of social power: 1) reward power, based on P's perception that O has the ability to mediate P's rewards; 2) coercive power, based on P's perception that O has the ability to mediate P's punishment; 3) referent power, based on P's
identification with O; 4) expert power, based on P's perception that O has some special knowledge or expertise; 5) legitimate power, based on P's perception that O has a legitimate right to prescribe P's behavior; and 6) informational power, based on the information conveyed to P by O.

It is important to note that while these bases of social power rarely exist purely and uniquely within a relationship, one particular base may be more salient within a specific instance or may be dominant within a particular relationship. In some instances, an influencing agent has the capacity to decide which of the various bases of social power to use. For example, a teacher may stress his legitimate role and emphasize that the student has an obligation to follow his suggestions and directives; he may try to establish a referent base of social power and accentuate the similarities between himself and the students by using similar language, sharing similar experiences, etc.; he may stress his experience, training, and knowledge about teaching and establish an expert base of social power; he may use coercive or reward bases emphasizing his control over grades, promotions, and recommendations, or he may generally communicate his approval or disapproval; he may stress an informational power base and establish himself as a resource for information dissemination.

Much of the experimentation derived from French and Raven's paradigm compare the different bases of social power. Such issues as the stability of influence, whether influence is dependent on the influencing agent's surveillance, and the interaction among bases
of social power have been explored. Recently there has been increased
attention to the bases of social power in on-going social relationships, e.g., in parent-adolescent relations (Smith, 1970), in hos-
pitals (Rosenberg & Pearling, 1962), in marital relationships
(Centers, Rodrigues, & Raven, 1971), and in counseling (Strong &
Matross, 1971).

Social Power and Helping Relationships

In any helper-helpee relationship there is a notable lack of
symmetry, for such relationships are not based on equality, and the
individuals involved do not exchange similar behaviors. Several
authors have addressed the complementariness of the helper-helpee
relationship in terms of superior-inferior roles, that is, in terms
of the amount of power held by the helper relative to the helpee
(Black, 1952; Frank, 1961; Haley, 1963; Schofield, 1964). The former
occupies the superior, primary, or "one-up" position while the
latter's status is inferior, secondary, or "one-down" (Watzlawick,
Beavin, & Jackson, 1967). Whether a psychotherapist is described as
a surrogate parent (mother or father), a teacher, an expert, or as a
savior, his role implies superiority with reference to his patient,
who has come seeking "help." By mutual definition, the therapist is
the "socially sanctioned healer," the patient the "supplicant," or
seeker of help; the helpee is in the relationship because "he has
learned his lesson well from all those who have taught him where to
go when he is in trouble (Steinzor, 1967, p. 98)."

Except in those situations in which psychotherapy is thought of
as fashionable, seeking psychotherapeutic help operates to lower the
person's status in his own eyes and in the eyes of others. "Almost 
all psychotherapy is to some degree disturbing to the patient because 
it is deflating to the ego to be so maladjusted that it becomes 
necessary to place oneself in the embarrassing position of having to 
amit failure and seek help from others (Black, 1952, p. 304)." The 
inequality between helper and helpee seems to function regardless 
of the school of thought or the therapeutic techniques practiced. In 
a dialogue between Carl Rogers and Martin Buber, the latter keenly 
articulated the point that the essence of helping is the inequity in 
the relationship between helper and helpee (Friedman, 1964). Rogers 
maintains that an individual has the capacity to change himself and 
that the therapist merely arranges the proper conditions in which 
growth can occur (Ford & Urban, 1965). In the conversation, Rogers 
stated his belief that the therapeutic relationship was the "meeting 
of two persons on an equal basis (Friedman, 1964, p. 488)." In reply, 
Buber noted that while Rogers believed the psychotherapist could give 
the client "something in order to make him feel equal...(Friedman, 
1964, p. 491)," in reality, when a patient comes for help, "... the 
esential difference between your role in this situation and his is 
obvious. He comes for help to you. You don't come for help to him. 
He can do different things to you, but not help you... (Friedman, 
1964, p. 487)." Buber continued to explain that while the therapist 
can perhaps experience the situation as the patient does via empathy, 
the reverse is not possible. "... you (the therapist) are able to do 
something that he is not able. You are not equals and cannot be. You 
have the great task, self-imposed--a great self-imposed task to
supplement this need of his and do rather more than in the normal situation (Friedman, 1964, p. 488)." Thus, the helpee neither sees from the helper's point of view nor meets with the helper "deliberately" to help him.

As in any social power relationship a helper-helpee interaction is based on the participants' relative and corresponding needs and resources. By definition, a helping relationship assumes that one of the participants is interpreted as a potential resource for the other. As Frank (1961, p. 115) has noted, "the therapist's power is based on the patient's perception of him as a source of help; and it tends to be greater the greater the patient's distress and faith in the therapist's desire and ability to help him." According to Strong and Natross (1971, p. 3-5),

the therapist's social power on the client resides in the client's perception of being dependent on the therapist. The source of this dependency is defined by the client's perception of correspondence between his needs and the therapist's resources... The strength of the client's dependence (and reciprocally, the therapist's power) is determined by the degree to which the client sees the therapist's resources corresponding to his needs.

Thus, the helper's power comes from the helpee's perception of him as a resource for aid in alleviation of the helpee's suffering and discomfort. The helpee believes he can be helped.

The establishment of an individual as a socially sanctioned resource (a "helper") is influenced by several factors which might include: the impressiveness of the setting in which the person works (hospital, clinic, or private practice); his/her training and ex-
perience as a helper; signs of professional legitimatization, like
diplomas, certificates, membership in professional organizations; and
the use of professional tools like psychological tests, the ability
to apply psychiatric labels, the demonstration of special knowledge.
(e.g., "knowledge" of the unconscious, dream interpretation, etc.),
and the ability to resort to psychiatric commitment.

People seek help, are requested to seek help, or are brought to
help-giving agencies for a variety of complex reasons, ranging from
self-determinism to compliance to the request of others, including
family, courts, and schools. However, although "problem" identifica-
tion and initiation of contact with a particular helper or help-
giving agency may differ in each situation, the helper as a resource
and the individual as a person in need is consistently made salient.
 Helpers in institutionalized settings spend much of their time and
energy convincing clients that they have problems they are not facing
and which require the skilled assistance of helpers like themselves.
This is done most explicitly with involuntary clients. Thus, although
the need-resource correspondence may differ in type and degree from
one situation to the next, it seems a necessary component for the
establishment of a helper-helpee alliance.

Several years ago Cartwright and Zander (1968) postulated five
conditions under which an individual may be found subjected to
influence in a social power relationship. They are: punishment-
reward contingencies; desire to abide by one's values; desire to be
correct; group-oriented desires; and intrinsic gratification. The
conditions leading to high helpee influencability seem curiously to
correspond to various motive bases that cause individuals to seek aid. Perhaps the most common reason people seek help is in order to alleviate the discomfort they experience. Consistent with the reasons for influenceability as suggested by Cartwright and Zander, the alleviation of anxiety, fear, depression, insecurity, or feelings of worthlessness can be seen as having "intrinsic gratification" for the individual enabling the person to "abide by one's values," be like an "admired person" (ego ideal), or can be seen in a "reward-punishment" framework. Seeking help carries many of its own rewards while avoiding or resisting help has certain painful consequences, such as the maintenance or perhaps, augmentation of discomfort. An individual may be motivated to seek help from his experience that "things are not right." In some instances, even though the individual may not define the situation as such, family members, friends, neighbors, or community residents may become dissatisfied with the person's behavior, feelings, or attitudes and encourage, request, or bring the individual to a help-giving agency. Thus, accepting the propositions offered by Cartwright and Zander, subjection to the influence of a helper may come about in order to "be correct," to "abide by one's values," or to maintain "group-oriented desires."

It becomes obvious that the role of the helper in terms of perpetuating that which is "correct," "supporting values," and maintaining and safeguarding the "desires of the group" are important issues for help-giving professionals to consider. Such issues as the tolerance of deviation from societal norms, the maintenance of values, and the mechanisms of social control are important factors in determining the
nature of the correspondence between helpers' resources and helpees' needs. The specification of deviance involves more than simply a designation of who is in need, but also how that definition of need comes about, and the functions it serves for the individual, the groups to which he belongs, the community and the society in which he lives.

A helper and helpee enter a relationship which is based upon the helpee's need for help and the potential help or resource which the helper offers; however, the power base from which help is delivered can vary, for in addition to a general need-resource correspondence, there exist several specific bases of social power through which "help" is delivered. Different pairs of helpees' needs and helpers' resources can be classified, according to the model proposed by French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1965, 1971), into distinct sources of helper's power, each of which can be referred to as the helper's power base (Strong & Matross, 1971). In this application of the French and Raven formulation, each power base implies a specific kind of dependency between the helper and the helpee. A helping relationship may rely on one particular power base or method of "helping" or it may incorporate several; one base may be more dominant within the relationship between the two individuals either in general, or at any particular time. Viewed in this manner, these bases of social power include the following:

**Expert power** -- Knowledge and skills are resources perceived as owned and maintained by the helper. The helper possesses these resources and the helpee experiences or has been defined as in need of the
helper's special knowledge and skills. Knowledge of psychological processes, interpersonal relationships, psychological tests, and other skills that reflect the helper's training and experience are examples of the resources subsumed by this power base (Strong & Matross, 1971).

Referent power — A point of reference or identification is often needed so that an individual can examine and perhaps reorganize perceptions of himself and his world. The discomfort which often causes people to seek help is sometimes the result of self-perceived inconsistencies between behavior and values (Strong, 1970). Consistency among beliefs and actions is more a matter of subjective interpretation dependent on social comparison than any objective assessment. As a consequence, people seek out others with whom to assess their consistency (Strong & Matross, 1971). Depending on the similarity of their basic values and attitudes, helpers can be referents on which helpees can depend to increase their own perceived psychological consistency. In some instances, a helper can refer a client to the behavior, feelings, and attitudes of others who can serve as referents for the client, for example, other members in a group psychotherapy situation. Referent power derives from the exposure of views, attitudes, and behavior, and can occur with or without formal or obvious attempts to influence. In general, a helper develops referent power by pointing either directly or indirectly to similarities between himself and the recipient of help in their values, opinions, and experiences.

Legitimate power — This base relies on the rights, duties, and
privileges implied in the role structure of the relationship between a helper and a helpee. Fulfilling their role as culturally defined and institutionalized personal and interpersonal help-givers, therapists are permitted or required to prescribe behavior. For example, a psychoanalyst or psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapist has the "right" or "privilege" to request and expect that a patient in treatment with him not move, marry, change jobs, or engage in any other major life decisions during the course of treatment. The therapist's position as "healer" provides a base of legitimate power from which he is permitted to demand such behavior from the helpee.

Informational power -- Individuals (helpees) seek information as to how they can meet their needs. Such information can be disseminated through articles, movies, books, and the contents of statements made by the helper. The helper's clarification, isolation, or identification of instances of particular behavior, feelings, or attitudes of the helpee provides the latter with important information. The labeling of behavior, ideas, and emotions occurs in all forms of psychotherapy although they differ in method and the degree to which labeling is practiced. The informational power base is distinguished from other bases of helper's social power in that in this case information is the prime concern, not the interpersonal relationship between the dispenser and recipient of information.

Coercive and Reward power -- Both of these may be seen as coercive bases of social power in that they both compel a helpee to act in accordance with the mandates of the helper. Although they both rely
on contingencies operative in the helping relationship, reward social power is a base from which the helper has the ability to administer rewards to "help" the helpee approach reduction of his needs whereas coercive base of power is distinguished by the fact that the helper has the ability to apply sanctions (punishment) to steer the helpee in the desired direction. In both of these bases, rewards and punishments can range from observable and tangible events to more subtle entities that cannot be objectified and must be considered "psychological" experiences. Observable consequences experienced by the helpee may include such things as the acquisition or loss of money, material objects, promotions, pleasant or unpleasant stimulation, receiving a favorable or unfavorable grade. Those that cannot be observed and that are "psychologically" experienced by the helpee include such feelings as love, hate, disapproval, approval, liking, disliking, acceptance, rejection.

