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CHAPTER I

Statement of the Problem

It is generally recognized that supervision is of importance in the training of counselors (A.P.A., 1952; Lanning, 1971; Patterson, 1964). Many theoretical essays and writings have been published on this topic, but until ten years ago relatively few published articles on research involving the supervision of counselors-in-training were available (cf. Hansen & Warner, 1971; Hansen, Pound, & Petro, 1976; Lister, 1966). The present study was designed to contribute to this pool of empirical research by providing a detailed examination of the primary observable behavior of the supervisory relationship, the spoken language. Brief reviews of some of the currently available research on supervision and of the research concerning the form of language analysis used in this study follow.

RESEARCH ON SUPERVISION

There are now a significant number of recent studies on supervision. As Hansen et al. (1976) have noted, a good deal of the research which they reviewed involved the training and measurement of Truax and Carkhuff's (1967) core conditions of facilitative communication (e.g., Pierce & Schauble, 1970, 1971a, 1971b; Sunblad & Feinberg, 1972). In general, this line of research has been supportive of the theoretical
position that the level of facilitative conditions provided by a super-
visor is positively related to the level of these conditions which a counselor can then provide for his/her clients.

Another popular topic within supervisory research has been the comparison of various ratings of a counselor's performance. Unfortunately, when viewed as a group, the studies which involve ratings by various participants in the process of counselor training (i.e., supervisor, trainee, peer, client) do not provide the basis for overall comparisons because of widely varying subject populations and experimental conditions. For example, the evaluative criteria used range from the ratings of facilitative conditions mentioned above (Martin & Gazda, 1970) to one's "personal choice as a counselor" (Engle & Betz, 1971). Thus, this wide variability precludes any general conclusions based on comparisons of these studies.

These two areas of supervisory research are exemplary of the deduc-
tive style which is prominent among studies on supervision. In short, much of the published research is influenced by preconceptions of what "good" supervision entails or requires (e.g., facilitative conditions, didactic or experiential styles, etc.). For the present study, it was felt that a more inductive approach, focusing on the observable behavior of the supervisor and the trainee while temporarily laying aside one's theoretical views, might provide a fresh perspective on the relationship and on these theories. Hence, an intensive analysis of the style and structure of supervisors' and trainees' language was undertaken.
RESEARCH ON THE STYLE AND STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE

In the area of linguistic research, a model has evolved which provides for observation of human interaction through study of language used by participants during that interaction. Its proponents have suggested that individuals acting in concert or interacting in some way are able to do so because of their connected discourse via natural language (i.e., the means habitually used by the members of a human group to communicate with each other, either orally or in writing, in the conduct of their daily affairs) (Patton, Fuhriman, & Bieber, 1977; Pepinsky, 1974). It seems apparent that persons are able to make known to one another what is, did, or should take place, through conversation. Patton and Pepinsky (1971) and Pepinsky (in press) have referred to the exchange of signals in natural language as informative display. Like Fries (1952) these authors believe that the structural properties of a natural language contribute materially to this exchange of information among its users.

In line with the idea of informative display, Pepinsky (1974) and Patton, Fuhriman, and Bieber (1977) have discussed a model for conceptualizing how this process takes place during interactions between two persons. This model does not merely take into account the observables of face-to-face contact (i.e., audible and visible display); it also assumes that prior experiences and knowledge will influence what is and is not likely to be interpreted during the interaction as well as how things will be interpreted (see Figure 1). The model allows for changes to occur within the interaction at successive stages as a result of
Figure 1. Model of two-person interaction and change via natural language. (Adapted from Patton, Fuhriman, & Bieber, 1977; Pepinsky, 1974; Pepinsky, Baker, Matalon, May, & Staubus, 1977; and Rush, Pepinsky, Landry, Meara, Strong, Valley, & Young, 1974).
feedback. In consequence of the interaction, observable changes are predicted to occur in the relationship.

Research based on the above model has centered on the texts of language used during interactions (i.e., the words that are spoken) and on structural properties of that language. The mode of analysis, identified as the Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System (CALAS: Pepinsky, et al., 1977; Rush, et al., 1974), is based upon a form of case grammar (cf. Chafe, 1970; Cook, 1979) that features the grammatical clause as a unit of information. Within each clause, a verb phrase is postulated to act as an essential relator, assigning case roles to noun phrases and linking them to each other. The system assumes the structure of a language to have important implications for the interpretation and meaning of utterances.

Through recourse to CALAS, categories of verb types and other structural attributes of language, e.g., of its stylistic complexity (after Cook, 1979), have been used more specifically to study the relationship between counselor and client and to draw inferences about what transpires in this relationship over time. In an intensive analysis of the language used in first, eleventh, and twenty-fifth interviews of three counseling series (i.e., of three counselor-client dyads), Bieber (1978) found differences between counselors and clients in frequency and pattern of usage of several verb types. However, he also noted that there was a trend toward "tracking" (parallel changes in frequency of usage) or "convergence" (a decrease in the difference or a coming together in the frequency of usage) when the frequencies of certain verb types were recorded over time. Bieber (1978) also
inferred that differences in the frequency of usage of these verb types among the counselors corresponded to the differences in the stated theoretical positions of those counselors.

Meara, Shannon, and Pepinsky (1979) made use of CALAS to analyze the language from segments of counseling sessions shown in the film series *Three Approaches to Psychotherapy* (Shostrom, 1966). Their results showed significant differences among the three counselors in the film on several measures of language structure. They also discovered changes in these same structural measures from the middle to the end of individual interviews which indicated that the language of the counselors and the client frequently changed in the same direction (i.e., tracking) or even become more alike (i.e., convergence).

The authors of these two studies have drawn inferences about how changes in the structure of language during counseling and psychotherapy may be related to the conceptual presentation of the counselor. The empirical analysis of what was observed to occur in language utterances was the basis for their inferences.

**SUPERVISION: A SIGNIFICANT INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP**

There has been disagreement among some authors who wish to characterize the supervisory relationship as analogous to that of counselor and client, or student and teacher. Some authors have described the role of the supervisor with the trainee as having much in common with that of the counselor in a therapy relationship (Arbuckle, 1963; Althucher, 1967; Lanning, 1971). There are others, however, who view the supervisory relationship as primarily a didactic one which requires...
additional training for the supervisor beyond that which he/she re-
ceives for counseling or psychotherapy (Bookbinder, Fox, & Rosenthal,
1971). In either case the supervisory relationship seems to share a
common property with many human relationships in that one or both of
the participants are interacting to seek reduction of a discrepancy be-
tween what is perceived to be an "actual" state of affairs and one to
be "desired".

By assuming supervision to entail a significant interpersonal
relationship of this kind (Conant, 1977; Mueller & Kell, 1972; Pepinsky
& Patton, 1971), it seems feasible to observe supervisory interactions
in a search for whatever may be the indigenous characteristics of such
a relationship. Given limitations imposed by the state of the art,
however, the present study is necessarily exploratory. It was designed
to permit observation and analysis of the language spoken during super-
visory interactions. In the research, the texts of conversations
transcribed from actual sessions of three supervisory dyads were analy-
zied for structural and stylistic characteristics. As Meara (1976) put
it, the analysis in terms of case grammar allows judgment to be "based
upon conceptions of the English language itself rather than a priori
assumptions about what ought to happen" (p. 2). Analysis of this type
centers on text to the exclusion of other potentially valuable inform-
ation (e.g., tone, inflection, gesture, etc.). However, the avail-
ability of consistent rules and procedures for use in a computer-
assisted analysis for written or transcribed material does add to the
rapidity, accuracy, and reliability with which data can be analyzed
and interpreted (Pepinsky, in press).
In short, the primary purpose of this study was to identify structurally the characteristics of language used by trainees and their supervisors over several occasions of their supervisory relationship. An examination of the participants' ratings of each other's performance was included to identify and clarify any gross relationships between language structure and evaluative measures.
SUBJECTS

The trainees and their supervisors involved in this study were participants in the regular counseling practicum offered through the doctoral program in Counseling Psychology at The Ohio State University. This practicum is arranged such that counselors-in-training are directly observed by supervisors via video monitors during their sessions with self-referred clients. During the ten weeks of an academic quarter, each student enrolled in the practicum is typically observed by a separate individual supervisor for each of the two clients he/she is seeing. On the average of once a week, he/she meets alone with the supervisor to discuss the counseling that has occurred. An additional group meeting of all trainees and supervisors to discuss cases and issues relevant to counseling is also held once a week. Three trainees, two men and a woman, were selected for the present study. They were all graduate students within their first year of supervised counseling in the Counseling Psychology program. As a group, they reported minimal previous experience in supervision or in formal counseling with actual clients. However, all had completed the initial sequence of didactic courses and laboratory experiences in counseling skills offered through
the program.

Of the three supervisors taking part in this study, two were advanced graduate students and candidates for the doctoral degree in Counseling Psychology, while one was a university faculty member in the Department of Psychology with a doctoral degree. It was intended that a man and a woman in each of these categories of supervisors participate, thus providing two supervisors of each sex. Trainees were originally assigned to supervisors such that every combination of matching of supervisor and trainee by sex was to be included. Because several clients cancelled appointments, one supervisory pair consisting of a female faculty supervisor and a female trainee had to be dropped from the study. Hence, three dyads (i.e., Male-Female, Female-Male, Male-Male), composed of persons who had not previously taken part in individual supervision with their assigned partners, were used in this study.

PROCEDURE

Since the ten-week teaching period in an academic quarter is the typical length of time in which a practicum student is supervised by the same supervisor in the practicum offered by the doctoral program in Counseling Psychology, this was the period of observation selected for this study. Prior to significant individual contact between the members of any dyad about supervision, the experimenter met with each pair to explain what would be required of their participation and to obtain their verbal consent for this participation. At this time each trainee and supervisor was asked to complete a separate data sheet.
On the data sheets, supervisors and trainees were asked to provide information concerning their level of familiarity with their partners and the extent of their previous individual experiences in counseling and supervision, as well as other biographical information relevant to performance in counseling or supervision.

With the permission of each trainee and his/her supervisor, an introductory session, in which the trainee and supervisor typically discussed goals and procedures while they got better acquainted, and each individual supervisory session which followed a counseling interview were recorded on audio cassettes. This taping procedure was used to facilitate accurate selection of sessions to be analyzed and to control for differences between sessions attributable to demand characteristics from the tape recorder's presence.

Following the final supervisory session of the quarter, each trainee was asked to complete the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI: Barrett-Lennard, 1962), as an evaluation of his/her supervisor's behavior and attitude during supervision, the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS; Myrick & Kelly, 1971) regarding his/her own performance during the 10 weeks, and a brief data sheet. This data sheet requested information to verify the numbers of counseling and supervisory sessions held, the numbers of clients seen, and the number of sessions per client. At the same time, the supervisors were requested to complete the CERS for their trainee's performance, the supervisor's form of the BLRI regarding his/her own behavior and attitude with the trainee, and a similar data sheet.
Because of scheduling conflicts and cancellation of appointments, the length of time between supervisory sessions and the total number of counseling or supervisory sessions was not consistent for all pairs. In order to obtain measures at relatively equivalent points of the supervisory relationship for each dyad, however, the initial, a middle, and a final supervisory sessions following counseling interviews during the 10-week period were selected for language analysis. In cases where an even number of sessions were held, the latter of the two middle sessions was used. The sessions for getting acquainted referred to above were not used because of large differences among them in formality and length which could not be controlled.

In order to obtain a representative, yet sufficiently large, sample of the language in each session and to investigate possible differences in style at different points in the session (see Gurman, 1973), three 5-minute segments of the taped sessions were selected in the following manner. The first segment was timed with a stopwatch from the beginning of the first utterance on the tape. A second segment was timed for 5 minutes from the nearest natural pause in the speech of the person talking at a point roughly 2½ minutes prior to the midpoint of the session. A final segment of a session was similarly timed from the nearest natural pause in speech prior to the point 5 minutes before the end of speech on the tape. Where a timed segment ended in the middle of a person’s statement, timing was extended to the nearest natural pause in that person’s speech. Segments of this length
were chosen at these points so that: 1) enough speech was available from each participant to allow for stable measurement of the structural characteristics and 2) several non-overlapping segments which occurred at different points of the interview could be obtained. Hence, three segments of roughly 5 minutes in length from each of three sessions were selected for language analysis from the recordings of each dyad.

It is important to note here that all segments were within 5 seconds of 5 minutes in length and that no segment contained less than 80 words by either participant. For this fine-grained analysis with the dependent measures described below, this level of equivalence in segment length was felt sufficient for comparison. The length of individual supervisory sessions ranged from 25 minutes, 57 seconds to 74 minutes, 28 seconds with a mean of 40 minutes, 29 seconds.

Each segment was transcribed from the tape by the author and his transcriptions were checked by a research assistant for accuracy. The corrected transcripts were then keypunched in a verbatim fashion for submittal to the series of CALAS programs.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

There are three independent variables which are of interest in the primary analysis of this study. The first involves the comparison of supervisors as a group with trainees, or role. The remaining two involve considerations of time: 1) the three sessions of the entire period of observation and 2) the segments within these sessions.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Structure of Language. As described in the User's Manual (Pepinsky
et al., 1977), CALAS was used to assess the structure and style of the language used by the trainees and supervisors. The measures described below are derived with the aid of this set of computer programs for analyzing the texts of discourse in the English language. An initial subset of programs makes a word-for-word translation of a given text into its grammatical counterparts (e.g., noun, verb, adjective, adverb); a second subset of programs aggregates the individual terms into phrases (e.g., noun phrases, verb phrases, adverbial phrases, prepositional phrases); a third subset aggregates the phrases into clauses (e.g., main and subordinate); and a fourth subset identifies the phrases within a clause by giving them particular structural designations (e.g., as designations of verb types for verb phrases, or essential or peripheral cases for other phrases) and visually displays the level of embeddedness of clauses by indentation (see Appendix A). An additional phase of CALAS enables the user to count any language unit classified in any stage of the program.

At each of these phases of analysis, there is provision for human editing of the computer's output, a feature that increases the precision of identification at any of the succeeding phases and the accuracy of the frequency counts made.

From information provided by CALAS, eleven measures of the complexity of the surface structure of each language segment were calculated for use in this study (see Table 1). The first measure of complexity is what Cook (1975) identified as Average Block Length (ABL). In a given text, ABL is defined in terms of the total number of clauses divided by the total number of main clauses. This ratio offers a
"quantitative measure of style complexity" (Cook, 1975, p. 114) based on the clustering of subordinate clauses around a single main clause which forms an information block.

Additional ratio measures derive from assumptions about the properties of phrases within clauses. Following the rationale of a case grammar (after Cook, 1972a; 1972b; Rush et al., 1974), CALAS designates phrases other than the verb phrase into two categories: essential case noun phrases (i.e., noun phrases whose roles which are necessary for the interpretation of language are governed by the kind of verb found in the clause); and peripheral phrases (i.e., adverbial and prepositional phrases whose roles as modifiers and embellishers are not essential to interpretation and are not governed by the verb). Peripheral phrases may include noun phrases which are nested within them and are also in a sense independent of the verb. These designations are defined on the basis of the roles that these clause components serve (Rush et al., 1974) (see Appendix B).

The following measures were obtained with the assistance of CALAS in determining case and phrase designations. The first two, Average Essential Cases-Clause (AEC-C) and Average Essential Cases-Main Clause (AEC-M) were determined by totaling the essential cases which constitute noun phrases in an individual segment of language, and dividing the sum by the number of clauses and main clauses in that segment, respectively. The Average Peripheral Phrases-Clause (APP-C) and Average Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause (APP-M) measures were obtained by adding up the number of adverbial and prepositional phrases in a segment and again dividing by the number of clauses or main clauses in that segment.
Two combined measures of both essential and peripheral phrases, (AEC + PP-C) and (AEC + PP-M) were obtained by summing the corresponding numerators for the AEC and APP measures and again dividing by the number of clauses or main clauses. The assumption here is that the greater the number of essential case roles (which are necessary for interpretation) or peripheral phrases (which modify and embellish but are not essential for interpretation), or both, per language unit (i.e., clause or information block), the more structurally complex that segment is.

Another measure, Words Per Phrase (WPP: total number of words/total number of phrases), was included to explore a finer level of structural complexity within the phrase; and the total numbers of Words, Phrases and Clauses were used as simple quantitative measures to compare differences in the amount of talk uttered.

**Linguistic Style.** The remaining linguistic measures are related to the style of language used and focus on the relational characteristics of an individual's language apart from the structural ordering and amount of talk. As was mentioned above, in case grammar the verb phrase is recognized as the relator which assigns functional roles to the noun phrases of the clause in which it appears. According to Chafe (1970) and Cook (1972b) verbs can be classified by type, each of which characterizes the state or activity described in those verb phrases. In the present study verb phrases were typed by CALAS according to a modified version of the Chafe-Cook classification scheme which provides for identification of 15 verb types in English language texts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Block Length (ABL)</td>
<td>Number of clauses divided by number of main clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Essential Cases-Clause (AEC-C)</td>
<td>Number of essential cases (noun phrases) divided by number of clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Essential Cases-Main Clause (AEC-M)</td>
<td>Number of essential cases (noun phrases) divided by number of main clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Peripheral Phrases-Clause (APP-C)</td>
<td>Number of peripheral phrases (adverbs and prepositional phrases) divided by number of clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause (APP-M)</td>
<td>Number of peripheral phrases (adverbs and prepositional phrases) divided by number of main clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Essential Cases plus Peripheral Phrases-Clause (AEC+PP-C)</td>
<td>Number of essential cases and peripheral phrases divided by number of clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Essential Cases plus Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause (AEC+PP-M)</td>
<td>Number of essential cases and peripheral phrases divided by number of main clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Words per Phrase (WPP)</td>
<td>Number of words divided by number of phrases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**

Measures of Structural Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>Total number of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrases</td>
<td>Total number of phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses</td>
<td>Total number of clauses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(see Appendix B). The ratios of the frequency of the usage of each verb type divided by the total number of verbs within the samples of language were calculated as measures of the style of language used by the different participants at various points in time.

Evaluations of the Supervisor. The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) (Barrett-Lennard, 1962) was used to assess the level of facilitation offered by the supervisor within the supervisory relationship as perceived by the trainee and by the supervisor himself/herself. This 64-item survey allows the respondent to indicate his/her level of belief in the various statements on a 6-point scale [(+3) "strongly feel that it is true" to (-3) "strongly feel that it is not true"]). Barrett-Lennard's (1962) slight modification of Roger's (1957) therapeutic conditions led to the development of this instrument which yields a total score and four subscale scores indicating levels of: empathic understanding (E), regard (R), unconditional positive regard (U), and congruence (C). Gurman (1977) has reported the mean internal reliability coefficients across 14 studies as .74 or greater for subscales and total. He also noted that the mean coefficients for test-retest reliability of subscales and total across 10 studies were .80 or greater.

Evaluations of Trainee Performance. The Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) (Myrick & Kelly, 1971) was used to measure the perceived performance of trainees on supervision and counseling tasks. The 27 items on the CERS provide subscale scores for rated performance in the counseling situation and in the supervisory setting as well as a total score for evaluating performance in general. The evaluator ranks his/her agreement with certain statements regarding the trainee's
functioning on a 6-point scale [(+3) "strongly agree" to (-3) "strongly disagree"]. (See Appendix C). Initial reliability figures indicate a .95 coefficient for split-half reliability and a .94 coefficient for test-retest reliability over 4 weeks (Myrick & Kelly, 1971).

As Jones (1974) points out, the CERS has not been related to any outcome measure and should not be used as an actual criterion of counselor effectiveness. In the present study it was considered only as a basis for comparing evaluations by supervisors and trainees with their linguistic characteristics, not as an outcome measure.

DESIGN AND ANALYSES

For the investigation of language characteristics, a matrix was constructed of the intercorrelations among each of the 21 linguistic variables. The score for each variable was based on the average of the correlation coefficients for each of the 6 subjects.

A univariate analysis of variance was then carried out for each linguistic measure as a dependent variable. Role, session, and segment respectively were the independent variables considered in a 2 x 3 x 3 totally within-subjects design with dyads serving as the subject variable. The patterns discovered in the intercorrelation matrix were used to clarify interpretations of the results of the numerous univariate analyses and to explore configurations of values for individual dyads.

HYPOTHESES

Because this study was exploratory, the number of hypotheses advanced was limited. Based on evidence from previous studies on the language used by persons during counseling (Bieber, 1978; Bieber et al.,
1977; Meara et al., 1979), several predictions were made. First, tracking (i.e., changes in the same direction over time) and convergence (i.e., changes such that initial differences decrease over time) across sessions were expected in the comparison of supervisors and trainees on a number of structural and verb type measures. It was likewise expected that changes across segments within sessions would provide evidence for similar tracking and convergence within the session. The strategy of analysis described above was specifically selected to investigate these hypotheses.

It was anticipated that the patterns of change and the relationships among the measures of linguistic structure and style and the other evaluative measures would provide much useful information about these supervisors and trainees and their relationships. However, there were a number of equally believable and sometimes conflicting hypotheses in this regard which could not be distinguished on the basis of logic or previous research. Hence, a discussion of other patterns and characteristics of linguistic structure and style follows the clarification provided by empirical observation.
The intercorrelation matrix in Table 2 was developed by averaging the coefficients of the six individual 21 x 21 matrices (i.e., one for each subject) of the same form. This matrix was used to examine the data for meaningful groupings among these measures across all the subjects. Several such clusters were discovered.