The helper, thus, has power or the potential to influence the helpee because he can affect the needs or motive bases of the helpee. Depending on the nature of the relationship (the specific need-resource correspondence), the helpee submits to the influence of the helper in order to gain a reward, avoid punishment, become more like the helper, do what is "right" within the social context of the relationship, conform to new information received, or utilize the guidelines suggested by an "expert."

It is important to emphasize, once again, that the different bases of helper's social power to not exist in "pure" form. However, particular power bases may be more salient or dominant within
particular helper-helpee relationships; and many of the formalized
types of helping relationships prevalent today seem to rely on the
various bases of social power in a differential manner. In client-
centered psychotherapy, for example, the helper relies most obviously
on a referent base of social power. His main function is to provide
an atmosphere in which the helpee can explore, understand, and
gradually reorganize perceptions of self and the world about him.
The client has the capacity to "cure" himself and is the source of
change. The helper does not give advice, suggest programs, teach, or
recommend areas of exploration. The helper serves as a "congruent,"
"empathetic," and "accepting" frame of reference through which the
helpee can "reorganize" himself. Parent effectiveness training,
on the other hand, derives more from an information power base.
Usually such helpers emphasize the contents of books, lectures, and
discussions. Legitimate social power operates in most situations
in which a "legitimate" and "socially sanctioned" healer functions;
however, it is most clear in situations in which an individual is
probated by a helper or group of helpers to a mental hospital. The
psychoanalytic psychotherapist "helps" the patient predominantly
through the use of an expert base of social power. The psychoanalytic
psychotherapist maintains knowledge of psychodynamic processes,
dream interpretation, and free association and utilizes these
special skills in therapy. Behavior therapists also operate mainly
from an expert base of social power and clients specifically request
their services as a result of the perceived special skills and know-
ledge which behavior modifiers possess. The therapeutic activity
of behavior therapists, however, clearly serves as an instance in which more than one base of social power is employed, for once expertise has been established behavior therapists may secondarily engage in coercive or reward bases of social power (depending on the particular method of behavior modification being utilized). An aversive conditioning therapist may use unpleasant and noxious stimulation (punishment) in order to affect an individual's behavior whereas other conditioning therapists employ reward to modify behavior in the desired direction.

The logic of the preceding discussion suggests that the definition of social power proposed by French and Raven (1959) is directly applicable to the influencing aspects of helping relationships, requiring only that the terms "helper" and "helpee" be substituted for influencing agent and influencee. "Helping," then, can be defined as the potential help of some helping agent, O, over some person, P. In this sense, "help" and "influence" are synonymous, and defined as a change in cognition, attitude, behavior, or emotion of P which can be attributed to O.

The notion that social power derives from such characteristics as knowledge, the ability to manage other people, accumulation of wealth, and status of one's occupation is generally accepted by middle class American society (Mendel, 1970). However, it appears that even if helping professionals acknowledge the unequal and complementary aspects of their relationship with clients, they seldom admit to the power and influence they wield, and as a consequence, fail to consider the social power implications of the structural
foundation of the relationship in which they participate with clients. Perhaps this is due to what appears to be a cultural taboo with regard to the explicit admission of the use of power, as well as the possibility that the concept of power is seen as contradicting the benevolent and humanitarian ideals espoused by the vast majority of helping professionals. Nevertheless, viewing helping in terms of social power has several significant implications worth considering by those involved in the profession. The goal of this research has been to consider how the structure of helping relationships affects verbal communication between helpers and helpees. Before proceeding, it is important to briefly summarize the major experimental findings concerning verbal communication in social power relationships.

Verbal Communication in Social Power Relationships

"Communication" is one way of describing the means which people contact, relate to, and "influence" each other. "Communication" can be conceptualized as a process in which one person initiates transmission of some particular unit of information that is ultimately received by another (Kretch et al., 1962; Longabaugh, 1962; Alkire et al., 1969). Investigators with this perspective have delineated two major roles in communication, that of the sender and that of the receiver. These roles are likely to alternate between the participants in an on-going interaction. However, the notion of sender and receiver can be used in two different ways when addressing the communicative process between two people. In the first, the roles of sender and receiver are defined in terms of the context or task and the part played a particular individual. When one person is
primarily conveying information to another, he remains the sender as long as the task is in progress, even while the receiver is asking questions concerning the information. A second way of conceptualizing the notions of sender and receiver is to focus on the communication process at the level of message exchange; the sender is defined as the actor who conveys information, and the receiver is defined as the actor who observes. In this instance, "sender" and "receiver" are defined in terms of specific behaviors of the participants rather than the task or context.

The literature suggests that social power variables strongly influence verbal communication. Although communication is essentially a two-way process, it appears that both the quality and quantity of verbal communication between participants may not be symmetrical. One important finding in communication research is that in the process of communication between persons of differential status there is a greater flow of information in the direction of low status person to high status person. Kelley (1950) and Cohen (1958) have both illustrated asymmetry within an experimentally created social hierarchy. Thibaut (1950) found evidence that low status persons tend to increase the amount of communication toward those persons who are identified as occupying a high status position, as compared to the amount of communication directed toward those of low status positions. Similarly, Back, Festinger, Hymovitch, Kelley, Schachter, and Thibaut (1950) have demonstrated a predominant tendency for people to transmit planted rumors to persons of high status within an existing social hierarchy. In a field study involving an unstructured interaction
situations, Hurwitz, Zander, and Hymovitch (1960) demonstrated that mental health workers defined as low in status communicated more frequently to mental health workers defined as high in status than to those of low status. There are also numerous studies within the field of organization and management which support this pattern of the information flow from low status to high status persons (e.g., Feld, 1962; Mellinger, 1965).

Alkire, Collum, Kaswan, and Love (1968) have shown that the amount and the accuracy as well as the direction of verbal communication are affected by status positions in a natural occurring hierarchy. A university sorority was used in this study and initiated members were designated as high status members, while those pledging (and therefore not yet qualified as members of the sorority) were defined as low status members. During a structured communication task, the high status members of the sorority received more useful information and were more active in asking clarifying questions than were the pledges. Partly as a result, the high status members were more accurate in the communication task.

As noted in the investigation by Alkire et al. (1968), it has been found that persons occupying positions of high status are likely to seek clarification from low status persons, but low status persons are not likely to question the information put forth by high status persons. In addition, high status members in a social hierarchy seem to display a greater freedom to criticize members occupying positions of low status than low status members display in reacting to high status members (Kelley, 1950; Cohen, 1958). There seem to be
constraints in communicating both questions and criticisms to high status people; if low status persons do voice criticism, it is directed to people occupying similar status positions as their own (Kelley, 1950).

Status in interpersonal relationships not only affects the general flow of verbal communication, but influences who talks, how much, and about what (Mortensen, 1972). It can be generally said that those with the highest status are most likely to talk, to initiate directives, and to make decisions. When relating to persons of high status, low status persons tend to feel a certain amount of "uneasiness" (Cohen, 1958; Hurwitz, Zander, Hymovitch, 1960), and often behave in an "ego defensive" manner. Since they may view high status persons as being in positions to help or hinder the achievement of their goals, low status persons tend to behave in a deferential, noncritical, "apple-polishing" manner toward persons of high status. For example, Collins and Guetzkow (1964) note that when a person of low status communicates to a person of high status, the content of the communication is often regulated by what the low status person has learned is reinforcing to the high status person.

The verbal communication pattern found to occur between low and high status persons often serves to protect their existing relationship from disturbances. In order that they remain in favor or gain favor from high status persons, low status persons, when given a choice, direct more communication to high status persons, relate specific types of information, and communicate in a certain fashion. This may legitimately be termed an "ego defensive" stance since in
this way the low status person maintains his relationship with the high status person and at the same time protects himself against potentially undesirable actions on the part of the high status person. It has been suggested that this communication pattern between persons of differential status may also serve as a method of "substitute locomotion"—that low status persons adapt their communicative role as a replacement for upward mobility (Kelley, 1950). In some instances, communication between persons of unequal status can be seen as a socially sanctioned and nondisruptive way in which to insure actual upward mobility because for those individuals who have the opportunity to change their positions relative to others, "being liked" by superiors may be important for promotions, salary increments, desirable work assignments, etc.

As noted, the amount and flow of information is directed to persons of high status. Depending on the task and context in which the transaction occurs, this constraint may or may not be in his best interest. The verbal communication which high status individuals receive from low status persons tends to be noncritical, nonquestioning, and conveyed in a deferential manner. This may be a "pleasant" experience for the person of high status, but in terms of effective management, organization, and planning, such information may be insufficient or misleading. Suggestions, requests for clarification, questions, and negative feedback are important aspects of meaningful interchanges between people; they serve to define and redefine the process of information exchange. Not only do suggestions, requests for clarification, questions, and critical comments serve to help
formulate ideas, but they often provide an important impetus for evaluation and change in ideas that have become developed and adopted. Thus, depending on the goal of an interaction, high status persons may succeed or fail depending on the specific type of information exchange needed from the low status person for the implementation and continuation of the desired task or goal (e.g., a factory foreman may ask each worker how long the worker has been employed or a factory foreman may ask each worker to discuss with him their experience in working at their jobs in order to plan for new work programs).

It is probable that low status persons acquire far less in terms of knowledge, skill, and information than is generally thought as a result of their interaction with high status persons. The direction and amount of communication, the usually low level of activity (including lack of attempts at clarification and questions), and the type of verbal communication generally displayed by low status persons with reference to high status persons (deferential, non-critical, non-questioning) probably affect the outcome of high status-low status interpersonal interactions. This has an important implication in light of the fact that many dyadic relationships whose goal is to impart knowledge, skill, and information can be categorized as social hierarchial relationships in which the person occupying the position of low status is expected to acquire knowledge, skill, and information from an individual occupying a position of high status. Some of these relationships include parent-child, teacher-student, counselor-client, psychotherapist-patient, doctor-patient.
Verbal Communication in Helping Relationships as a Function of Social Power

For a long time psychotherapy was characterized as a process that occurred within the patient. Freud recognized that the psychotherapist was a powerful influencing agent and he attempted to control this potential by making him interpersonally neutral and physically invisible to the patient. However, it was several years before the majority of psychotherapists began to appreciate that they were far more than a "blank screen" while working with patients in psychotherapy. Psychotherapy researchers began to consider therapist factors as well as patient factors as criteria in outcome studies. They began to examine therapist traits such as training and experience, personal analysis, expectations, interest patterns, attitudes toward treatment, and general characteristics such as age, sex, and professional discipline. Treatment factors, such as therapist's empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness were also investigated. Psychotherapists began to recognize the existence of counter-transference, and began discussing their own reactions to patients in a manner similar to the transference reactions they had described in their patients.

Researchers, theoreticians, and practitioners have considered the effect of therapist, patient, and treatment factors. However, as mentioned previously, psychotherapy as a relationship in which social power is assumed to be an important dimension has not been empirically explored, despite its possible far-reaching consequences for the interaction which occurs between the individuals involved in
a helper-helpee relationship.

If the amount, type, and accuracy of verbal communication in dyadic helping relationships like psychotherapy is influenced by the relative social power of the helper and the helpee, it is indeed an important area for investigation. Psychotherapy takes place largely through talking, and most helpers would agree that verbal communication is a central and necessary component of helping alliances. The function of helper-helpee communication may vary dependent on the particular psychotherapeutic theoretical orientation. For instance, some therapists view conversation with their clients as the actual tool through which therapeutic change occurs; others would say conversation is only one of the ways through which clients can receive suggestions and directions in adopting new behaviors (e.g., psychoanalytic psychotherapists vs. behavior modifiers). Nevertheless, the verbal interaction between helper and helpee is important in determining both the immediate and long-term direction and focus of the helping relationship regardless of theoretical orientation, for a helper and a helpee construct the data from which they work through their verbalizations. Problems are stated, requests are made, information is exchanged, dispositions and diagnoses are determined, and ultimately important aspects of individuals' lives are "influenced" through communication within the context of helping alliances. The exact manner in which these activities occur varies, but, such activities generally take place in all forms of helping, although they may be subtle and covert at times. If verbal communication between helper and helpee does replicate the pattern of
communication displayed in other situations between persons of differential positions in a social hierarchy, then the direction and type of information, degree of individual participation, accuracy of communication, and fashion in which communication is put forth are all affected. As a result, the entire process of information exchange as well as the subsequent decisions and directions which may occur as a consequence of a helper-helpee interaction may be structured by the differential power positions of the helper and helpee.