The measures of quantity of talk (Clauses, Words, and Phrases) formed the first cluster based on their extremely high correlations with each other (\( r = .96 \) to .99) as well as their similar patterns of correlation with the other linguistic measures.

A second cluster of measures was found to include the four structural ratios based on the main clause and information block (ABL, AEC-M, APP-M, and AEC+PP-M). These variables were highly correlated with one another (\( r = .75 \) to .94) and as a group had similar moderate correlations with each of the measures of quantity. However, when these ratios were individually compared with those based on the clause or phrase, the correlation coefficients ranged from -.60 to .24, with the exception of the figure for the two measures involving the peripheral phrase (i.e., APP-C and APP-M: \( r = .50 \)). In short, the measures based on the main clause form a fairly distinct grouping among the structural measures.
Table 2

Intercorrelation Matrix Displaying Mean Coefficients for Linguistic Measures over 6 Subjects

| Measure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
|---------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. Clauses | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Words | .96 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Phrases | .98 | .99 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. ABL | .57 | .50 | .52 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. WPP | .10 | .25 | .15 | -.09 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. AEC-M | .52 | .48 | .51 | .91 | -.20 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. AEC-C | -.37 | -.29 | -.28 | -.60 | -.22 | -.23 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. APP-M | .43 | .44 | .43 | .85 | .18 | .75 | -.57 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. APP-C | -.11 | .03 | -.02 | -.02 | .50 | -.06 | -.07 | .50 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. AEC+PF-M | .50 | .49 | .50 | .94 | .00 | .93 | -.43 | .94 | .24 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. AEC+PP-C | -.33 | -.17 | -.20 | -.41 | .26 | -.19 | .60 | .02 | .75 | -.09 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. S | .02 | .11 | .11 | -.10 | .06 | .07 | .40 | -.13 | -.09 | -.03 | .19 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. SEC | -.01 | -.06 | -.05 | .06 | -.09 | .01 | -.10 | -.04 | -.17 | -.01 | -.20 | -.19 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| 14. SEA | -.07 | -.08 | -.07 | -.06 | .21 | -.12 | -.09 | -.12 | -.15 | -.13 | -.18 | -.07 | -.16 | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| 15. SB | -.07 | -.07 | -.07 | -.20 | -.26 | -.09 | .33 | -.34 | -.33 | -.23 | -.05 | .02 | -.02 | -.03 | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| 16. P | .07 | .06 | .06 | .01 | .05 | -.09 | .18 | .03 | -.04 | -.03 | -.15 | .14 | .00 | .40 | -.08 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 17. FE | -.31 | -.28 | -.27 | -.04 | .01 | .03 | .01 | .03 | .03 | .00 | .10 | .00 | -.27 | .09 | -.13 | -.15 | 1.00 | | | | |
| 18. A | .09 | .09 | .07 | .07 | .29 | -.08 | .36 | .31 | .51 | .13 | .17 | -.33 | -.46 | -.08 | -.32 | -.10 | -.08 | 1.00 | | |
| 20. AP | -.08 | -.13 | -.12 | -.02 | -.06 | .00 | -.07 | -.05 | -.05 | -.02 | .00 | -.38 | .03 | .50 | .10 | -.23 | -.12 | .01 | .25 | 1.00 | |
| 21. APE | .11 | .08 | .09 | .18 | -.09 | .20 | -.06 | .15 | .05 | .18 | .00 | -.18 | -.18 | -.01 | -.10 | -.14 | .04 | .12 | .11 | -.27 | 1.00 | |

Note. ABL = Average Block Length; WPP = Words Per Phrase; AEC-M = Average Essential Cases-Main Clause; AEC-C = Average Essential Cases-Clause; APP-M = Average Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause; APP-C = Average Peripheral Phrases-Clause; AEC+PF-M = Average Essential Cases plus Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause; AEC+PP-C = Average Essential Cases plus Peripheral Phrases-Clause; S = Stative Verbs/Total Verbs; SEC = Stative Experiencer Cognitive Verbs/Total Verbs; SEA = Stative Experiencer Affective/Total Verbs; SB = Stative Benefactive Verbs/Total Verbs; P = Process Verbs/Total Verbs; PE = Process Experiencer Verbs/Total Verbs; A = Agentive Verbs/Total Verbs; AE = Agentive Experiencer Verbs/Total Verbs; AP = Agentive Process Verbs/Total Verbs; APE = Agentive Process Experiencer Verbs/Total Verbs.
Among the measures of proportional usage of verb types there were no readily identifiable groups of variables. In fact, no single verb type related in positive or negative fashion at more than moderate levels ($r = -.50$ to $.51$) with any other linguistic variable; and no patterns of these moderate correlations were outstanding.

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE AND EXAMINATION OF MEANS

Several points concerning the procedure and thought behind the use of the 21 univariate analyses must be made prior to discussing the actual results. First, in order to achieve a more normal distribution of each of the structural ratios as dependent variables, an inverse transformation of all eight was performed prior to the analyses. Secondly, the danger of achieving spurious significant results by chance from the large number of individual analyses was recognized. Hence, emphasis was given to results that were similar for groups of dependent variables that were meaningfully related.

The design of the analyses of variance was chosen so that the interactions for role x session and role x segment, which were especially relevant to the hypotheses of tracking and convergence, could be examined statistically in addition to the role, session, and segment main effects. However, in light of the conservative nature of these significance tests (i.e., due to the small number of subjects) several trends are reported which did not reach traditional levels of statistical significance but which did appear consistently in comparisons of overall means and of the means for each individual dyad.

For the purposes of describing significant and non-significant
trends, tracking was defined as the condition in which all changes in the dependent variable from one unit (segment or session to the next) were in the same direction for the supervisor as for the trainee. (Note: This definition was also meant to include instances where neither member made any change from one unit to the next). Convergence was defined as a condition in which the difference between the supervisor and the trainee on a dependent variable is less at the last segment (or session) than the difference between the two at the first segment (or session).

Only 6 of the 21 analyses yielded main effects or first-order interactions that were statistically significant (Table 3). These effects and some non-significant trends which were consistent for all dyads are described in the following sections.

Overall Effects: Quantity of Talk. The analyses for the three measures of quantity provided the only statistically significant results for a meaningful cluster of variables. The role x session interactions for Clauses ($F = 35.91, p < .01$), Words ($F = 22.80, p < .01$), and Phrases ($F = 25.71, p < .01$) were all significant, but the similar shapes of the interactions (Figure 2) did not indicate tracking or convergence. In fact, the increase in the trainees' talk and corresponding decrease in the supervisors' talk particularly from the middle to ending segments resulted in a significant difference between the two by that final segment. This group of effects is especially important since no other consistent trends or statistically significant effects were observed for measures of quantity.
Table 3
Summary Table
of Six Analyses of Variance with Significant Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Clauses</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R x D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9882.57</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.69</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sg x D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>287.91</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156.52</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ss x D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144.57</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role x Session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1476.97</td>
<td>35.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R x Ss x D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.12</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role x Segment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3489.69</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg x Ss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101.99</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R x Sg x D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>779.52</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>AEC-C</th>
<th>AEC+PP-C</th>
<th>APE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0283</td>
<td>30.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R x D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sg x D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ss x D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role x Session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R x Ss x D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role x Segment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg x Ss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R x Sg x D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Parentheses indicate error term. D = Dyad; R = Role; Sg = Segment; Ss = Session; AEC-C = Average Essential Cases-Clause; AEC+PP-C = Average Essential Cases plus Peripheral Phrases-Clause; APE = Agentive Process Experiencer Verbs/Total Verbs.
* p .05. ** p .01.
Figure 2. Mean values of measures of quantity by session over time for supervisors and trainees.
Overall Effects: Structural Ratios. The single effect of statistical significance for these variables was the role main effect for AEC-C ($F = 30.97$, $p < .05$), with the supervisors being more complex on this variable than the trainees. However, non-significant but consistent trends for role also showing the supervisor as more complex than the trainee were apparent in the overall and dyadic means for the WPP, APP-M, and AEC+PP-C variables (Table 4). It is important to note that on no individual dependent variable was every trainee more structurally complex than his/her supervisor. In fact, there were only four out of the total of 24 individual comparisons (i.e., each of 3 dyads on 8 structural measures) of the trainees' and supervisors' total language where the trainee was more complex.

There were no statistically significant role x session or role x segment interactions for the structural ratios, and the cluster of structural measures based on the main clause did not as a group show similar trends of any sort. However, a non-significant trend of convergence by session was apparent for the APP-M variable alone; while the AEC-C and AEC+PP-C variables provided the only non-significant trends toward convergence by segments within session.

Overall Effects: Verb Types. The only statistically significant results among the measures of verb type were for the Agentive-Process Experiencer (APE) type. Although the role x session ($F = 7.11$, $p < .05$), role x segment ($F = 10.05$, $p < .05$), and segment x session ($F = 31.98$, $p < .01$) interactions were above traditional levels of statistical significance, no attempt has been made to attach interpretive significance to results which appear with a single, infrequently-used
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Clauses</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>WPP</th>
<th>AEC-M</th>
<th>AEC-C</th>
<th>APP-M</th>
<th>APP-C</th>
<th>AEC+PP-M</th>
<th>AEC+PP-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyad I</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>87.89</td>
<td>498.56</td>
<td>354.22</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>72.56</td>
<td>401.78</td>
<td>297.78</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad II</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>223.44</td>
<td>232.22</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>125.78</td>
<td>673.33</td>
<td>487.44</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad III</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>263.22</td>
<td>180.67</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>321.78</td>
<td>233.89</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>APE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad I</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad II</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad III</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Su = Supervisor; Tr = Trainee; ABL = Average Block Length; WPP = Words Per Phrase; AEC-M = Average Essential Cases-Main Clause; AEC-C = Average Essential Cases-Clause; APP-M = Average Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause; APP-C = Average Peripheral Phrases-Clause; AEC+PP-M = Average Essential Cases plus Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause; AEC+PP-C = Average Essential Cases plus Peripheral Phrases-Clause; S = Stative Verbs/Total Verbs; SEC = Stative Experiencer Cognitive Verbs/Total Verbs; SEA = Stative Experiencer Affective Verbs/Total Verbs; SB = Stative Benefactive Verbs/Total Verbs; P = Process Verbs/Total Verbs; PE = Process Experiencer Verbs/Total Verbs; A = Agentive Verbs/Total Verbs; AE = Agentive Experiencer Verbs/Total Verbs; APE = Agentive Process Experiencer Verbs/Total Verbs.
verb type and which are not consistent in form and direction for each dyad (Tables 4, 5, and 6).

Again, there were no groupings of non-significant trends for main effects or interactions. There was a trend of convergence for the Stative Experiencer Cognitive (SEC) verb type by segments across session for each dyad. Also, there was a non-significant tendency for the three supervisors to use a greater proportion of Stative Experiencer Affective (SEA) verbs than their trainees.

**Summary of Overall Effects.** First, in this sample, the group of trainees tended to increase their amount of talk by session over the relationship and the group of supervisors to decrease theirs such that by the last meeting the trainees were saying significantly more than the supervisors. Secondly, the supervisors' total talk tended to be more structurally complex than that of the trainees, although only significantly so on a few measures. Lastly, the supervisors tended to use more verbs relating to affective experience than did the trainees overall.

**DIFFERENCES AND PATTERNS AMONG DYADS**

In examining the results of the analyses and the tables of means for the different dependent variables, it became apparent that individual differences among dyads and their members were frequently more outstanding than most overall effects. In view of the impracticality and likely confusion involved in describing individual differences at all sampling points for 21 variables, the focus of observation here was on three groups of variables: 1) the three highly correlated
Table 5

Mean Values by Dyad and Role for Linguistic Measures

Showing Consistent Non-significant Trends

Over Time by Session within Relationship

APP-M*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Su</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Su</th>
<th>Tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyad I</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad II</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad III</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Su = Supervisor; Tr = Trainee; APP-M = Average Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause.

* indicates non-significant trend of convergence by session within relationship for each dyad.
Table 6
Mean Values by Dyad and Role for Linguistic Measures
Showing Consistent Non-significant Trends
Over Time by Segment within Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Dyad I</th>
<th>Dyad II</th>
<th>Dyad III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEC-C*</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEC+PP-C*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Su = Supervisor; Tr = Trainee; AEC-C = Average Essential Cases-Clause; AEC+PP-C = Average Essential Cases-Clause; SEC = Stative Experiencer Cognitive Verbs/Total Verbs.

* indicates non-significant trend of convergence by segment within sessions for each dyad.
measures of quantity of talk (Clauses, Words and Phrases); 2) the group of related structural measures based on the main clause (ABL, AEC-M, APP-M and AEC+PP-M); and 3) the four verb types whose average proportional use per segment was highest for each and every subject (Stative, S; Agentive Process, AP; Stative-Experiencer Cognitive, SEC; Agentive, A). These verb types were the only ones which made up 10 or more percent of each member's mean number of verbs per segment.

In accordance with the descriptive-exploratory nature of this study, the patterns of each of these variables for the members of each dyad at the nine sampling points were inspected.

**Quantity.** In terms of amount of talk, each of the three dyads had particular characteristics which stood out (Figure 3). For the first pair, there was an obvious tendency for the trainee and supervisor to change position within each session, such that the supervisor who was initially talking less than the trainee was saying more than the trainee in the latter segment or segments of a session. In the third session, the change took place from segment 1 to segment 2 but was reversed at segment 3. It is interesting to note, however, that during this latter part of the final session, the supervisor did initiate a change in the content of discussion by specifically requesting evaluative feedback from the trainee. It may be conjectured that otherwise the interactive pattern would have been maintained over the final session as well. In terms of tracking or convergence, the latter, as defined above, was evident within the last session only on these measure of quantity. Although there was a rough interactive
Figure 3. Measures of quantity of talk at each segment over time.
pattern for these measures of quantity, neither of the members of this dyad individually maintained a consistent pattern of change for each session.

Likewise, there was no consistent directional pattern of change within each session for either member of the second dyad. However, the most outstanding trait of this pair was the large discrepancy between supervisor and trainee in amount of talk at every sampling point. In fact, not only did the trainee and supervisor not change positions in terms of who was saying more at different points in the relationship, they did not, at any of the sampling points, come close to saying equal amounts. Additionally, the relative difference in amount of talk tended to increase from session to session as the trainee said more and more in succeeding sessions while the supervisor said less and less. In spite of these wide discrepancies, tracking was apparent in the first session and a small amount of convergence in the second session on these structural variables.

As in the first dyad, the members of Dyad 3 also changed positions with the supervisor becoming the more talkative member in later segments of each session. However, there was a difference between these pairs in that the supervisor of Dyad 3 did present the same directional patterns of change for every session regardless of the way the trainee changed in how much was said. The supervisor began each session saying very little and continued to increase the amount of talk markedly from segment to segment within that session. It is interesting to note that in spite of the supervisor's apparent consistency and the shifts in position of who was speaking more, each session
ended with the members closer in their amount of talk than at the beginning of the sessions (i.e., convergence).

**Structure.** The shapes of the figures for the same dyads over the nine points of measurement were roughly similar on these four variables (Figure 4). Hence, for the purpose of inductive description, some license has been taken such that individual deviations at single sampling points for any one variable were overlooked. In the following, the group of variables, as a whole, is referred to, unless otherwise noted. Again, there was no consistent pattern of change in direction which was apparent for either member of Dyad 1 for every session.

A complex interactive pattern was evident with the trainee and supervisor: 1) reversing positions in level of structural complexity during session 1 (i.e., Tr>Sup to Sup>Tr); 2) tracking each other over session 2 with the trainee consistently more complex; and 3) reversing positions during session 3 such that the trainee ends up speaking more complexly than the supervisor.

The supervisor of Dyad 2 did have a V-shaped pattern of change in structural complexity within every session regardless of the pattern of the trainee. While the trainee did have the same pattern of change (i.e., tracking was apparent) for the first two sessions, for the last session the complexity of the trainee's language changed in opposite ways from that of the supervisor's (i.e., inverted V-shaped). However, tracking or convergence (or both) was apparent for each of these structural measures within every session with one exception. Neither of these trends appeared within the last session for the APP-M measure.
Figure 4. Structural measures based on main clause at each segment over time.

Note. ABL = Average Block Length; AEC-M = Average Essential Cases-Main Clause; APP-M = Average Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause; AEC+PP-M = Average Essential Cases plus Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause.
Once more for the structural measures, the supervisor of the third pair had an obvious pattern of change which was roughly the same for each session. The supervisor consistently began each session very low in structural complexity and became much more complex over the latter segments. Supervisor 3 had, by far, the widest average range and most drastic change in complexity within sessions of the three supervisors. This pattern was maintained in spite of different, inconsistent changes in complexity within sessions on the part of the trainee. There was a consistent interactive pattern in each session with the trainee beginning the session speaking more complexly than the supervisor and the two members reversing positions by the second or third segment of every session. The only instances of tracking or convergence appeared within the first session on all these measures.

Verb Types. For the four verb types used in highest proportions overall, there were no obvious interactive patterns between members which were consistent within sessions for individual dyads or for specific verb types. (Figure 5). There was tracking or convergence for Dyad 1 within the last session on all four types, for Dyad 2 within the middle session on all four types, and for Dyad 3 within the last session for all by the AP type. However, the supervisor of Dyad 3 did provide the only examples of a consistent directional pattern of change within each session by an individual. The inverted V-shape of supervisor 3's usage of the S and SEC verbs over the segments of each session was the same regardless of how, or whether, the trainee's usage shifted.

Reflections About Dyadic Patterns. Although these configurations
Figure 5. Proportion of usage at each segment of Stative, Agentive Process, Stative Experiencer Cognitive, and Agentive verb types.
certainly display the kind of variability which precluded the observation of significant effects for the independent variables, the fact that some uniformity was found for individual supervisor lends itself to cautious interpretation. As was noted above, the supervisor of Dyad 1 showed no repeating configurations by session for any of the three types of measures. The supervisor of Dyad 2 showed a pattern of increase followed by decrease during the session for the structural measures only, while the supervisor of Dyad 3 showed definite patterns within sessions for each type of variable. Several pieces of biographical information for the supervisors suggest further meaning from these different levels of uniformity.

The supervisors of Dyads 1, 2, and 3 reported their personal amounts of experience as supervisors to be 3 months, 1½ years and 8 years, respectively. The ordering of these levels of experience does generally correspond to the degree of individual consistency in patterns shown by each supervisor. Also, the supervisor of Dyad 3 was the only one to denote a definite theoretical orientation in terms of his (her) own counseling. Supervisor 2 mentioned similarities to a few orientations while not selecting a dominant one, and Supervisor 1 reported no dominant orientation. In other words, the most experienced supervisor with an avowed theoretical orientation had consistent patterns within sessions for variables of quantity, structure and verb type; the second most experienced supervisor with a mixed orientation had consistent patterns for structural variables, and the least experienced supervisor with no declared orientation showed no consistent patterns within sessions at all.
In view of the fact that the present study provided data from three supervisors' contact with a single supervisee each, there are no grounds for any definitive statement regarding the above findings. However, it does make logical sense that the greater a supervisor's experience and the more willing he/she is to declare a personal theoretical orientation in counseling, the more consistent a style of supervision he/she would have developed. It is at least feasible that a consistent supervisory style might be reflected in a consistent pattern of linguistic style and structure.

THE EVALUATIVE MEASURES

The ratings of the counselors' performance by their particular supervisors and themselves (i.e., on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale, CERS) are displayed in Table 7 as are the ratings of the supervisors' performance by the members of the appropriate pair (i.e., on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, BLRI). The only consistent pattern of results by role involved the Congruence and Total scores of the BLRI. The trainees each rated their supervisor higher on these scores than the supervisors rated themselves.

Otherwise, the ratings are fraught with variations within and among roles and subjects. No patterns among ratings were evident, which clearly corresponded to patterns on the linguistic measures. However, the ratings on the BLRI for one dyad at least, raised the possibility of a relationship of the ratings to one group of linguistic characteristics.

In Figure 3 one of the features which stood out as most unique
Table 7

Ratings of Ss by Dyad and Role on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dyad I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dyad II</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dyad III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Co = Counseling Score; S = Supervision Score; R = Regard; E = Empathic Understanding; U = Unconditionality of Regard; C = Congruence; T = Total Score; Dif = Difference between Supervisor and Trainee Ratings.

<sup>a</sup> scores on the CERS for Trainees are self-ratings.

<sup>b</sup> scores on the BLRI for Supervisors are self-ratings.

<sup>c</sup> negative signs (-) in the Difference column indicate higher evaluation by the Trainee than the Supervisor.
was the continuous large discrepancy in amount of talk between the members of Dyad 2. While in normal conversation such complete and continual dominance of the speech by one member might be expected to lead to some difficulties in a relationship, the importance of reciprocal communication in supervision seems to magnify the practical significance of such an occurrence. The ratings on the BLRI by the trainee and supervisor of Dyad 2 suggest differences in perceptions of the relationship which may relate to this dissimilarity in amount of talk.