Since the social psychological studies on communication in social hierarchial relationships are being used as a background in formulating questions pertaining to helper-helpee communication, it is important to emphasize that the positions granted to and the activities engaged in by helpers and helpees permit helpers to maintain both status and social power.

Many researchers do not distinguish between "social power" and "status" when discussing communication in social hierarchial relationships, but there does seem to be differences between them. Status refers to the relative position of an individual in a hierarchy; it implies a superior-inferior comparison. Social power corresponds to the actual or potential capacity of one individual to influence another. Status and social power do not always reside together. For example, a secretary in a business office may be relatively low in status in comparison to the officers, managers, and employees of a particular company, but the secretary may be extremely powerful in terms of her access to various resources, e.g., information, procedures, personnel. As a consequence, she maintains social power or
the ability to influence those around her. In the case of a helper, the distinction between status and social power is usually not essential because the helper maintains both status and social power. A helper's status comes from his role as a socially sanctioned healer. He is an expert in the method of psychological healing in a society that generally values that particular knowledge and skill, and as a result, maintains many highly valued rights, duties, and privileges. The helper's social power resides in the helpee's expectations as well as in the helper's actual ability to influence and affect the needs which the helpee experiences. Although the helper's status and social power both contribute to the position he occupies relative to the helpee, a helper may recognize and explicitly use his status and social power in varying degrees (e.g., Rogerian psychotherapist vs. behavior modifiers).

As previously mentioned, it is probable that the social power aspect of helping relationships cannot be ignored as long as the relationship is built upon an alliance between an individual who is in need and an individual who is perceived as having a corresponding resource. It is most important to explore whether unanticipated consequences occur as a result of the structure of helping alliances.

Statement of Problem

The major objective of this research is to examine whether the definition of a dyadic interaction as a helping relationship automatically confers differential social power on the helper and on the helpee and whether the resulting social hierarchy replicates the findings of studies investigating verbal communication between persons
in a social hierarchy which have demonstrated predictable effects on the amount, direction, and accuracy of verbal communication.

**Hypotheses**

1. Social power is an important aspect of helping relationships and that is directly and substantially affects verbal communication between helpers and helpees.

   A. Communication will flow from helpee to helper.
   
   B. Helpers will be more active and ask questions and seek qualification of communication from helpees.
   
   C. Accuracy of communication is the result of information contained in the sender's message and questions and clarifications by the receiver. Since helpers are expected to have more information directed toward them and exhibit greater interventions, questions, and qualifications, it is hypothesized that helpers will display greater accuracy.

2. Different bases of helper's social power will be differentially reflected in helper-helpee verbal communication.

   A. There is a difference in the communication process of expert helper-helpee pairs as compared with referent helper-helpee pairs. It is hypothesized that expert helper-helpee pairs will display greater social status differentiation in their verbal communication than referent helper-helpee pairs (the above hypotheses (1) will be more pronounced in the case of expert helper-helpee pairs than referent helper-helpee pairs).
CHAPTER II

Method

Subjects

Twenty-four male undergraduate students enrolled in either Introduction to Clinical Psychology or Introduction to Counseling Psychology, both upper division psychology courses at The Ohio State University, were selected and trained to perform as "helpers." Sixty-six male undergraduate students, mostly freshmen, who had defined themselves as having difficulty with procrastination were the "helpees."

Materials

Interview Questionnaire:

The Interview Questionnaire contained 37 statements concerning the interviewer's behavior and personal characteristics. The questionnaire was based on a previous questionnaire devised and used by Dell (1972). For the first 30 items, helpees were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each item using a five-point scale: 1—strongly disagree, 2—disagree, 3—neither agree or disagree, 4—agree, 5—strongly agree. In the last seven items, which were seven-point Lickert scales, the helpees were asked to indicate their opinion regarding certain characteristics of the helper. A copy of the Interview Questionnaire is found in Appendix A.
Squiggles Task:

A modification of a communication task designed by Krauss and Weinheimer (1966), the Squiggles Task consists of 36 geometric forms and requires the verbal description of these novel graphic designs by a sender to a receiver. In this study, the sender and the receiver were separated by a screen and not in each other's view. The sender was given a predetermined set of designs. Four sets of 9 designs randomly selected from the 36 forms were used in this study. Each set of designs was presented in a bound booklet so as to insure the exact order of transmission by sender to receiver. The sender described the design and continued on to the next design presented in the booklet. The receiver listened to the sender's description of the design and was permitted to ask the sender questions. He was then required to identify the design from among the 36 alternatives he had in front of him. One minute was permitted for the description and the selection of each design. Feedback as to whether a correct choice had been made was not given. The verbal interaction of the dyads were tape recorded for later analysis. The 36 designs comprising the Squiggles Task is found in Appendix B.

Procedure

Helper Solicitation:

The experimenter visited two upper division classes at which time a description of the project was read (see Appendix C). The goal of the project was described to students as an investigation to determine the feasibility of training individuals like themselves in a relatively short period of time to provide effective short-term
counseling. Students were to receive course credit for their participation. Interested male students filled out a short questionnaire (Appendix D) requesting name, age, year, class schedule as well as several questions including their experience helping others, future plans, and reasons for wanting to be part of the project. Twenty-four students were randomly selected. Depending on students' schedule, students were assigned to one of two counseling training groups. One group of 12 student-counselors were trained as "expert" helpers. Another group of 12 student-counselors were trained as "referent" helpers.

Helper Training:

An intensive training program was devised. Each group (Expert/Referent) met for two hour sessions during three consecutive weeks, totaling six hours of training. A male graduate student in clinical psychology assisted by a male undergraduate student was responsible for training each group of student-counselors. The basic structure of training sessions was exactly the same for both groups. However, the content of training differed depending on whether the group consisted of student-counselors trained to be expert or referent helpers. For each group, a manual (Appendix E) and an extensive outline of counseling procedures (Appendix F) was provided with carefully spelled out instructions and rationale for specified counseling behavior.

During training sessions students were divided into small groups of three. These groups differed from week to week. Each student within a group rotated in several roles—counselor, procrastinator,
and objective observer (rater). The role of the objective observer was to rate and give immediate feedback to the person who was playing the role of the counselor. A short, but specific rating scale was devised to assist the objective observer (Appendix G). These ratings helped monitor students' progress toward the adoption of behavior specified in the particular counseling role. Ratings were collected and kept in individual folders for students as well as trainer's reference.

Counselor Roles (Expert/Referent):

The counselor roles (expert/referent) in this study were based on the role descriptions developed and used by Dell (1972) in a previous study.

Expert Role

The expert counselor role used by Dell (1972) was similar to that originally developed by Strong and Schmidt (1970). In order to insure the distinction between expert and referent counselor roles, Dell found it necessary to devise an expert role that specifically emphasized the counselor's knowledgeableness but "played down" his attractiveness. He found it necessary to insure only minimal counselor responsiveness to the client and developed an interview protocol. An interview protocol is found in Appendix H.

In general, expert student-counselors were trained to appear organized, confident, and knowledgeable. Student-counselors were instructed to be professional. They were informed that the most important aspect of a counseling relationship is the counselor's expertness and that people who seek counseling take it most seriously
and attempt to find workable solutions to their difficulties when they talk with a counselor who appears to be an expert as compared to when they talk with a counselor who does not appear to be an expert. Expert student-counselors followed a structured interview protocol (Dell, 1972) which involved a logical line of questioning and a thorough inquiry of the student's procrastination difficulties. To insure a sense of professionalism, student-counselors were told to minimize self-disclosing statements and to give as little non-verbal feedback as possible. To reinforce presentation as a professional helper and display knowledgeable about procrastination difficulties, student-counselors were required to make two standard comments; one about the correspondence between the student's procrastination experience and those of other students, and a second about current research pertaining to procrastination with which the student-counselor was familiar.

In summary, expert student-counselors sought to be perceived as professional. They appeared confident, organized, and knowledgeable. They avoided being self-disclosing or interpersonally responsive to the student. They sought to be perceived as maintaining the necessary knowledge and did not attempt to be perceived as especially attractive or similar to the student.

Referent Role

Similar to the referent role devised by Dell (1972), referent student-counselors were encouraged to be likeable, friendly, and convey a genuine attempt to understand the student's feelings and experiences. They were told that the essential ingredients in
effective counseling relationships are similar to that which is found in very close friendships. Not particular skills, but the counselor's attitude and personal way of being was emphasized as important. They were told that it was essential that they did not act "professional" and thereby distant and removed from the student's personal experience. Being open, sharing similar experiences, and establishing a process of identification were described as primary.

Referent student-counselors, unlike the expert student-counselors did not follow a structured interview protocol. Referent student-counselors began each interview by greeting the student and casually explaining that his role was to understand how the student felt about his problem and perhaps share similar personal experiences. Referent student-counselors were encouraged to be responsive to students during the interview as well as use reflection and restatement as a means of demonstrating their understanding of students' experiences.

In order to provide effective counseling, referent student-counselors were told that they needed to capitalize on personal characteristics they already possessed. In order to foster identification and a sense of similarity in a short period of time, referent student-counselors were asked to make 4-5 positive similarity self-disclosures. The specific number of similarity statements was determined on the basis of previous research (Murphy & Strong, 1971).

In summary, the referent student-counselor role was designed to encourage the student's perception of a friendly, likeable, and similar person who was not consumed with professionalism but who
could serve as a referent.

Interview:

The actual counseling procedure was also based on that used by Dell (1972). The basic format of the counseling interview was similar in both expert and referent helper conditions and consisted of 3 stages; an introduction, the bulk of the interview, and a helping sequence and termination. The specific content and manner of counselor's presentation of each interview segment depended on the particular helping condition, expert or referent.

A behavioral model for dealing with procrastination was advocated. Action-plans involving defining a specific goal to be accomplished, developing a plan of action to accomplish the goal, and selecting a reward to receive upon completion of the goal were suggested. Once again, the exact manner in which counselors presented this model depended upon whether the counselor operated from a referent or expert helper base.

Helpee Solicitation:

A prepared statement was read to several introductory psychology classes in order to solicit the participation of students who defined themselves as having difficulty with procrastination (See Appendix I). It was explained that the project staff hoped to learn more about individual students' concerns about procrastination as well as develop effective ways for students to deal with it. Students were also told that enough was already known that the majority of volunteer students would receive some personal benefit as a result of their participation in the study. Students were to receive credit
for their participation in the experiment. This point was mentioned but not emphasized.

Students filled out a questionnaire (Appendix J) to obtain their name, telephone number, age, and class schedule. They were also required to rate their degree of procrastination on a five point scale as well as indicate other people who they believed would define them as procrastinators (e.g., parents, teachers, roommate).

Conduct of the Study:

Students and student-counselors' class schedules were matched and appointments were made by telephone. Each student-counselor conducted three interviews, one a week for three consecutive weeks.

Interviews during the first two weeks (student-counselors' first two interviews) served two purposes. They provided the student-counselors with an opportunity to counsel students and practice their role. They also provided a way to assess whether student-counselors were being perceived as operating from different bases of helper's social power and thereby being differentially perceived as either helpers or referent helpers.

Verbal communication between helper and helpee was assessed only during student-counselors' third counseling interview. In order to insure the establishment of a helper-helpee relationship, students who had rated themselves as having moderate to severe procrastination difficulties and thereby more likely to desire and take seriously the services of a helper were scheduled for counseling appointments during the third week of the study. Students who had rated themselves as having mild to moderate degree of difficulty
with procrastination were scheduled for appointments during the first two weeks of the study.

When a student arrived for his appointment, he was met by the experimenter. He was escorted to the interviewing room where the student-counselor was waiting. The interviewing room was an impressive and authentic looking interviewing room containing two large chairs, a desk and chair, a file cabinet, etc. A tape recorder was in view on the desk. The student was informed that the interview was being recorded and that all material gathered in the course of the project was entirely confidential. After a 30-40 minute interview, the student-counselor terminated the interview and instructed the student to go to another room. It was at this time that the student was requested to complete the Interview Questionnaire.

This procedure was somewhat altered during the third week of the project. At each student-counselor's third interview, a structured communication task (the Squiggles Task) was introduced. Although this task is by no means identical to the verbal communication that occurs between a helper and a helpee in psychotherapy, it does provide a tool by which to assess how the definition of a relationship as one that is between a helper and a helpee affects the basic structure of verbal communication. It permits the appraisal of the direction, type, and accuracy of verbal communication. It has been used in a previous study of social power and communication (Alkire et al., 1968) as well as in research on family interaction (Alkire, 1969).

When the student arrived for his appointment, he was led to an experimental room and asked to sit behind a screen. The experimenter
went to the interviewing room where the student-counselor was waiting and asked the student-counselor to join her in another room by stating:

As you know, this is a large study. Before you see the student you will be counseling today, the project staff would like you to participate in an adjunct study on how people communicate geometric forms.

The experimenter escorted the student-counselor to the experimental room and indicated where he be seated.

Neither the student nor the student-counselor was told who was seated on the opposite side of the screen. A trained experimenter (naive to the hypotheses of the study) administered the Squiggles Task in a standardized manner (See Appendix K). After completing the Squiggles Task, the student-counselor was requested to return to the interviewing room. Several minutes later, the experimenter led the student to the interviewing room for the scheduled appointment. After the counseling interview, the student returned to the experimental room to fill out the Interview Questionnaire. At that time, the experimenter returned to the interviewing room and once again requested the student-counselor to participate in the geometric form task. The experimenter once again escorted the student-counselor to the experimental room. In order to make the helper-helpee roles salient, the experimenter read the following:

The two of you have just spent time talking with each other in a counseling situation. The staff of this project are interested in how two people who have spent time talking with each other in a situation in which a counselor tried to help another communicate geometric forms.
The experimenter left the room. The Squiggles Task was once again administered.

The particular set of designs (1, 2, 3, 4) as well as whether the role of sender would be initially filled by the helper or the helpee was predetermined by a random number selection method prior to the actual administration of the Squiggles Task pre and post counseling. Sender-receiver roles were alternated within each helper-helpee pair as well as across participating pairs of helpers and helpees.

In summary, pairs of helpers and helpees were brought together to perform on the Squiggles Task. This was done twice; once in a pre-counseling condition and prior to the role definition of each individual as either a helper or a helpee, and once during a post-counseling condition and after the two individuals participated in a counseling interview during which time one individual was clearly defined as a helper, the other a helpee.

Neutral Squiggles Group:

A neutral group of 20 male subjects (10 pairs) participated in the Squiggles Task in order to provide a baseline of how people perform on the Squiggles Task who are neither self-defined procrastinators nor individuals trained to perform as helpers.
CHAPTER III

Results

Effectiveness of Helpers' Differential Role Performance

Student-counselors were trained and instructed to perform as either expert or referent helpers. These role manipulations were designed to affect students' (helpees') perception of their student-counselor (helper) and influence certain aspects of helper-helpee verbal communication. In order to assess the effectiveness of helpers' role performance, helpees' perception of helpers were tapped by the Interview Questionnaire (See Appendix A).

Means and standard deviations of students' ratings of their student-counselors on the thirty-seven items presented in the Interview Questionnaire is found in Appendix L. Helpees' ratings on all items are in the predicted direction and indicates the instrument's face validity. A series of t-tests revealed statistically significant differences between mean ratings of expert student-counselors and referent student-counselors on nineteen of the thirty-seven items presented in the Interview Questionnaire. These items are presented in Table 1. These results suggest that the helper training program and its subsequent differential role requirements were effectively utilized by student-counselors.

Accuracy of Communication in the Communication Task

The number of correct choices made by each receiver over the nine
Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations of Helpees' Ratings on Nineteen Questionnaire Items that were Significantly Different for Expert and Referent Helpers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base of Helper's Social Power</th>
<th>Item(^a) ((\text{Interviewer:}))</th>
<th>Expert (\bar{X})</th>
<th>Expert SD</th>
<th>Referent (\bar{X})</th>
<th>Referent SD</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. looked at things in a way similar to me</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. amount of experience and training did not matter</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. person I would like as a friend</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. behavior reflected extensive training and knowledge</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. liked me</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. was structured and followed a plan</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. knowledge came from his own personal experience</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. have great deal in common</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. understood my feelings and ideas</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. knowledge came from his training</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

Means and Standard Deviations of Helpees' Ratings on Nineteen Questionnaire Items that were Significantly Different for Expert and Referent Helpers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (Interviewer:)</th>
<th>Base of Helper's Social Power</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. agreed with what I said</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. good understanding of my personal experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. acted like a machine</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. enjoyed the time he spent with me</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. was open and shared his personal experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. degree experiences, attitudes and/or values similar</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. degree knowledge due to his own personal experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. degree knowledge due to training and specialized experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. degree to which he is likeable</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The items in the table are abbreviated. Complete items are found in Appendix P.
trials were used as the measure of accuracy. Means and standard deviations of the accuracy of helpers and helpees prior to counseling and a group of subjects who were neither helpers or helpees are presented in Table 2. A one-way analysis of variance for the accuracy attained by the six groups was not significant ($F = 1.80$, $df = 5,54$, $p > .10$) indicating a similar baseline accuracy for all subjects.

Means and standard deviations of accuracy for both helper and helpee pre and post counseling are shown in Table 3. A 2 (helper-helpee) X 2 (pre-post counseling) X 2 (expert-referent helper) analysis of variance for accuracy revealed a significant main effect for pre-post counseling ($F = 11.28$, $df = 1,18$, $p < .01$). Accuracy, therefore clearly improved from pre to post counseling.

In order to more clearly assess helper and helpee effects, separate analyses of variance were computed for these two groups. Major findings are with regard to helpers. A 2 (pre-post counseling) X 2 (expert-referent helper) analysis of variance for helpers' accuracy yielded significant findings. As predicted and shown in Table 4, helpers' accuracy was significantly greater in the post counseling condition ($F = 10.53$, $df = 1,18$, $p < .01$). Also as predicted, a significant interaction was found between pre-post counseling and expert-referent helper status ($F = 5.37$, $df = 1,18$, $p < .05$) indicating that after counseling, the accuracy of expert helpers improved to a greater degree than the accuracy of referent helpers. As shown in Table 5, a 2 (pre-post counseling) X 2 (expert-referent helper) analysis of variance for accuracy failed to reveal significant findings with respect to helpees.
Table 2

Number of Accurate Selections Made at the Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sender</th>
<th>Receiver</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Helpee</td>
<td>Expert Helper</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Helper</td>
<td>Expert Helpee</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent Helpee</td>
<td>Referent Helper</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent Helper</td>
<td>Referent Helpee</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Group (2)</td>
<td>Neutral Group (1)</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Group (1)</td>
<td>Neutral Group (2)</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Number of Accurate Design Selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th></th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Analysis of Variance of Number of Accurate Design Selections Made by Helpers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2088.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert-Referent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>10.53(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(E)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.37(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP (E)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^b\)_{p} < .01
\(^c\)_{p} < .05
Table 5
Analysis of Variance of Number of Accurate Design Selections Made by Helpees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1932.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert-Referent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(E)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP(E)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall these findings support the major hypothesis concerning the accuracy of verbal communication between helpers and helpees. After the counseling interaction and helper-helpee role definitions were clearly established, there was an increase in accuracy for helpers when helpees were senders. This was not found for the post counseling accuracy displayed by helpees when helpers were senders. This finding with respect to helpers' accuracy was especially pronounced in the expert helper condition as compared to the referent helper condition.

In order to more directly investigate how minimal status differentiation between helpers and helpees (referentness) as compared to maximal status differentiation (expertness) affects verbal communication between helpers and helpees, a correlation was obtained between helpees' endorsement of helper's referentness as indicated by helpees' response to the questionnaire and helpees' accuracy. Endorsement of helper's referentness was examined regardless of expert-referent helper manipulation and thus independent of the base of helper's social power from which a particular helper was deliberately operating from.

To obtain a measure of referentness, a sample of nineteen items were selected from the Interview Questionnaire. These items were selected because they originally differentiated between expert and referent helpers (see Table 1). Responses on five items were numerically reversed to reflect low referent endorsement instead of high expert endorsement. Each of these items was correlated with the total score for these items (see Appendix M). Those items that
correlated .50 or above with the total score were selected. These eleven items can be found in Table 6. These items were then combined to obtain a total score. This total score was then in turn used as a correlate of helpees' accuracy.

It was hypothesized that there would be a correlation between high total score and accuracy. A high total score would represent the endorsement of referentness whereas a low total score would represent the endorsement of expertness.

Correlations between accuracy and the eleven item total score was computed. A correlation of .29 was found. Although not reaching significance, this trend is in the direction of indicating a correlation between the degree of helpees' accuracy and the total score on items reflecting referentness. However, it is clear that this correlation reflecting aspects of helpees' perception of helpers, accounts for only a small portion of the variance in the results.

**Objective Measures of Information Exchange**

(1) Number of Words Used by Sender

Means and Standard deviations for the number of words used by both helper and helpee pre and post counseling when they were senders is presented in Table 7. A 2 (helper-helpee) X 2 (pre-post counseling) X 2 (expert-referent helper) analysis of variance yielded a statistically significant interaction between helper-helpee and pre-post counseling (F = 10.08, df = 1,26, p < .01; Table 8). When helpers were senders they increased the number of words they used after counseling whereas when helpees were senders they decreased the number of words they used after counseling. This occurred regardless
Table 6
Eleven Items that Display High Correlation with Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Interviewer:)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. person I would like as a friend</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. liked me</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. was structured and followed a plan</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. knowledge came from his own personal experience</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. have great deal in common</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. agreed with what I said</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. good understanding of my personal experiences</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. acted like a machine</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. was open and shared his personal experiences</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. degree experiences, attitudes, and/or values similar</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. degree to which he is likeable</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The items in the table are abbreviated. Complete items are found in Appendix P.
Table 7
Number of Words Used by Sender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>64.29 85.21</td>
<td>35.63 38.98</td>
<td>60.00 84.79</td>
<td>26.29 62.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>77.00 43.93</td>
<td>40.28 19.71</td>
<td>56.29 53.71</td>
<td>38.12 33.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Analysis of Variance of Number of Words Used by Sender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>482737.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert-Referent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>428.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>177.50</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper-Helpee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7024.72</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1449.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2065.72</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11583.22</td>
<td>10.08a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1544.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1830.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X P X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1242.21</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPH(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1149.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a_p < .01
of whether helper-helpee pair was operating within an expert or referent helper condition.

Individual comparisons (Appendix N) were computed to examine whether pre-post counseling changes in the mean number of words used by helpers was significant. A similar analysis was used to examine pre-post changes in the mean number of words used by helpees. The findings indicate that the mean number of words used by helpers after counseling was significantly greater than the mean number of words used by helpers before counseling ($F = 6.52$, $df = 1,104$, $p < .05$). Although the analysis with respect to the mean number of words used by helpees pre-post counseling did not reach significance ($F = 3.87$, $df = 1,104$, $p > .05$), this trend indicated that the mean number of words used by helpees after counseling was less than the mean number of words used by helpees before counseling. In other words, after the helper-helpee relationship was clearly established, helpers increased the amount of words they used when communicating with helpees whereas helpees decreased the amount of words they used when communicating with helpers. These findings are consistent with empirical work on verbal communication in social hierarchial relationships. High status individuals tend to talk more than low status individuals. Low status persons tend to become deferential, cautious, less spontaneous, and, in general, decrease in their verbal activity when interacting with high status persons.

(2) Number of Words Used by Receiver

Means and standard deviations for the number of words used by both helper and helpee pre and post counseling when they are receivers
Table 9

Number of Words Used by Receiver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Analysis of Variance of Number of Words Used by Receiver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11160.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert-Referent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper-Helpee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>531.57</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>150.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PXH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>456.03</td>
<td>6.40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>127.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPXH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPH(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ap < .05
is presented in Table 9. A 2 (helper-helpee) X 2 (pre-post counseling) X 2 (expert-referent helper) analysis of variance indicated a significant interaction between helper-helpee and pre-post counseling (F = 6.40, df = 1,26, p < .05; Table 10). The mean number of words used by helpers when they were receivers increased after counseling whereas the mean number of words used by helpees when they were receivers decreased after counseling.