For example, as can be seen in Table 7, the supervisor of Dyad 2 provided self-ratings much lower than those of the other supervisors on the scales of Regard (-16) and Congruence (-3) and on the total score (18). In spite of these relatively low scores, Supervisor 2 did give self-ratings on Empathic Understanding (18) and Unconditionality of Regard (19) which were somewhat higher than the self-ratings of the other supervisors. Additionally, a subjective comment by Supervisor 2 on the BLRI sheet indicated that this supervisor believed certain issues concerning the supervisory relationship would need to be "processed" with the trainee were it to continue. In short, this supervisor appeared to have mixed feelings about the relationship in general and particularly about his/her own performance.

Equally significant is the fact that Trainee 2 did not at all share the lower perceptions of the supervisor's performance (i.e., trainee ratings: R = 22, C = 40, Total = 90). In short, Supervisor 2's distinct, mixed pattern of ratings, which includes the lowest
total BLRI score, happened to occur within a relationship in which he/she had far less talk in every segment than Trainee 2, the most talkative subject. Though with such limited correlated information it can only be speculated, the question is at least raised whether an individual's perceptions of the supervisory relationship and his/her performance is affected by the level of equivalence in amount of talk (i.e., opportunity for self-expression) given to both members.

DISCUSSION

This study has been an attempt to explore the language spoken during supervision in a new way by examining the structural and stylistic characteristics of that language. Focus on the linguistic behavior of a small number of supervisors and trainees was maintained to raise questions about supervision rather than to answer some which had already been hypothesized. Such an open-ended style of research forces one to look closely at what one observes but does not usually leave one with definite refutable conclusions. Additionally, one runs the risk of being selectively observant of certain events while overlooking others. Even with such caveats in mind, the venture can be worthwhile if one is presented with information that encourages further thought and research in an attempt to find out more about a particular topic.

In this discussion a few hypotheses are addressed initially. However, the remainder of this section is devoted to questions raised by the findings and possible areas of thought and research which may lead to further learning about supervision and more generally about
the use of language in interactions.

Initial Hypotheses. The anticipation of statistically significant tracking and convergence by sessions and by segments within sessions was not supported by this group of supervisory pairs on measures of quantity, structure or verb type. Non-significant trends toward tracking or convergence were evident within all dyads for a few individual variables (i.e., by session: APP-M; by segment: AEC-C, AEC+PP-C, SEC) and there were several instances of tracking and convergence within individual sessions for particular dyads noted above. However, with the lack of consistent trends for groups of related variables of quantity, structure or verb type, no meaningful interpretation of the individual cases in these terms was suggested by the data. The dyads did provide instances of convergence and tracking, but not such that one could draw meaningful inferences about supervisory relationships in general.

The Importance of Amount of Talk. One outcome of this study has been an implication that the sheer amount of talk by members of supervisory dyads may provide a key to understanding what transpires in other respects in supervision. Several of the more important findings involved the measures of quantity of speech.

First of all, the significant role x session interaction for these variables indicated that the trainees, as a group, said significantly more than the supervisors during the last session of the relationship. At face value, sense can be made of this finding with the expectations that the trainee would begin to take more of an active role in the planning and processing activities of supervision later
in the relationship. However, based on the evaluations by members of the individual dyads, one may ask whether differences between members in their amount of talk affect their perceptions of the relationship of their performance in it.

It is not clear how or even whether the degree of equivalence in amount of talk or the changes in who is speaking more at various points in the supervisory relationship relate to other events in supervision. But the awareness that certain changes or differences in amount of talk did exist at various times during some relationships led to a search for events that might correlate with those changes. The possibility of a link between amount of talk and other events suggests a large avenue for future research. For example, a simple study might be designed to examine further whether the discrepancy in amount of talk between members was related to their evaluative ratings. Dyads where the trainee spoke significantly more might be compared on the basis of members' ratings on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) with dyads in which the supervisor spoke more. With other variables sufficiently controlled, such a study might ultimately lead to discovering ways in which a supervisor might structure the exchange of talk to achieve optimal evaluations by both participants.

Numerous other possibilities exist for investigating the relationship between amount of talk and other non-language traits of a supervisory relationship. The point to be made here is that the simple measurement of how much is said during supervision may be an important factor in supervision.
"Styles" of Supervision. As has been noted, several forms of evaluative and demographic information were obtained from the subjects and were scrutinized along with the linguistic data for possible relationships. Differences within sessions among the three supervisors in the patterns of linguistic structure generally corresponded to 1) their level of experience in supervision and 2) their commitment to a definite theoretical orientation toward counseling. Hence, the possibility of a positive relationship of experience and orientation with consistency of language patterns provides warrant for the inference of "styles" or approaches to supervision which might indeed become more prominent with increasing experience.

Although Bieber (1978) has suggested a relationship between the structuring of language (i.e., especially in terms of usage of verb types) and the theoretical orientations of counselors, available research does not support the idea of a relationship between structural patterns of language and either the counselor's degree of experience or theoretical orientation. In light of this, two areas of future study are suggested. First of all, some form of comprehensive examination of the language of supervisors of a wider variety of levels of experience might initiate a better understanding of the relationship between experience and patterns of talk. Also, whether particular theoretical orientations do lead one to structure one's speech distinctively might be investigated by organized comparisons of the language of several groups of supervisors of different avowed theoretical orientations.
A more basic implication from this study is that since these factors may have effects which extend to the most objectively observed verbal behavior, any research into the supervisor’s behavior should be designed to take them into account as described or controlled variables.

**Final Comments.** Although studies of amount of talk may be practical, it is perhaps unrealistic to expect that research such as that discussed here involving the other structural and stylistic characteristics can easily be undertaken in large scale. The practical expenditures of time and money involved in using a system of analysis such as that of the present study presently prohibit its application to representative samples of language from large numbers of subjects. However, this is not to say that other small-N studies or single case studies would not be of value in the understanding of supervision as well as the language of human interaction. Advances in psychological knowledge can, and should, be made based on the accumulation of information from these types of studies which are frequently grounded in the most stringent and detailed forms of empirical observation.

In short, the generalizable knowledge about what happens in supervision is admittedly limited. While this study has not verified any new, broad-based information, it is hoped that it has contributed to the process of developing that knowledge by: 1) sharpening our awareness of factors which should be taken into account in future research; 2) by introducing a systematic manner of carefully observing the spoken language of individual supervisory pairs; and 3) by
simply raising questions that need to be answered.


Barrett-Lennard, G. T. The Relationship Inventory: Forms OS-M-64, OS-F-64, and MO-M-64 plus MO-F-64. Unpublished manuscript, University of New England (Australia), 1964.


APPENDIX A

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
The review of the literature presented here will include the following: 1) the rationale for performing research with a small number of subjects; 2) the history of research into the language of interaction, especially in psychotherapy; 3) a presentation of the conceptual development and operation of the Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System and a review of the research which has been carried out using the system; 4) a description of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) and its past use in studying supervision; and 5) a description of the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) and pertinent research concerning its use. It is hoped that a more detailed coverage of these areas will contribute to a fuller understanding of the conceptual development as well as the theoretical background of this study.

In view of the present author's findings that much of the current research on supervision is based on various theories or models of supervision and is not directly relevant to the type of linguistic observation engaged in here, an extensive description of the literature on supervision is not viewed as important to an understanding of the development and context of the present study. However, since this study does attempt an initial investigation of the relationship between linguistic style and structure and several independent measures of the supervisory relationship and of the performance of the supervisor and trainee, the later sections of this review will include specific references to the use of these measures in supervision. (Note: Interested readers are referred to the most recent reviews of research on supervision by Hansen and Warner [1971] and Hansen, Pound,
and Petro [1976].

THE CASE FOR SMALL-\textsc{n} RESEARCH

A number of authors have recently expressed their concern that research in psychology may be in danger of being controlled by methodological procedures, most notably the significance test, rather than by its function in the pursuit of new knowledge. Cronbach (1975), for example, has noted that when the emphasis on hypothesis testing has increased, there has been a corresponding decrease in the emphasis placed on rigorous observation. Hence, he calls for a renewal of "intensive local observation" that "goes beyond discipline to an open-eyed, open-minded appreciation of the surprises nature deposits in the investigative net" (Cronbach, 1975; p. 125).

Besides the significance test, many modern researchers have focused on basing their findings on studies involving as many subjects as possible. In fact, three national conferences on research in psychotherapy were held from 1957 to 1966 to consider the design of large-scale research projects of a collaborative nature (Bergin & Strupp, 1970). In a paper conveying the opinions of an investigative committee regarding the feasibility of such mass research projects, Bergin and Strupp (1970) concluded that such large-scale studies were not feasible enough to justify the costs in manpower and financial expenditures. One of their suggestions was that the experimental case study and the experimental analogue might be the primary strategies for understanding mechanisms of change at least within psychotherapy.
In short, these authors imply that there is much to be gained by the careful observation of either experimentally arranged or naturally occurring events which can be done most practically with a limited number of such events. Hence, it is important to note that the small-\(n\) study has much to offer in terms of enhancing observation and contributing to the isolation of factors which are important to understanding mechanisms of human behavior and interaction (Leitenberg, 1973). As Dukes (1965) has stated concerning the \(n = 1\) design, in the history of psychological research case studies have served to clarify questions, define variables, and indicate approaches.

It has been noted earlier that much research on supervision has been derived at least in part from specific theories of supervision. The present study is seen as an appropriate attempt to "isolate psychological principles embedded in, and often obscured by divergent theoretical formulations" (Bergin & Strupp, 1970; p. 22). The small-\(n\) format seems to mesh well with this goal as well as with the practical characteristics and techniques offered by the program of language analysis exemplified in this study.

STUDIES OF LANGUAGE IN PSYCHOTHERAPY AND SUPERVISION

Since much of the research involving the language of two-person interactions is related to the psychotherapy relationship or the diagnostic interview and little of this type is based on the supervisory relationship, much of what follows will necessarily derive from the perspective of the former. Several approaches to the study of language in psychotherapy are found in the psychological literature. Frequently
the verbal output of counselor, client, or both has been analyzed for certain content-based characteristics related to a theoretical variable or concept of interest (e.g., Kiesler, 1973; Marsden, 1971). More recently a number of researchers espousing learning theory have focused on the systematic manipulation of counselors’ verbal behavior to achieve specific client responses (e.g., Barnabei, Cormier, & Nye, 1974; Crowley, 1970; Hackney, 1969; Kennedy & Zimmer, 1968). In these studies there is an unwritten assumption that communication between persons takes place via spoken language, but the focus was not on how or in what form this is observed to happen. These are some of the very questions which are of importance in the present study. The focus here is upon the observation of measures of linguistic style and structuring rather than on other semantic characteristics of content. A brief description of several studies which have led to this type of detailed, objective observation of language follows.