Individual comparisons (Appendix N) investigating pre-post counseling changes in the mean number of words used by helpers failed to yield significance. A similar analysis computed for pre-post counseling changes in the mean number of words used by helpees was also not significant. However, individual comparisons for the mean number of words used by helpers as compared to helpees post counseling was highly significant (F = 13.84, df = 1.104, p < .01). Helpers and helpees change in the opposite direction post counseling; helpers increase in the mean number of words they use as compared to a decrease in the mean number of words helpees use. These findings were not different for expert and referent helper conditions.

These findings support previous results of empirical work on verbal communication between persons of differential positions in a social hierarchy. High status persons not only talk, in general, more than low status persons, they tend to ask more questions and seek clarification of communication more often than low status persons. The results of the present study indicating that helpers use more words than helpees when they are receivers may reflect not only the tendency of high status persons to talk more but, more specifically,
Table 11

Number of Interruptions during Communication Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th></th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M Pre</td>
<td>M Post</td>
<td>SD Pre</td>
<td>SD Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M Pre</th>
<th>M Post</th>
<th>SD Pre</th>
<th>SD Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Analysis of Variance of Number of Interruptions during Communication Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert-Referent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper-Helpee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.55(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X P X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPH(E)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a_{p} < .05\)
their tendency to ask more questions and seek clarification of communication more often. Here again, the decrease observed in the number of words used by helpees post counseling when they are receivers seems to reflect the change in their relative position with respect to helpers and its corresponding affect on their verbal activity.

(3) Number of Interruptions during Communication Task

Means and standard deviations for the number of interruptions during communication task exhibited by both helper and helpee pre and post counseling are shown in Table 11. A significant interaction between helper-helpee and pre-post counseling ($F = 4.55, df = 1,26, p < .05$; Table 12) was found in a three-way analysis of variance. After counseling, helpers increased in their mean number of interruptions whereas helpees decreased in their mean number of interruptions.

Individual comparisons (Appendix N) were computed to examine pre-post counseling change in the mean number of interruptions for both helpers and helpees. Neither change in the mean number of interruptions pre-post counseling for helpers nor change in the mean number of interruptions pre-post counseling for helpees reached significance. However, individual comparisons between the mean number of interruptions displayed by helpees post counseling and the mean number of interruptions displayed by helpers post counseling was significant ($F = 9.11, df = 1,104, p < .01$). In the post counseling condition, helpers and helpees change again in the opposite direction. The utilization of interruptions increased for helpers whereas they decreased for helpees. The mean number of interruptions was not
significantly different for helper-helpee pairs operating within the referent helper condition as compared to the expert helper condition.

These findings are consistent with previous studies. Because of their relative position with regard to low status persons, high status persons display a greater number of interruptions than low status persons. Such interruptions may take the form of questions or general attempts at clarification. Low status individuals, in general, appear reluctant to assert themselves and perhaps threaten their relationship with high status individuals. They tend not to interrupt as often and as a result ask far less questions and attempt clarification less often. Helpees' decrease in the mean number of interruptions post counseling seem to reflect their change in relative status with regard to the helper pre-post counseling.

(4) Geometric and Referent Phrases

Senders tend to use two general types of concepts during the communication task (Alkire et al., 1968). One of these is the use of a referent phrase consisting of animate or inanimate noun objects (Krauss & Weinheimer, 1966). Two raters were asked to identify referent concepts from transcripts representing a selected sample of task communication between helpers and helpees. They obtained 76% agreement. A given referent concept was counted only once if it was repeated during the description of any given design. Referent concepts used in the sender's initial message was analyzed in a 2 (helper-helpee) X 2 (pre-post counseling) X 2 (expert-referent helper) analysis of variance. No significant findings were found.

The second category of concepts used by senders during this task
has been termed geometric-descriptive and consisted of phrases referring to lines, circles, curves, enumeration of points, etc. (Alkire et al., 1968). Phrases falling into this category were counted only once for a given design because it was difficult to define where once such geometric-descriptive phrases left off and another began. Rater agreement was 59%. Because geometric-descriptive phrases were either counted as present or not within the designated sample of designs, chi square analyses were used. No significant findings were obtained.

Judgments of Design Descriptions

A supplementary component of the study was conducted to evaluate whether design descriptions transmitted between helpers and helpees during their participation in the Squiggles Task were different in terms of permitting accurate design selection by neutral subjects. Design descriptions actually transmitted by helpers and helpees before and after counseling and within either the referent or expert helper condition were compared. Consistent with the focus of the study, it was hypothesized that the social power aspect of helping relationships affects helper-helpee verbal communication and that this, in turn, would be reflected in neutral subjects judgments of helpers' and helpees' design descriptions. Specifically, and derived from the major hypotheses, it was hypothesized that the design descriptions sent by helpers and helpees pre counseling would not differentially affect accurate design selection by neutral subjects who heard these descriptions. However, post counseling (once the relationship between helper and helpee was established), it was hypothesized that
the design descriptions sent by helpees would be qualitatively superior in terms of facilitating accurate design selection by neutral subjects than those sent by helpers. It was expected, in addition, that this difference between design descriptions sent post counseling by helpers and helpees would be more pronounced in the expert helper condition as compared to the referent helper condition. Ninety-six male undergraduate students from the general pool of subjects available for psychological studies at Ohio State were solicited. These subjects were naive as to the goal of the original study as well as the goal of the subsequent portion of the study in which their participation was being requested.

Eight different groups of twelve subjects each met independently. Upon meeting, each group received explicit instructions (see Appendix 0) describing that their task was to listen to a tape recording of two men talking and choose the design being described. They were supplied with an answer sheet and a sheet containing 36 designs from which they were to select the particular designs they heard being described. They heard twelve different design descriptions. There were 15 second intervals between each design description permitting subjects to make their design choice before hearing the next description.

Design descriptions used in this portion of the study represent a sample of those transmitted in the original study. Every third and seventh design transmitted during each set of trials was transcribed verbatim. Designs were categorized according to sender (pre-counseling expert helper; pre-counseling expert helpee; pre-counseling
referent helper; pre-counseling referent helpee; post-counseling expert helper; post-counseling expert helpee; post-counseling referent helper; post-counseling referent helpee). Twelve designs from each sender category were randomly selected. Because there were four sets of different design sequences, there was significant overlap of designs appearing in each sender category. Thus, the eight edited tapes used in this segment of the study consisted of the same designs but originally transmitted by eight different groups of subjects. These tapes were recorded by two male research assistants.

Means and standard deviations of accuracy scores in the eight different tape conditions are presented in Table 13. Table 14 presents the results of a three-way analysis of variance performed on neutral subjects' accuracy scores. As can be seen from this table, helper-helpee status reached significance as a main effect (F = 5.89, df = 1.88, p < .05) indicating overall that the sample of design descriptions sent by helpees were more accurately perceived by neutral subjects than those sent by helpers.

A significant main effect for pre-post counseling (F = 6.45, df = 1.88, p < .05) indicated that messages sent before counseling were more accurately perceived by neutral subjects than those sent after counseling. As will be shown below, further examination of this particular finding helps elucidate the nature of the helper-helpee status main effect reported above. Table 14 also reveals a pre-post counseling interaction with expert-referent helper status (F = 5.89, df = 1.88, p < .05) as well as a strong trend indicating an interaction between expert-referent helper status and helper-
Table 13
Neutral Subjects Accuracy when Relying on Information from Original Sender-Receiver Dyads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Counseling</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Sender</td>
<td>Receiver</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Sender</td>
<td>Receiver</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Analysis of Variance for Neutral Subjects' Accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3613.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>6.45&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert-Referent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper-Helpee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>5.89&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>5.89&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X E X H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>&gt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H(PEC)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup><sub>p < .05</sub>
helpee status \( (F = 3.90, df = 1,88, p > .05) \). Neutral subjects pre counseling accuracy scores were higher than post counseling accuracy scores only when helpers were performing in the referent helper condition and this finding held regardless of whether the sender was a helper or a helpee. Further examination of these pre-post counseling differences, depicted in Figure 1, suggests that differences in pre-post accuracy found for messages sent by helpers and messages sent by helpees are differentially related to expert-referent helper status.

Neutral subjects accuracy scores were examined separately in terms of designs descriptions sent by helpers and design descriptions sent by helpees (Figure 1). Planned comparisons were employed and a significant difference was found between pre counseling accuracy scores attained by neutral subjects in response to designs sent by referent helpers and pre counseling accuracy scores attained by neutral subjects in response to designs sent by expert helpers \( (F = 4.01, df = 1,88, p < .05) \). This finding indicated that pre counseling accuracy scores were higher in the referent helper condition as compared to the expert helper condition. This result was unexpected and cannot be satisfactorily explained.

As shown in Figure 1, neutral subjects were less accurate when descriptions were sent by post counseling helpees in the referent as compared to the expert helper condition. Planned comparisons of these post counseling accuracy scores obtained by neutral subjects were significant \( (F = 5.45, df = 1,88, p < .05) \). This finding reflects a difference \( (F = 4.01, df = 1,88, p < .05) \) in neutral subjects accuracy in response to design descriptions sent by helpees.
Figure 1. Receiver Accuracy

Helper

Helpee

Mean Accuracy

PRE POST PRE POST

 REFERENT

 EXPERT

Figure 1. Receiver Accuracy
post counseling in the referent helper condition. Contrary to hypoth-
thesis, the findings do not reflect an improvement in the level of
accuracy of subjects receiving design descriptions sent by helpees
operating within an expert helper condition (F > 1).

These findings were both unexpected and fail, at this time, to
provide a compelling explanation. One may speculate that sampling
bias may have been operative in terms of design description selection.
Another possible explanation may be that the reception of design
descriptions by neutral subjects is not comparable to actually being
part of the interaction and experiencing oneself in a relative
power position with reference to the individual with whom one is
attempting to communicate. It may be that what transpires between
helpers and helpees does not extend into the experience of neutral
subjects as they attempt to select correct designs.
CHAPTER IV

Discussion

The focus of this study was an investigation of how social power affects verbal communication in helping relationships. Major findings of the present study will be summarized below.

Social Power and Helping Relationships

The results of the study indicate that after counseling and the role differential between helper and helpee is apparent to the participants, the general pattern of verbal activity of helpers and helpees differs significantly. Helpers became more active after counseling than helpees, and sought to clarify and sharpen messages exchanged between themselves and helpees. The results indicate that helpers, both as senders and as receivers used more words and engaged in a greater number of interruptions (questions and clarifications) during the task as compared to helpees. The data indicates that helpees demonstrated a reverse effect. After a relationship between helpee and helper was established through counseling, helpees decreased the number of words they used when they were senders, decreased the number of words they used when they were receivers, and decreased the number of interruptions they initiated during the course of the interaction sequence. These results are entirely consistent with findings in the literature on verbal communication in social hierarchic relationships. High status persons talk more, ask more
questions, are more likely to seek clarification, and experience, in general, a greater freedom to pursue, sharpen, and clarify messages exchanged. Conversely, low status persons direct information to high status persons, talk less than high status persons, display a lower level of activity (including lack of attempts at clarification and questions) than high status persons, and exhibit communicative patterns that are often described as deferential, noncritical, and nonquestioning when interacting with high status persons. The present findings are therefore consistent with the assumption that differential social power exists between helpers (high power) and helpees (low power) and that this difference in power affects verbal communication between helpers and helpees as in other hierarchial relationships.

As suggested by Alkire et al. (1968), this overall pattern of high activity of high relative to low status individuals seems also to be reflected in the higher degree of accuracy achieved by helpers—the high status receivers. After counseling and the status differentiation between helper and helpee was clearly established, helpers became much more verbally active than helpees and significantly improved in their ability to select the design being described by helpees.

The results of the supplementary component of the study investigating whether design descriptions transmitted by one particular group of senders was qualitatively superior as compared to those transmitted by other groups of senders in terms of permitting more accurate design selection by neutral subjects was inconclusive and
somewhat confusing. As mentioned earlier, these findings may reflect a sampling bias operative in this segment of the study or it may reflect the fact that subjects' experience of listening and responding to tapes is significantly different from the direct experience of interacting and communicating with someone of a different status.

Bases of Helper's Social Power

Referent and expert helper role manipulations seemed very successful. Helpees' response on the Interview Questionnaire indicated that referent helpers were seen as more likeable, more friendly, and more similar than expert helpers. Their knowledge as a counselor was seen as derived from their personal experiences rather than training and specialized experience as a counselor. By contrast, expert helpers were seen as organized and professional and their behavior was perceived as reflecting more specialized training and experience as counselors than referent helpers. Consistent with other studies in the literature (e.g., Browning, 1966; Hartley, 1969; Patton, 1969; Strong & Schmidt, 1970; Strong & Schmidt, 1971), these results indicate that counselors can be trained in ways that capitalize on different dimensions of helping behavior and can subsequently affect their clients' perception of them.

The results indicate some support of the notion that different bases of helper's social power differentially affect helper-helpee verbal communication. Although, after counseling, the accuracy of both expert and referent helpers significantly increased, the increased accuracy displayed by expert helpers was significantly greater than that displayed by referent helpers. It appears that the
low-high power differentiation between helper and helpee is much more salient in a helping situation in which the helper operates from an expert base of social power as compared to a helper who operates from a referent base of social power.

No difference was found between expert and referent helpers in terms of the number of words they used when they were senders, the number of words they used when they were receivers, or the number of interruptions they engaged in during the task. However, as noted above, expert helpers were more accurate than referent helpers, even though there was no difference between the two groups of helpers in terms of their pattern of communication on certain quantitative dimensions. It seems reasonable to speculate that the type or content of information directed toward expert helpers and perhaps requested by expert helpers themselves was different and accounts for the difference in accuracy observed for expert as contrasted with referent helpers. Perhaps in the expert helper condition, being an expert and being responded to as an expert created a situation in which the interacting persons were much more task oriented than that which occurred between referent helpers and their helpees. Perhaps expert helpers were far less concerned with the interpersonal dynamics of maintaining the relationship and were less concerned with being friendly, likeable, and similar appearances. Their expertness was the main source of their relationship with helpees and both were constrained to concentrate on information relevant to the task and not the individual with whom they were interacting.

A weak correlation ($F = .28$) between endorsement of helper's
referentness and helpees' accuracy was found. It appears that the degree of helpees' accuracy is positively but only slightly related to written endorsement of helper's referentness as indicated by questionnaire items. Apparently the dynamics of an actual ongoing interaction in which maximal or minimal status differentiation is emphasized contribute more to the communication process than helpees' attitudes about the helper's power base.

Implications

As a counseling analogue study, questions as to the generalizability of results may arise. However, it seems that perhaps one of the strengths of the study is the very fact that it is an analogue to actual counseling relationships. For it is quite notable that significant results can be obtained in even such a "diluted" helping situation. Undergraduate students, trained in a relatively short period of time, performed as helpers with students who were not terribly different from themselves. The very definition of their role as "helpers" had a significant effect on the verbal communication that transpired between themselves and the students they counseled. Even within the referent helper condition, in which the stereotypic professional role of "helper" was attenuated, the effects of social power on verbal communication were noted. It appears that this study helps highlight the simple fact that being a "helper," no matter if the helper is just another student who has no "real" power is enough to unbalance information flow and accuracy. The data also suggests that this emergent pattern of information exchange, especially with regard to accuracy, may be substantially different
depending on the helper's base of social power.

Applying a paradigm derived from empirical work in social psychology has provided a manner in which to investigate helping in a way which differs from approaches traditionally used in psychotherapy research and clinical analogue studies. It is interesting to note that applying questions to helping within a social psychological framework lends to results similar to those demonstrated in studies of vertical information flow in very different groups (e.g., business organization, a sorority). When two individuals come together of differential social power, consequences seem to automatically appear in terms of the way they talk and the information they ultimately receive from one another.
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Interview Questionnaire
Interview Questionnaire

We are interested in your reaction to the interview you have just completed. Using the scale below, please write your response in the blanks to the left of each item.

1 - strongly disagree
2 - disagree
3 - neither agree or disagree
4 - agree
5 - strongly agree

1. The interviewer seemed to look at things in a way similar to me.
2. The amount of experience and training the interviewer had did not matter to me during the interview.
3. The interviewer seemed to be a person I would like as a friend.
4. The interviewer was able to help me discuss my personal experiences.
5. The interviewer's behavior during the interview seemed to reflect extensive training and knowledge.
6. The interviewer's questions and comments seemed to come at the right time.
7. The interviewer was the type of person I usually like.
8. This study is worth the time I have given to it.
9. The interviewer was the type of person in whom I could readily confide.
10. During the interview I was sure that the interviewer had a clear picture of my personal experiences.
11. The interviewer seemed very attentive to whatever I was saying during the interview.
12. The interviewer seemed to like me.

13. The interviewer was very structured and followed a plan during the interview.

14. The interviewer seemed to lack confidence in himself during the interview.

15. The interviewer seemed to be attempting to change feelings and ideas I have about myself.

16. Most of the knowledge the interviewer seemed to have during the interview came from his own personal experience.

17. I have a great deal in common with the interviewer.

18. The interviewer really understood my ideas and feelings.

19. I felt very involved with the interviewer during the interview.

20. Most of the knowledge the interviewer shared during the interview came from his training as an interviewer.

21. I wish the interviewer had been more friendly.

22. The interviewer did not seem to know what he was doing.

23. The interviewer was helpful in clarifying my feelings and views about procrastination.

24. The interviewer seemed to agree with most of what I said during the interview.

25. The interviewer had a good understanding of my personal experiences.

26. The interviewer acted like a machine.

27. The interviewer seemed to enjoy the time he spent with me during the interview.

28. The interviewer's background and experience made no difference to me.

29. The interviewer was quite open and shared his personal experiences.

30. The interviewer was quite helpful to me.
31. On the following scale, circle the number which, in your personal opinion, most accurately describes the degree to which your interviewer has experiences, attitudes and/or values that are similar to yours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely dissimilar</td>
<td>neither similar or dissimilar</td>
<td>extremely similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. On the following scale, circle the number which, in your personal opinion, most accurately describes the degree to which your interviewer is knowledgeable about solving procrastination problems due to his own personal experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely unknowable</td>
<td>neither knowledgeable or unknowable</td>
<td>extremely knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. On the following scale, circle the number which, in your personal opinion, most accurately describes the degree to which your interviewer is knowledgeable about procrastination problems due to his training and specialized experiences as an interviewer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely unknowable</td>
<td>neither knowledgeable or unknowable</td>
<td>extremely knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. On the following scale, circle the number, which in your personal opinion most accurately describes the degree to which your interviewer is likeable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely unlikeable</td>
<td>neither likeable or unlikeable</td>
<td>extremely likeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. On the following scale, circle the number, which in your opinion, most accurately describes the degree to which your interviewer's suggestions and comments seem helpful to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely unhelpful</td>
<td>neither helpful or unhelpful</td>
<td>extremely helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. On the following scale, circle the number, which in your personal opinion, most accurately describes the degree to which you are likely to set specific goals and action plans to deal with your procrastination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely unlikely</td>
<td>neither likely or unlikely</td>
<td>extremely likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. On the following scale, circle the number, which in your personal opinion, most accurately describes the degree to which you see your interviewer as someone you can look up to as a strong, authoritative, helpful person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely unauthoritative, unhelpful, and not very strong</td>
<td>neither authoritative or unauthoritative, helpful or unhelpful, strong or not very strong</td>
<td>extremely authoritative, helpful, and strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Squiggles Task
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Request for Helper Participation
Request for Helper Participation

In conjunction with the Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychology 794 an experiential course-research program is being sponsored in which a small group of upper division psychology students will be trained to counsel students. In recent years there has been much talk about the fact that the number of trained professional helpers is not enough and will probably never be enough to meet public demands for people-helping services. There has been increasing employment of helpers who have not had extensive professional training and, for the most part, this is working out extremely well and seems to be gaining wide acceptance in the helping fields.

We are looking for upper division male students who are interested in helping others. You must be able to commit approximately 2-3 hours a week during this winter quarter. Psychology 794 or 693 credit are available for participating students. Students will receive training in order to provide short-term counseling for students who have specific concerns. We believe that this project not only provides an important service to students in need but permits the student-helpers valuable training and first hand experience in actually helping others.

If you are interested please fill out this form. We have only limited enrollment. But please remember that if you commit your time to the project we must expect that you will follow it through. If you have any questions you can call 2-7102. I will be organizing the project schedule for Mr. Bertner.
APPENDIX D

Helper Questionnaire
Counseling Training Program
Winter, 1974
Psychology 794

Name ______________________________________
Address ____________________________________
Telephone ________________________________
College Year ______________________________
Age ____________
Major ____________________________________

In order to coordinate training program and counselee sessions,
please fill in your schedule (leave blank the times you are currently
available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thr</th>
<th>Fri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no other times can be coordinated among participants would you be
willing to attend three training sessions on 3 consecutive Saturday
mornings? Yes_____ No_____

1) What is the main reason you are interested in participating in this program?

2) At this time, what do you plan to do after college graduation?

3) Have you had previous experience helping others in a formal helping situation. If so, when and where was this?
APPENDIX E

Counseling Training Manual
Counseling Training Program

Introduction

People have concerns, questions, problems, or needs to which they seek answers and solutions. The process of one individual attempting to help another is not an exclusive province of professional helpers. In the past several years there has been an increasing sense of awareness that persons without extensive formal professional training and affiliation can be trained to be effective helpers. This is an exciting change for it promotes the mobilization of untapped potential manpower to meet the increasing need for people-helping services. A need which traditional professional and formal helping services cannot possibly meet.

The staff of the present project maintain the conviction that the helping field must increasingly look toward the training and employment of laymen as helpers. Along this line of thought, the current research project has been developed. We are interested in investigating the feasibility of training individuals like yourself to effectively provide short-term counseling.

We have defined several important elements necessary for effective short-term counseling. You will be trained as counselors during a series of three, two hour training sessions. Because of the limited training time as well as the limited interview time allotted with each student, we have developed a structured interview for you to follow. The structured interview provides an outline for you as a counselor to follow in order to obtain information as well as offer the student valuable help. Because this is a research project you may occasionally be observed by members of the project staff and/or recorded during training.
meetings and actual counseling sessions. We hope that you enjoy being a part of this project and find it rewarding and personally enlightening.

You will be conducting several counseling interviews with students who have volunteered to meet with trained interviewers in order to discuss their experiences and concern about their problem with procrastination. The students are aware that this is a research project. They were informed that we are interested in learning more about procrastination and are especially interested in learning more about effective ways of helping students deal with it. They do expect to receive some personal benefit with their procrastination difficulties as a result of their individual interviews with counselors like yourself.

There has been much written about counseling. Although descriptions of counseling vary, most would agree that there are two central elements in any counseling relationship. First, counseling takes place within the context of a social relationship in which two people agree to meet and communicate with each other. Second, the primary purpose and focus of a counseling relationship is to change the attitudes, feelings, or behavior of one of the participants. People arrange to meet with counselors because they wish to change something about themselves and have generally found that they cannot do so on their own.

What helps another person explore his difficulty with something like procrastination is the opportunity to talk with someone who is knowledgeable, confident, and generally appears to know what he is doing. Research has shown that the more expert a counselor appears, the greater the likelihood the individual seeking counseling will listen, take the counselor's advice seriously, and eventually alter his behavior, attitude, or feelings. This intuitively seems to make a great deal of sense.
People have expectations about individuals who occupy certain roles. Counselors, like other helpers, are expected to be knowledgeable and display their expertise.

You will be meeting with each student you counsel only once for a thirty minute interview. In order to quickly establish a professional atmosphere, it is extremely important that you act as a professional and experienced counselor and appear knowledgeable, confident, and organized. It is important that you gain an accurate understanding of the student's concerns while at the same time maintain professional distance. In order to insure a sense of professionalism, you will need to minimize self-disclosing statements about yourself as well as give as little non-verbal feedback as possible. This might be slightly awkward for you at first.