Some of the earliest research on characteristics of language which are quantifiable but not strictly based on content dates back to the work of Chappie (1939) and his interaction chronograph (Chappie, 1949). The interaction chronograph was an instrument designed to facilitate measurement of frequency and duration of utterances, pauses, etc. Since that time several series of research and a few devices for objective measurement of observed traits of language have been developed (see Wiens, Molde, Holman, & Matarazzo, 1966).

One of the most prolific programs of research of this type has been initiated by Matarazzo and his associates at the University of Oregon Medical School. Since 1954 this research group has published
numerous studies on the "non-content characteristics of interview speech behavior." They have used the interaction chronograph and the interaction recorder (Matarazzo, Saslow, & Matarazzo, 1956) to focus on factors such as frequency and duration of utterances, silences, and interruptions, primarily in information-seeking interviews of non-standardized content.

Several of the more significant general findings of this program of research are noted here:

1) Despite wide variability among individuals, individual speech and silence behaviors (i.e., frequencies and durations) are generally stable in psychiatric and clinically oriented employment interviews of free and controlled types (Matarazzo, Hess, & Saslow, 1962; Matarazzo, Wiens, & Saslow, 1965; Saslow & Matarazzo, 1959). Matarazzo, Wiens, Matarazzo, and Saslow (1968) reported that test-retest intervals of from 5 minutes to 8 months were used to confirm this stability.

2) There are negatively skewed frequency distributions for the following measures within interviews of the form of initial psychiatric interviews: time length of utterance (Matarazzo et al., 1962); length of silences (Matarazzo et al., 1965); and number of interruptions (Wiens, Saslow, & Matarazzo, 1966). These distributions roughly take the form of a mirror-image J-shape.

3) Interviewers have the ability to: a) influence the length of interviewees' utterances (Matarazzo, Weitman, Saslow, & Wiens, 1963; Matarazzo, Wiens, Saslow, Dunham, & Vous, 1964) and silences (Matarazzo & Wiens, 1967) by increasing or decreasing the duration of their own utterances and silences in the preferred direction; and b) decrease
the number of interviewees' interruptions by increasing their own response latency or number of interruptions (Wiens et al., 1966).

Although there is an indication of overall stability in some measures of frequency and duration of an individual's language, this third area of findings provides warrant for expecting individual differences in language within certain settings and in interaction with certain individuals. One particular study in this series by Saslow, Goodrich, and Stein (1956) points more directly to this specificity of language behavior to a particular interactional situation.

In this study the diagnostic interviews of a senior psychotherapist with 12 different patients were observed by a person trained in the operation of the portable interaction recorder, an instrument used to record tempo, activity, and other quantitative language data. Additionally, 7 conversations by this therapist with colleagues and supervisees on other topics were similarly observed for comparison. Results indicated that the therapist had a considerably wider range of variability in his linguistic interactional behavior than he utilized with his patients in diagnostic interviews. Sample interviews, for example, showed that in a 50-minute interview the therapist spoke 0.2 times as many words as an anxious patient (despite the fact that the therapist spoke 176 words per minute while the patient spoke 107-115 words per minute) and 2.72 times as many words as a supervisee-control in a supervisory session (Therapist spoke 203-218 words per minute; supervisee spoke 128-150 words per minute). The range of behavior in the control conversations in words per minute and other variables derived through the use of the interaction recorder was much greater than that
used with patients in a diagnostic interview. Thus, language characteristics at least on the basis of these comparisons of a small number of samples in the more structured interview setting and in other conversations do seem to show situational specificity.

In a complex study in which numerous characteristics of the language of psychotherapists and their patients were quantified, Lennard and Bernstein (1960) attempted a detailed examination of the language of the therapy relationship. Noting the advantages of observers over participants in psychotherapy in being able to study verbal interactions intensively and repeatedly, the authors undertook the study involving verbatim recordings of nearly a year's worth of therapy interviews from 8 therapy dyads (4 therapists with 2 patients each). The recordings were transcribed and keypunched after classification of various language segments within categories of quantity, informational specificity, grammatical form, affective content, interaction process, and role system reference. A number of questionnaires of various types were also administered to patients and therapists during the course of therapy. When the third, fifth, and seventh sessions were divided into 3 equal segments in order to compare within-session characteristics of individual interviews with those of the entire therapies, a number of similarities and differences were noted:

1) Within the session just as over the length of therapy, primary system communication (i.e., reference to the roles and process of therapy) was more frequent at the beginning than at the end for both patient and therapist.
2) The increase in affective communication by both therapist and patient over the entire length of therapy was reflected in a similar within-session increase from segment 1 to segment 2 only. The authors partially attributed this to the practical types of questions typically dealt with near the end of the session.

3) The informational specificity of therapist communication increased from segment 1 to segment 2 but did not continue to increase over the entire session, whereas this specificity continued to increase over the course of therapy.

4) In contrast to the lower rate of interaction (i.e., number of exchanges or changes in speaker) for later sessions in therapy, the middle phase of the individual session was lowest in rate.

5) While there was no systematic pattern of frequency of therapists' questions over the course of therapy, the third segment of the individual session showed a greater frequency of questions than either the first or second.

The results also showed distinct differences which remain constant throughout therapy between therapist (TH) and patient (P) verbal behavior on more formal, quantitative variables (e.g., P > TH in number of propositions per statement; P > TH in proportion of total output; P > TH in proportion of statements indicating a change of subject; TH > P in proportion of questions among propositions). However, with respect to "content" or qualitative variables (e.g., proportion of affective propositions, proportion of primary system propositions; proportion of evaluative propositions; proportion of prescriptive propositions) therapist and patient behavior was far less differentiated.
and less stable. Hence the authors stated:

On the basis of this and other findings available to us, there appears to be a trend toward symmetry when the therapy system is considered. Thus, while the roles of patient and therapist require differentiated activities, their continuous interaction tends to increase the similarity of their behavior. (Lennard & Bernstein, 1960; p. 86)

This general statement seems to allude to a number of behavioral differences based on the verbal behavior of therapist and patient which decrease with the contact provided by the relationship.

Although an extensive review of the literature on supervision was carried out by the author and several colleagues (Hurndon, Lent, & Taylor, 1979), only a single study was found which attempted a direct analysis of verbal behavior of supervisors and trainees in supervision. Wedeking and Scott (1976) compared judges ratings from audiotapes of supervisory and counseling sessions at the beginning and the end of a one-semester counseling practicum with 19 trainees. Measures of verbal content (Wittmer's [1971] Counselor Activity Profile categories), empathy, and trainee competencies were obtained in this fashion at these points of time. The results did indicate that trainees did show significantly more "informative" behavior in the first session of supervision than they did in the final session. Also over both sessions, trainees showed significantly more informative behavior in the first quarter of the session than in the others and significantly more "evaluative" verbal behavior in the final quarter of the session. Supervisors showed correspondingly more "listening" behavior in the early parts of the sessions. The results also showed little change in trainees' empathy regardless of their supervisors' empathy levels.
It is important to note that ratings of verbal content alone, not structure were the focus here.

In short, the research on the language of interaction within interviews provides mixed results. Apart from the several studies which are concerned with semantically-based variables derived from content, there is evidence that certain frequency variables less dependent on the meaning of content seem stable and consistent within individual or within role (e.g., therapist or patient). However, a number of studies reported that various language characteristics are subject to change based on differences in situation and in the point of time within the interaction at which they were measured.

A separate group of studies has approached the objective measurement of language characteristics of counselor and client using a system of analysis which involves both the surface structure (i.e., ordering) of language and its relational features. These will be discussed in detail following a description of that system which is identical to that of the present study.

LANGUAGE AS RULE-GOVERNED

According to Sapir (1970) there are some general characteristics which apply to all human languages. First, language is a system of phonetic symbols for the expression of communicable thought and feeling. Second, not only are all languages phonetic in character, they are also "phonemic." That is, language is not merely articulate sound. Rather, its significant structure is dependent upon the unconscious selection of a fixed number of sound units, phenomes. Speech (and written
language) thus becomes a "symbolic composition with limited material and units" (p. 17). Third, in all known languages, sound units are built up into distinct and arbitrary sequences which are easily recognized by the speakers as meaningful symbols of references. These arbitrary yet distinct sequences may be complete words such as "g" plus "o", yielding the sequence "go," or a significant element, like suffix "ness" of "goodness." Fourth, words are combined and integrated to form meaningful, continuous discourse. The formal procedure for combining words into meaningful discourse or sequences constitutes grammar, which may be defined as the "sum total of formal economies intuitively recognized by the speakers of a language" (Sapir, 1970). Except for the non-audible quality of its production, written language holds to the same qualities as the spoken word.

Additionally, Charles Catania (1972) offers a useful distinction between structural and functional analyses of language. The latter analysis involves investigating how languages come to be emitted (e.g., the conditions of occurrence of a particular language utterance) and what its consequences may be (e.g., increased frequency of the utterance, higher status for the individual who produced it, etc.). The structural analysis of language, however, focuses upon relations among the component parts of a language utterance, namely its internal organization (e.g., what parts of speech immediately precede or follow a preposition, or what relations exist between noun phrases and verb phrases in a sentence). Catania (1972) does not see these two modes of analysis as mutually exclusive, but rather as complementary in viewing language in relation to cognitive events.
Pepinsky (1974) noted that Catania's (1972) consideration of the analytic modes implies the rule-governed nature of language. Besides the meaning of language related by the lexical definition given language components as symbols, in his 1967 book Chomsky also referred to a second type of meaning. He also stated that "the intrinsic meaning of a sentence and its other grammatical properties are determined by rule, not by condition of use, linguistic context, frequency of parts, etc." The linguist Fries (1952) also believed that individuals signalled interpretable meaning to each other through the grammatical structuring of their messages (p. 430). In other words, meaning cannot be divorced from the rule-governed grammatical structure of a sentence. Consequently, a consideration of language in terms of the previously mentioned procedures called grammar, which generally indicate how words are combined into meaningful discourse, should lead to a clearer understanding of the meaningful structure of language segments and hence the rule-governed (structural) nature, or style, of the producer of that language.

CASE GRAMMAR

The language analysis system used in the present study involves a particular view of grammatical structure called case grammar. The following treatment of case grammar, as it concerns the present study, is different than Fillmore's (1969), but it builds upon his work with the modifications and conceptualizations of Chafe (1970) and Cook (1971, 1972a, 1972b). Case grammar essentially proposes that grammatical structure consists of a series of non-linearly ordered, case-marked
noun phrases associated with a verb phrase. The verb phrase is considered the pivotal word class in language analysis via case grammar (Chafe, 1970), and it is surrounded by noun phrases. The noun phrases exhibit certain relationships to the verb phrase and to each other and the remaining phrases in the sentence (Rush et al., 1974). Every noun phrase is a case candidate, and unless the noun phrase is embedded within another phrase, it performs a role or function within the clause and is given a case designation indicative of that role or function. Noun phrases whose roles are largely governed by the kind of verb phrase in the clause are given an essential case designation. Certain other noun phrases are nested within prepositional or adverbial phrases called peripheral phrases; and hence, their functions are not directly governed by the verb phrase as are essential case noun phrases.