We have found that with practice individuals can evolve to a point where they are perceived (through their behavior) as expert counselors. This is extremely important. As previously mentioned, studies have shown that the counselor's expertness is the primary element in short-term counseling. We cannot overemphasize the fact that people who seek counseling take it most seriously and attempt to find workable solutions to their difficulties when they talk with a counselor who appears to be an expert as compared to when they talk with a counselor who does not appear to be an expert. Studies have shown that the counselor's "real expertise is not as important as the expertness the counselor seems to possess. This finding is completely consistent with what we know from the attitude change literature as well as research in person perception.

Please bear in mind that the primary purpose of this study is to see whether individuals such as yourself can be trained in a relatively
short period of time to perform as expert counselors and conduct effective short-term counseling interviews with students who have difficulty with procrastination. It is likely that the role of an expert counselor will become comfortable and automatic through training and practice.
Counseling Training Program

Introduction

People have concerns, questions, problems, or needs to which they seek answers and solutions. The process of one individual attempting to help another is not an exclusive province of professional helpers. In the past several years there has been an increasing sense of awareness that persons without extensive formal professional training and affiliation can be trained to be effective helpers. This is an exciting change for it promotes the mobilization of untapped potential manpower to meet the increasing need for people-helping services. A need which traditional professional and formal helping services cannot possibly meet.

The staff of the present project maintain the conviction that the helping field must increasingly look toward the training and employment of laymen as helpers. Along this line of thought, the current research project has been developed. We are interested in investigating the feasibility of training individuals like yourself to effectively provide short-term counseling.

We have defined several important elements necessary for effective short-term counseling. You will be trained as counselors during a series of three, two hour training sessions. Because of the limited training time as well as the limited interview time allotted with each student, we have developed a structured interview for you to follow. The structured interview provides an outline for you as a counselor to follow in order to obtain information as well as offer the student valuable help. Because this is a research project you may occasionally be observed by members of the project staff and/or recorded during training.
sessions and actual counseling sessions. We hope that you enjoy being part of the project and find it rewarding and personally enlightening.

You will be meeting with students who have volunteered to meet with trained interviewers to discuss their experience and concern about their difficulty with procrastination. These students are aware that this is a research project. They have been informed that we are interested in learning more about procrastination and are especially interested in learning more about effective ways of helping students deal with it. They expect to receive some personal benefit with their procrastination difficulties as a result of their individual interviews with counselors like yourself.

You will be meeting with each student assigned to you once only for a thirty minute interview. With each of these students it will be necessary to establish a counseling relationship as quickly as possible. What is important in counseling relationships are also found in close friendships. Warmth, empathy, and genuineness have been described in the literature as key ingredients in counseling relationships. In order to convey these important qualities and rapidly establish an effective counseling relationship, it is important that you are likeable, friendly, and convey a genuine attempt to understand the student's feelings and experiences. Many psychologists believe that it is not the particular skills of a counselor that cause people to grow and change. They feel that it is the counselor's attitude and personal way of being that is therapeutic. Thus it is extremely important that you do not act "professional" and thereby distant and removed from the student's personal experiences. Listening carefully, attending to what is said, and reflecting (repeating and paraphrasing) feelings, content, and experiences back to the student are important ways of establishing
and maintaining rapport with a student during a counseling interview. It is important to remember that all we really have as counselors are our own experiences from which we draw upon when relating with counselees. Being open and sharing similar experiences and feelings with the student is an essential part of counseling. Giving advice, giving information, or expressing "expertise" only gets in the way of establishing an effective counselor-counselee relationship. It is important to remember that the relationship you will be seeking to establish with those students you counsel is like a close and caring friend.

As mentioned earlier, the students you will be seeing have some sort of difficulty with procrastination. That is, putting things off. Establishing a common base of experience is the most important stage in counseling another person. It will be important for you to think of times when procrastination has plagued you. What helps another person change and move toward solving his problems is seeing that someone like himself understands, has had similar experiences, and has been able to deal with similar concerns. This process is known as identification and operates in every counseling relationship. In some forms of counseling it is more apparent than in others. In Alcoholic Anonymous, in Weight Watchers, and in some drug treatment programs the use of identification is primary and an observable facet of their counseling procedures.

Research has shown that the establishment of an effective counseling relationship can be quickened by having the counselor consciously make self-disclosing statements about himself to emphasize similarity with the counselee and thereby encourage identification. Due to the
limited time allotted for counseling each student, it will be necessary to follow a similar procedure. Thus, in addition to being friendly, likeable, and genuinely interested in the student, it will be essential that you make an concerted effort to share your similarities—whether that be feelings, attitudes, or experiences. At times this might feel gimmicky or uncomfortable for you. Please remember that you are attempting to squeeze an effective counseling procedure into a 30 minute interview. What is important is the establishment of an overall process between you and the students you counsel. Below is an outline of the counseling procedure. We are sure that this prescribed method for counseling students will become natural and automatic as a result of practice and training.
APPENDIX F

Counseling Procedure
INTERVIEW OUTLINE

I. **Introduction** (preparation, appearance, atmosphere)

A. Interviewer's dress should be somewhat professional.

B. Sit comfortably at the desk in the office you'll be using for the interview.

C. Have the tape recorder on.

D. Remain seated as the student enters the office and indicate where he should sit.

E. As soon as the student is seated explain to him that the interview will be taped as part of the research. At the same time emphasize that the interview is strictly confidential and will be heard only by authorized project staff.

F. Be attentive to the student while he is discussing his problem but avoid being "reactive" (e.g. nodding head, smiling, saying "mmhm", etc.) to student's remarks.

G. Remember that the interviewer is in control of the situation and maintain the initiative and lead during the counseling session.

H. Speak with confidence but avoid being overbearing.

I. Try to communicate nonverbally as little as possible.

II. **Interview**

Begin the interview by saying:

"The purpose of this interview is to help us learn more about the difficulties students have in getting assignments and other tasks completed on time. To do this I have several questions I'd like to ask you in order to understand how you think about this problem."
A. Turn to the interview protocol. Please ask the questions in order and take notes as the interview progresses.

B. You will note that two comments are required in the interview. (see interview protocol). One comment is to be said after student's response to question #3 and the other comment is to be said after student's response to question #10. These comments should be said as naturally as possible. They have been inserted in the interview protocol in order to reinforce your presentation as a professional helper. This might seem a little gimmicky at first, but please keep in mind that you are interested in facilitating an effective counseling relationship during a short period of time. As described previously, your "expertness" is the most important tool you have in establishing the desired relationship with the counselee in the amount of time available.

III. Helping Sequence and Termination

A. Approach

A very short and concrete approach to procrastination can be spelled out for the student. This particular approach has been used successfully in a previous project with procrastinators. It involves helping the individual state the behavior he desires to accomplish in terms of goals, working with him to establish an actual plan for its accomplishment, and in order to insure success, working with him to set up a way to reward himself when the desired task is completed. In other words, it involves a 3 step procedure:

1. Restate the behavior (or task to be accomplished) in terms of goals
2. Develop a feasible plan for its accomplishment

3. Establish a self-reinforcement schedule. That is, a way the student can reward himself for completing the task and reaching his goal.

B. Procedure

Immediately following the student's response to the last question on the interview protocol, say:

"From all we know about dealing with procrastination problems, the most effective solution is a three-step procedure. First, it is important to set a very specific goal. The second step is to decide exactly when you are going to do the work and, finally, the third step is to build in some ways of assuring that you get the work done. I want to apply this to the situation you have described. You have already accomplished the first step (supply specific goal here based on response to question #11 on the protocol). Now when and how could you accomplish the goal?" (Help the student formulate an action plan).

When the action plan and deadline have been set, talk with the student about ways of reinforcing himself for completing his plan.

An important point to remember when helping the student develop an action plan to accomplish the desired behavior and goal is that the plan you develop together must be realistic and easily done within a relatively short period of time (1 week). It is important to stack the cards in favor of success. It may be that only part of the student's desired task (goal) can be specified and planned (For example, the student may be looking for a job for next year and can't get started. Starting the process such as initially writing letters and making initial contacts might be an appropriate goal to plan and reward). If the desired goal can be planned for within a relatively short period of time like a week- then do it. You'll have to use your judgement.
C. Termination

After the student's action plan and reward have been discussed, summarize the procedure as follows by saying:

"So here's what I want you to do: 1) set a specific goal, 2) make a definite plan of action and, 3) build in some ways of assuring that you will get your task done. Everything I know about solving procrastination problems such as yours convinces me that if you follow through on the plan you have outlined, you will get your task accomplished." (Instead of using words "your task", you should substitute to actual task you have been discussing with the student?).

Terminate the interview by the following:

"Well it looks like our time is up. Use this three step procedure and your procrastination will lessen. Now if you will return to the other room, Mr. Bertner has some forms for you to fill out."
INTERVIEW OUTLINE

I. Introduction
   A. Have the tape recorder on.
   B. Meet the student at the office door.
   C. In order to establish initial rapport smile, extend your hand to shake, and establish eye contact.
   D. Introduce yourself by saying: "I'm pleased to meet you________ (student's first name), I'm________(introduce yourself by first and last name).
   E. Lead the student into the office and indicate where he can sit. Make a friendly comment or two so as to put the student at ease (e.g., Glad to see you, appreciate your coming here today, etc.) Explain to the student that the interview will be taped as part of the research. At the same time emphasize that the interview is strictly confidential and will be heard only by authorized project staff.

II. Interview
   A. Introduce the interview by saying:

   "I appreciate your willingness to meet with me today. As you know, the staff of this project are interested in the hard time some students seem to have in getting started on assignments and other tasks. My role is to try to understand how you feel about this problem. Perhaps I'll be able to share some of my own experiences as we go along. Can you tell me some of the kinds of things you put off?"

   B. To help establish and keep a comfortable flow of conversation between you and the student you can ask the student various open-ended questions. It will be up to you to decide whether you need to ask such questions. But having a few questions in mind is often helpful at silent or especially uncomfortable moments.
during the initial stages of an interview. Below are a few possible questions to use during the interview:

1. How long have you been putting........off?

2. What kinds of things do you do instead of completing this task?

3. Do you finally do the things you put off?

4. How do you feel when you know you have something to do but don't get it done?

5. Do your family and friends pressure you to get things done?

6. What kinds of things have you tried to do to get over your habit of putting things off?

C. If it seems like it is very hard for the student to talk about himself and his difficulty with procrastination, let him know that you understand and would feel similar. For example:

"I know that it might be difficult to talk with someone like me about putting things off— I felt the same way the first time I was in a similar situation".

D. Make clear your understanding of the student's feelings and concern about procrastination. This can be done by listening extremely carefully, by attending and being responsive to the student, and by reflecting (repeating and paraphrasing) many of the ideas or feelings the student is expressing. In addition, briefly summarize occasionally what the student has been saying so as to let him know that you are following and understanding his ideas and feelings.

E. Sharing similar likes and dislikes is the most important tool you have to quickly establish a counseling relationship with each student. The importance of telling the student some of the
things the two of you share in common whether that be experiences, feelings, attitudes, or values cannot be overemphasized. To insure this, it is requested that you make about 4 or 5 positive similarity, self-revealing statements during the interview.

This might seem a little gimmicky at first, but please keep in mind that you are interested in facilitating a counseling relationship during a short period of time. Using positive similarity statements will encourage the student to identify with you and thereby affect the overall counseling process and eventual outcome. This may be done by expressing that you feel the same way, have done similar things, etc. (for example, "I've done that too", "I know how that feels", etc.)

F. In order to maintain a friendly atmosphere, it is suggested that you avoid using psychological explanations and terms. Psychological words and explanations of problems often distance people from each other. Try to keep the student involved in discussing his own experiences as well as listening to the experiences, feelings, and ideas you share about yourself.

G. After discussing the student's difficulty with procrastination for about 20 minutes, end that part of the interview by saying:

"I think I have a good understanding now of the difficulties you have had. Can you tell me what is the most important thing you are putting off right now?"

At this point, you want to help the student and suggest a way of tackling his difficulty with procrastination.

III. Helping Sequence and Termination

A very short and concrete approach can be spelled out for the
student which has been shown in the past to be successful with
procrastination. This approach to problems with procrastination
involves stating the behavior desired to be accomplished in terms
of goals, establishing a plan for its accomplishment, and in order
to insure success, establishing a plan for self-reinforcement or
reward. In other words it involves a three step procedure:
1. Restate behavior (or task to be accomplished) in terms of
goals
2. Develop a feasible plan for its accomplishment
3. Establish a self-reinforcement schedule. That is, a way the
student can reward himself for completing the task and reaching
his goal.
You must remember to encourage the student to design an action
plan that is realistic and easily accomplished within a relatively
short period of time (e.g., 1 week). It is important to stack the
cards in favor of success. It may be that only part of the student's
desired goal (task) can be specified and planned (e.g., the
student may be looking for a job for next year and can't get started.
Starting the process such as initially writing letters and making
initial contacts might be an appropriate goal to plan and reward).
If the desired goal can be planned for within a relatively short
period of time like a week—then do it. You'll have to use your judge-
ment.
A. Immediately following the student's response to your question
about the most important thing he is putting off right now, say:
"Maybe it would be helpful if I told you how I handled a similar
situation."
(At this point you want to model the action plan procedure for
procrastination outlined above. Using yourself as an example is the
best way to help the student learn such an approach. You may use the following example or think of an example on your own)

"I had a big Spanish test which I could not get down to deal with. So I decided that I needed to do something. I had 5 days to study 300 vocabulary words. So I made a plan that I would study 60 words a night. I love to watch late night TV. So I made a deal with myself that unless I got the words studied I could not watch TV. It was hard. But, I was able to do it. I studied 60 words a night, watched TV, and did OK on my test."

Return to the student's situation and say:

"In your situation the first thing I would do is be very specific about what it is that needed to be done. In your case that would be ______________________ (supply goal from student's response to your question about what is the most important thing he is putting off right now). Then I would decide exactly how and when I could get it done (ask the student to set up a plan including a time schedule for accomplishing his goal). The final thing I would do is think of some ways of insuring that I follow my plan (ask the student to think of some of the things he could use as self-rewards. Give some example of somethings that you find rewarding)."

End the interview with the following:

"Well it looks like our time is up. I've enjoyed talking with you and hope that you found this helpful. I guess Mr. Bertner has some forms he wants you to fill out."

Thank the student again and show him to the other room.
APPENDIX G

Rating Scale Used by Objective Observers
RATING SCALE

Name ________________________
(person being rated)
Rater _________________________
Date _________________________
Interview Segment (circle)
Introduction
Bulk of Interview
Helping Sequence and Termination

Friendly

1  2  3  4  5
very  very
unfriendly friendly

Likeable

1  2  3  4  5
very  very
unlikeable likeable

Organized

1  2  3  4  5
very  very
unorganized organized

Attentive

1  2  3  4  5
very  very
unattentive attentive
Knowledgeable

1 2 3 4 5
very unknowledgeable
very knowledgeable

Similar

1 2 3 4 5
very dissimilar
very similar

Professional

1 2 3 4 5
very unprofessional
very professional

Knowledgeable (due to similar experiences)

1 2 3 4 5
very unknowledgeable
very knowledgeable

Understanding

1 2 3 4 5
not very understanding
very understanding
3. **Confident**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not very confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expert (really knows what he is talking about)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very inexpert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong> (person being rated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rater</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Segment (circle)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulk of Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helping Sequence and Termination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Friendly

- **Very unfriendly**

#### Likeable

- **Very unlikeable**

#### Organized

- **Very unorganized**

#### Attentive

- **Very unattentive**
2.

**Knowledgeable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unknowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Similar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very dissimilar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unprofessional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knowledgeable (due to similar experiences)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very unknowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not very understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Confident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not very confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very confident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expert (really knows what he is talking about)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very inexpert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Interview Protocol
Interview Protocol

1. What is the most recent example you can remember of putting something off? (Inquire about specifics here)

2. How long did you put (have you been putting) this off?

3. What kinds of things did (do) you do instead of completing this task?

*** From talking with other students who have difficulty with procrastination, I have found that other students do similar things.

4. Did you finally get it done? How (or why)?

5. Has the same thing happened before? How often? (be specific)

6. What other kinds of things do you put off? (explore thoroughly)
   a. school
   b. home
   c. personal or social life
   d. family

7. Do you do similar things in all these situations? How are they similar (or different)?
8. How do you feel when you know you have something to do but don't get it done?

9. What have you identified as the reasons for your procrastination?

10. What kinds of things have you tried to do in an attempt to avoid these difficulties?

***It is not unusual for people to struggle with the problem of putting things off and yet not be able to change. I have found that global attempts that people try on their own do not work. Several studies have shown that procrastination can be overcome by a specific and structured approach. A recent study demonstrated an 80% success rate with students who have had difficulty with putting things off.

11. What is the most important thing you are putting off right now? (Be specific here, e.g., the number of pages of reading that need to be done)

**(Proceed immediately to the Helping Sequence. After the student responds to question #11 say the following as much from memory as possible)

"From all we know about dealing with procrastination problems, the most effective solution is a three-step procedure. First, it is important to set a very specific goal. The second step is to decide exactly when you are going to do the work. And finally, the third step is to build in some ways of assuring that you get the work done. I want to apply this to the situation you have described. You have already accomplished the first step (supply specific goal here based on student's response to question #11) How now and when could you accomplish the goal?" (Help the student formulate an action plan)

**(After the student's action plan (goal, plan, and reward) has been discussed, summarize the procedure as follows:)

"So here's what I want you to do: 1) set a specific goal, 2) make a definite plan of action and, 3) build in some ways of assuring that you will get the task done. Everything I know about solving procrastination
problems such as yours convinces me that if you follow through on
the plan you have outlined, you will get
done." (Substitute in student's goal)

Terminate Interview
APPENDIX I

Request for Helpee Participation
Request for Participation

A study concerning the problem of procrastination; that is, putting things off is currently in progress.

Procrastination is a problem common among college students and it is probably safe to say that everyone sitting here in this room has had some difficulty at one time or another in getting started on assignments or projects, in studying for exams, or in meeting deadlines.

In order to learn more about the problems students have with procrastination and to develop even more effective ways than we have now with working with students concerned with their tendency to put things off, we have undertaken the present project.

As previously mentioned, procrastination is a common source of trouble and most all students probably have some difficulty with procrastination although it may vary in degree. We are looking for volunteers (male students) who would be willing to talk about their procrastination. Enough is already known that we would expect those of you who volunteer for this project will receive some personal benefit with your procrastination difficulties as a result of your participation.

If you volunteer, you will 1) have a 30 minute interview with one of our interviewers and 2) complete some short questionnaires regarding the interview. If you are interested, upon completion of the project we would be willing to talk with you about our findings.

Once again—we believe volunteers can receive valuable assistance in dealing with their procrastination by participating in this
study. Two credit hours of psychology 100 experimental credit will be available for participants.
APPENDIX J

Helpee Questionnaire
Procrastination Study

The purpose of this project is to talk with students about their problem with procrastination. Procrastination is a common concern among students. By talking with students like yourself we hope to learn more about individual students concerns about procrastination as well as develop effective ways for students to deal with it. We anticipate that the majority of volunteer students will receive some personal benefit as a result of their participation in this study.

Name:_____________________________________
Address:__________________________________
Telephone:______________________________
Age:_____________________________________
College Year:____________________________
Major:__________________________________

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thur</th>
<th>Fri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How serious would you rate your problem with procrastination?

1 2 3 4 5
slight moderate severe

2. Who of the following would you say see you as a procrastinator?

Yourself_____ Teachers_____  
Family_____ Roommates_____  
Friends_____ Girlfriend_____  

3. Have you ever spoken with anyone (family, friends, counselor, teacher, etc.) about your procrastination?

Yes_____ No_____  

4. If you have spoken with anyone, did you find this helpful?

Yes_____ No_____  

As mentioned, we will call you within the next five or six weeks with an appointment to come in and talk with one of our project staff members.
APPENDIX K

Squiggles Task Administration Procedure
Instructions

This is a gamelike task. We are interested in the way people verbally communicate geometric forms. Your job (Talk to person on the right [sender]) will be to describe the designs on cards like this one (show sample card to sender). Your job (talk to person on left [receiver]) will be to decide which design is being described to you. You will have a number of designs in front of you and you will be required to write down the number of the design being described. You will always have the correct design before you. This screen is up between the two of you so that you will not be able to see each other. After the sender is finished describing the design he is attempting to communicate, the receiver (turn to the receiver and say: that is you) may ask as many questions as you may want. You will only have one minute to communicate and decide on the design being communicated. Are there any questions?

***Turn tape recorder on and time how long it takes receiver to make a choice about the design being sent. If one minute is up write down one minute and ask subjects to move on to next design. When finished with first series (9 designs), ask subjects to switch places and say: Now, the receiver will be the sender and the sender will be the receiver. Once again, you'll have one minute to describe and decide upon the design being communicated.

***Take a different series and begin the task as before.

***Make sure series is correct and whether sender/receiver is counselor/counselee.

***When squiggles task is finished say to counselor:
You can return to your office now... thank you.

***Wait for the counselor to leave the room and tell the counselee that it will be a few minutes... I'll come in to show the counselee to the other office.

Post Interview Squiggles

***After the interview the counselee is directed back to the room to fill out a questionnaire. After the counselee finishes, please have him wait. I'll go and get the counselor and bring him back to the room for another round of the squiggles. This time go on to use the series designated to be used the third and fourth time... repeat as above.
APPENDIX L

Means and Standard Deviations of Helpees' Ratings on Interview Questionnaire
Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations of Helpees' Ratings on Interview Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.37b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.44b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.44b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.68c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.83c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.54b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.61b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>7.46b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.11b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.33b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.23b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>5.38b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.34b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.48b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.68b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>6.60b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>11.56b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.89b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.01b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.15b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.05b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aNumbers correspondence to numbered items found in Interview Questionnaire

b_p < .01

c_p < .05
APPENDIX M

Item Correlation
### Table 16

**Item Correlation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 16 (Continued)

**Item Correlation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

Additional Tables
Table 17

Mean Number of Words Used by Sender\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>66.64</td>
<td>48.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>62.14</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Standard error computed from Table 8.
Table 18

Mean Number of Words Used by Receiver\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Standard error computed from Table 10.
Table 19

Mean Number of Interruptions during Communication Task$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpee</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Standard error computed from Table 12.
APPENDIX O

Instructions for Neutral Subjects
Instructions

You will be listening to a tape of two men talking. One is describing geometric forms to the other. Your task will be to listen to them and decide upon which design is being described. You will hear twelve descriptions. Choose the design being described from among the thirty-six designs in front of you. Some of the designs may be repeated. Write down the number of the design being described on the sheet provided.
APPENDIX P

List of Items Differentiating 
Expert and Referent Helpers
Questionnaire Items that were significantly different for expert and referent helpers on Interview Questionnaire.

1. The interviewer seemed to look at things in a way similar to me.
2. The amount of experience and training the interviewer had did not matter to me during the interview.
3. The interviewer seemed to be a person I would like as a friend.
5. The interviewer's behavior during the interview seemed to reflect extensive training and knowledge.
12. The interviewer seemed to like me.
13. The interviewer was very structured and followed a plan during the interview.
16. Most of the knowledge the interviewer seemed to have during the interview came from his own personal experience.
17. I have a great deal in common with the interviewer.
18. The interviewer really understood my ideas and feelings.
20. Most of the knowledge the interviewer shared during the interview came from his training as an interviewer.
24. The interviewer seemed to agree with most of what I said during the interview.
25. The interviewer had a good understanding of my personal experiences.
27. The interviewer seemed to enjoy the time he spent with me during the interview.
29. The interviewer was quite open and shared his personal experiences.
31. ...the degree to which your interviewer has experiences, attitudes, and/or values that are similar to yours.
32. ...the degree to which your interviewer is knowledgeable about solving procrastination problems due to his own personal experiences.
33. ...the degree to which your interviewer is knowledgeable about procrastination problems due to his training and specialized experiences as an interviewer.
34. ...the degree to which your interviewer is likeable.
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