Examples:

(a) The hunter killed the bear.

(b) In the villages the men worked for money.

In example (a) there are two essential cases and no peripheral phrases. The noun phrase the hunter takes on the case role of actor (agent), and the bear takes on the case role of the acted upon (object). Both of these case roles are primarily determined by the central verb phrase killed. In example (b) there are one essential case (the men) and two peripheral phrases (in the villages and for money). The peripheral phrases are not governed by the verb phrase (worked) as is the essential case phrase the men. Both of the peripheral phrases here have the nested noun phrases as objects of the prepositions (the villages and money). In the villages and for money add additional but
in some sense arbitrary information (i.e., in terms of the verb phrase) about location and reason for the action.

Chafe (1970) and Cook (1969; 1972b; 1978) have developed a classification system for verb types which is based on the different functions or roles designated by the verb for the noun phrases within a clause. By definition verb types categorize the state or activity described in verb phrases. The basic verb types are: Stative (S), Process (P), Action (A), and Action Process (AP). Again, the verb type provides for the assignments and numbers of case roles available for the noun phrases in the clause. The verb type/case frame matrix presented in Appendix B depicts the relationship between types of verb phrases and the case roles of noun phrases. For example, stative verbs are only used in defining a property of a person or thing; and so they take only objective cases in the basic case frame. A further explanation of the verb types currently available for classification and tallying through the assistance of the Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System will be presented in the accompanying glossary (see Appendix B).

THE COMPUTER-ASSISTED LANGUAGE ANALYSIS SYSTEM (CALAS)

Pepinsky (1974) noted that a natural language (i.e., spoken or written material as it is normally presented) can be arranged for analysis in terms of a metalanguage (i.e., a structural language designed to represent orderly arrangements of phenomena plus its implementing algorithm). The research program initially outlined by Pepinsky (1974) led to the development of CALAS (Rush et al., 1974) which is based on this case grammar view of language. The algorithms
for CALAS are based on the following postulates (Meara, Note 2):

1. The verb phrase is the central word class.

2. The verb has only one set of essential cases associated with it.

3. Verbs with the same set of essential cases belong to a single verb type.

4. Essential cases are assigned by the verb phrase to the noun phrases.

5. Peripheral cases (phrases) are independent of the particular verb phrase and of the set of essential cases a particular verb requires.

In its present form CALAS involves a series of programs written in SPITBOL and PL/I languages to be run on an IBM System/370 Model 168 computer. The processing currently performed by CALAS includes essentially four stages of operation applied to text written in English and entered into the computer as data via punched cards.

The first stage of the program, REMFALSE, allows for certain words or phrases which are marked by the keypuncher to be deleted from the data which are submitted to further analysis. This stage allows for the removal of certain textual matter which is considered non-essential to the meaning of the language and its clause structure in order to streamline the operation of the following subprograms. These deleted portions of text are printed out separately for tallying purposes.

The second stage of analysis, EYEBALL, uses a set of procedures to make grammatical class assignment for every word in the text. The assignment is made on the basis of a small dictionary of frequently used words primarily employed as "structural markers" to provide grammatical links to other words in the text. Remaining grammatical assignments are
made with reference to rules of position and context (Pepinsky, in press). EYEBALL also numbers the words within the sentence and the sentences within a language text.

Example of EYEBALL output:

1. IN THE WORLD OF WORDS, THE IMAGINATION IS ONE OF THE FORCES OF NATURE.  
   P D N P N D N V U P D N P N  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14  
   (P = preposition, D = determiner, V = verb, U = pronoun, and N = noun)

In the third stage of CALAS, PHRASER, the words already assigned grammatical (part of speech) classes are aggregated into phrases according to rules governed by the orderings in these grammatical case assignments. Phrases within a sentence are numbered at this stage.

Example of PHRASER output:

1. 2. 3. A. 5. 6.  
   1. |IN THE WORLD| OF WORDS, | THE IMAGINATION | IS | ONE | OF THE FORCES|  
   P P N V N P  
   7.  
   OF NATURE.  
   P  
   (P = prepositional phrase, N = noun phrase, and V = verb phrase)

The fourth stage of CALAS, CLAUSE AND CASE, makes use of programs designed to mark clause boundaries within a sentence. A clause by definition contains one and only one predicate (verb phrase) (Cook, 1969). At this stage verb types and particular case assignments are given according to the verb classifications (see Appendix B) spoken of earlier. Sentences are printed out in visual display form with phrases and clauses numbered.
Example of CLAUSE AND CASE output:

2. A01 THE BACKGROUNDS OBJ NOUN
   B02 THAT SUBORD
   03 WE AGT NOUN
   04 COME VERB
   05 FROM ADVERB
   A06 ARE S VERB
   07 DIFFERENT OBJ ADJ
   C08 WHICH SUBORD
   D09 I EXP NOUN
   D10 ALSO ADVERB
   D11 THINK SEC VERB
   C12 IS S VERB
   13 PRETTY GOOD. OBJ ADJ

(The right two columns indicate the further classification of verb phrases and essential case phrases, and the phrase classifications of all phrases respectively.)

The final stage of CALAS, TALLY allows for a frequency count of any language unit which has been given a label at any of the previous stages of the CALAS analysis. It should be noted that each of the first four stages of CALAS provides for human monitoring to check and correct the computer's output before any counts from TALLY are implemented.

LANGUAGE MEASURE DERIVATION

The Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System (CALAS) provides the mechanized means of classifying and counting certain types of language units. However, certain ratios of these units were also considered meaningful in observing an individual linguistic style. In this section I will describe the theoretical rationale behind these measures.
Besides the gross quantitative measures of structure (i.e., WORDS, PHRASES, CLAUSES) seven ratios using the total number of clauses or main clause as denominator have been considered as measures of the complexity of the surface structure of language. Their use is based on the argument that both are pivotal units of language. As was mentioned earlier, the clause is maintained by several linguistic authors (Bever, 1972; Pepinsky, 1974) as the primary unit of information in language. Bever (1972) tested this empirically by interrupting the flow of individuals' speech by simple clicks. In a series of studies done by him and his colleagues it was determined that (1) the reaction time to clicks was faster at clause boundaries; (2) that clicks are accurately located when they occur at clause boundaries; and (3) the structure of clauses was forgotten by subjects after a few clauses. The suggestion of these findings for Bever is that clauses are erased from short term memory after processing and stored in an abstract form. Hence, they are considered by him as the primary structural unit in humans' processing of language.

Cook (1975), however, has written of the work of the research team headed by Pepinsky (1974) in establishing the information block (i.e., a cluster of clauses which by definition is organized around a single main clause). He argues that the information block provides for a measure of structure which takes into consideration the differences between main clauses (i.e., single clauses which can stand alone as a complete, meaningful utterance) and dependent clauses (i.e., single clauses within a sentence which cannot stand alone as a complete, meaningful utterance). The information block serves as a meaningful
intermediate unit for understanding the processing of language interpre-
tation, since it is assumed that dependent or subordinate clauses
can only be interpreted completely "is the light of the main clause or
which they are dependent" (Cook, 1975, p. 109). Hence, the main clause
is considered the essential part of an information block which other
clauses serve to embellish or modify.

If it is hypothesized that information blocks are processed one
at a time, Cook (1975) has suggested that the average number of clauses
per information block (or main clause) is a valid measure of style
complexity. Thus the average amount of information in clauses which is
processed for each information block is indicated by the Average Block
Length (i.e., the number of clauses per main clause) of an utterance.

In line with the current transformational theory that a sentence
containing embedded clauses is processed one at a time beginning with
the lowest embedded clause (i.e., farthest in the string of clauses of
an information block from the main clause). Cook (1975) also developed
the idea of evaluating clauses from the perspective of depth of
embedding. However, since in previous studies (Hurndon, Pepinsky, &
Meara, 1979; Meara, Shannon, & Pepinsky, 1979) the Average Clause
Depth measure based on this line of thinking has been found to correlate
highly with Average Block Length and in the study by Hurndon et al.
(1979) to exhibit the same pattern of correlations with other language
measures, it was not included as a dependent measure.

As has been noted elsewhere, a case grammar view of language notes
essential case noun phrases and noun phrases within peripheral phrases.
Since the essential case is so closely determined by the verb phrase
and since different verb types allow for different numbers as well as types of essential cases, it was decided that a measure of the average number of essential cases per clause (i.e., Average Essential Cases-Clause, AEC-C) or main clause (i.e., Average Essential Cases-Main Clause, AEC-M) would be logical measures of language complexity.

Since peripheral phrases are in a sense independent of the verb phrase as prepositional phrases or single or multiple word adverbial (i.e., phrases functioning as non-essential modifiers of the essential case phrases and verb phrases in a clause), quantitative measures of the number of peripheral phrases per clause or per main clause were also chosen as measures of complexity. It was assumed that a measure of the average amount of these descriptive units used by a speaker is positively related to his/her stylistic complexity. Hence the Average Peripheral Phrases-Clause (APP-C) and Average Peripheral Phrases-Main Clause (APP-M) measures were used. As in the work by Hurndon, Pepinsky, and Meara (1979) the AEC and APP measures were summed to find out if an average total measure (AEC + PP-C and AEC + PP-M) was as useful as the two individual measures. Both the main clause and clause totals were used in deriving these average measures in the present study because there is currently no empirical evidence as to which is the more meaningful measure of overall complexity of linguistic style.

The final pure structural measure, number of Words Per Phrase (WPP) was introduced to detect a hypothesized finer level of complexity within the phrase. It was assumed that the greater the number of words used in a phrase the more complex was the language style at the phrase level.
The remaining measures are more clearly measures of relational style rather than complexity of surface structure and ordering. Within the present CALAS format, there are 15 verb types which have been developed from the 4 basic verb types described earlier (see Appendix B). In the context of the present study just as in Bieber's (1978) study which will be described in full later, the frequency of usage of these different types is considered a raw measure of style in language usage. In order to represent the differences in verb type usage in a meaningful way which provides continuous rather than categorical data, the ratio of the frequency of each verb type over the total number of verb phrases in a language segment was used as a measure of language style. As the definitions suggest, the usage of different verb types can provide meaningful information concerning an individual's manner of talking about life events as well as a possible indication of his/her perspective on those events.

RESEARCH USING CALAS

Several empirical studies have made use of the case grammar approach to language as operationalized by CALAS. Hurndon et al. (1979) examined the structural complexity of language used in 39 protocols of a Paragraph Completion Method of measuring conceptual level (CL). Their results indicated that measures of language quantity (i.e., numbers of words, phrases and clauses) accounted individually for a significant amount of the variance in composite CL scores (i.e., \( r = .73, .72, \) and \( .69 \) respectively). In several stepwise multiple regression analyses, Average Essential Cases (AEC), Average Peripheral Phrases
(APP), and Average Essential Cases Plus Peripheral Phrases (AEC + PP) were also found to contribute in small but statistically significant ways to the variance accounted for in composite CL scores.

McCarthy (1978) used CALAS to derive certain measures which she deemed characteristic of deferent language and compared the language of television interviewers of both sexes on these measures. Although the two female interviewers were not significantly different from the two male interviewers on these measures, individual interviewers did have different individual language patterns on these measures.

The majority of research using CALAS derives from the model of informative display in interaction (Patton, Fuhriman, & Bieber, 1977; Pepinsky, 1974) which has been applied to the counselor-client interaction. Bieber, Patton, and Fuhriman (1977) presented an analysis of the language used by a single counselor-client pair in their 1st, 11th, and 25th interviews. Results indicated a change from the 1st to the 25th interview in the percentage use of stative verbs (an increase) and agentive verbs (a decrease). Additionally, although the percentage of each verb type used by the counselor and client at any point in time was never identical, by the 11th interview there was a striking similarity in the direction taken by both parties in frequencies of usage of several verb types similar to a "tracking phenomenon" (Jaffe, 1964). The authors noted also some support for their hypothesis of similarity in relative use of verb types by the counselor and client at various points in time (i.e., linguistic "convergence" of Frank, 1961; Pepinsky & Karst, 1964). The use by the client of a significantly larger number of experiencer verbs in the final session than in the
other sessions was viewed as confirmation of the authors' expectation of a focus on the client's inner state due to the form of treatment used.

An expansion of this study's format to include two other counselor-client dyads was used by Bieber (1978) in his dissertation research. The language segments analyzed were the first fifteen minutes of the 1st, 11th, and 25th interviews of 2 client-centered (A and B) and 1 psychodynamic (C) counselors with their individual clients. Some of his major findings follow.

The three counselors used 8 of the 11 verb types in roughly similar proportions but differed in overall use of process verbs (C > A or B), stative verbs (A and B > C), and stative experiencer-cognitive verbs (C steadily increasing over the interviews with A and B remaining the same). The clients of these counselors showed overall high similarity in proportions of usage of all the verb types initially. But these early similarities later changed to diverging patterns of language use across interviews. The graphs displayed by Bieber (1978) of the percentage of use of verb types by members of each pair showed tracking or convergence between counselor and client over time on a great majority of the individual displays. In other words, even though the counselor and client may have used the dependent variables in significantly different proportions, the individual pairs frequently exhibited a paralleling in their language use, and in some cases even converged in the rates at which they used certain verb types.

In terms of the two-person model of interaction (Patton et al.; 1977; Pepinsky, 1974) Bieber (1978) interpreted his results as
indicating that counselors from different theoretical approaches display what they intend to communicate in their counseling approach at least partially by the stylistic patterning of their language. He also inferred that the tracking and convergence phenomena within pairs were indicative of concerted action between parties, regardless of the counselors' theoretical bias.

A recent study by Meara, Shannon, and Pepinsky (1979) made use of CALAS to compare the stylistic complexity of the language of counselors and client taken from the film series Three Approaches to Psychotherapy (Shostrum, 1966). The middle three minutes and final three minutes of interviews of the same female client with Albert Ellis, Carl Rogers, and Fritz Perls, were transcribed and submitted to CALAS. On measures of number of sentences (SEN), Average Sentence Length (ASL), Average Block Length (ABL), and Average Clause Depth (ACD), Ellis' language shows by far the highest values over both segments and hence the most complex style. Perls, however, did speak almost as many sentences as Ellis but in a much simpler style according to the other measures. The client's language also differed significantly across all counseling interviews on all four dependent measures: SEN (with Perls > with Rogers > with Ellis); ASL (with Rogers > with Ellis > with Perls); ABL (with Ellis > with Perls > with Rogers); and ACD (with Ellis > with Rogers > with Perls). In general she spoke more with Perls but in the simplest style, while her fewer sentences with Ellis were more stylistically complex.

The authors defined tracking and convergence by comparing values on each of the dependent measures for client and counselor at the two
different sampling times. Tracking was operationally defined to occur if a) client and counselor showed a significant change on a measure in the same direction from one time to the next, or b) if there was not a significant difference on the measure between client and counselor at both times. Convergence was said to occur if there was a significant difference between client and counselor at Time 1, and if by Time 2 there was a change in one or both participants' language such that the significant difference disappeared. Evidence for concerted action by tracking or convergence was noted between the client and Perls on all four measures, between the client and Rogers on all but the ABL measure, and between the client and Ellis on ABL only.

Meara et al. (1979) concluded that counselor differences in language structure do seem to match up with theoretical expectations, but they did not prematurely propose the generalizability of these results without further empirical testing. The client's post-interview comments were cited as indicative of the development of a relatively high level of common understanding with Perls and Rogers commensurate with that shown by their linguistic concerted action. The client statements also supported the inference that no such level of understanding had yet been reached with Ellis.

In general, the research in which CALAS has been applied provides a logical and technical basis for using patterns of linguistic style as meaningful but objective measures of human interaction in various contexts. The studies involving the therapy relationship suggest: a) that therapists may differ from one another in the patterning of the surface structure of their language and the frequency of usage of verb
types in ways that are consistent with their theoretical orientations; and b) that over time (i.e., within session or over several sessions) the language utterances of a therapist and his/her client frequently show tracking or convergence on some of these same measures as evidence of concerted action or common understanding. The present study was designed with the above findings in mind to extend the use of CALAS to the two-person interaction involved in the supervision of a counselor-in-training.

THE BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY (BLRI) AND SUPERVISION

As was noted earlier the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI; Barrett-Lennard, 1962) was originally designed to measuring "the client's experience of his therapist's responses" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; p. 2) in terms of the following therapeutic dimensions: Empathic Understanding (E), Congruence (C), Level of Regard (R), and Unconditionality of Regard (U). These dimensions or facilitative conditions are described below.

Empathic Understanding may be defined as the "active process of desiring to know the full present and changing awareness of another person..." (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; p. 3). Empathic understanding is concerned with experiencing the process and content of another person's awareness. Specifically, it includes sensing the here-and-now affective quality and intensity of another's experience in a particular context (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Rogers, 1957, 1959; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).
Congruence is the degree to which an individual is "functionally integrated in the context of his relationship with another, such that there is absence of conflict, or consistency between his total experience, his awareness, and his overt communication..." (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; p. 4). Congruence implies that the individual is freely open to awareness of his ongoing streams of experience and is not threatened but open to what the other person is communicating to him.

Level of regard and unconditionality of regard were formulated by Barrett-Lennard (1962) as two distinct components of unconditional positive regard, initially developed by Standal (1954) and, of course expanded upon by Rogers and his associates.

Level of regard refers to affective aspects of one person's response toward another. These aspects include various qualities and intensities of both positive and negative feelings. Positive emotions include "respect, liking, appreciation, affection, and any other affectively ambient responses" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; p. 4). Negative feelings would include emotions of dislike, contempt, impatience, and in general "affectively ambient responses" (p. 4). Level of regard may be more specifically considered "the composite 'loading' of all the distinguishable feeling reactions of one person toward another, positive and negative, on a single abstract dimension. The 'lower' extreme of this dimension represents maximum predominance and intensity of negative-type feeling, not merely a lack of positive feeling" (p. 4).

As opposed to level of regard, unconditionality of regard concerns the degree of variability of an individual's affective response to another. It is defined by Barrett-Lennard (1962) as "the degree of
constancy of regard felt by one person for another who communicates self-experiences to the first" (p. 4). The more a person's regard for another depends on the other person's attitudes, feelings, or experiences, the less unconditional it is.

In a comprehensive review of the evaluative research on the stability of the instrument, Gurman (1977) cited the mean internal reliability coefficients across 14 published and unpublished studies as: E, .84; R, .91; U, .74; C, .88; Total, .91. Gurman (1977) also noted that reports of test-retest reliability on 10 studies showed similar stability with mean test-retest correlations of: E, .83; R, .83; U, .80; C, .85; Total, .90. These individual studies showed high test-retest reliability over periods of time from 12 days (Barrett-Lennard, 1969) to 4-12 months (Kiesler, Mathew, & Klein, 1967).

Although there has been some controversy over whether the sub-scales of the BLRI are in fact tapping different dimensions of clients' experience, Gurman (1977) in his review of the empirical research wrote that "...these scales, while overlapping to some extent, are consistently measuring different dimensions of the patient's perception of the therapeutic relationship" (Gurman, 1977; p. 511). Gurman also noted in light of a critical analysis of 9 different factor-analytic studies, of which some were based on inappropriate interscale rather than interitem correlations, that the BLRI is "tapping dimensions that are quite consistent with Barrett-Lennard's original work on the inventory (Gurman, 1977; p. 513)."
The original BLRI has been revised and adapted for use in a variety of relationships including that of supervision. Hansen (1965) was the first to use the BLRI in a study involving the supervisory relationship. He administered the instrument to 30 trainees in an N.D.E.A. institute prior to a 10-week period of supervision and again after that supervision. He found that the trainees' report of their actual experience in supervision yielded significantly higher ratings of their supervisors than their initial expectations on all scales except regard.

In a study comparing group versus individual supervision, Lanning (1971) compared responses of two groups of 10 counselor trainees on their perception of supervisors (i.e., BLRI) and their expectations of how they felt their clients would perceive them on the same BLRI items. After 45 to 50 minute counseling sessions with those trainees, clients were asked to complete the BLRI concerning their perceptions of the relationship with that trainee. There were no significant differences on any of the BLRI measures between the individual supervision and group supervision trainees. However, the correlation coefficients among the dependent variables did indicate that more than half of the variance in the trainees' expectations of how their own clients would perceive them was accounted for by the trainees' own perceptions of their supervisors ($r = .73; p < .001$). Lanning (1971) concluded that the trainee's perception of his/her supervisor can indeed be an important factor effecting the way a trainee looks at himself/herself.

Karr and Geist (1977) found that judges' ratings of supervisors in terms of their genuineness, respect, and concreteness within supervision
were significantly related to their ratings of the level of performance of trainees on these same dimensions in counseling. However, the trainees' (i.e., graduate students in counseling psychology and rehabilitation counseling) perceptions of the facilitative conditions offered by supervisors (as assessed by their responses to the BLRI) did not relate significantly to judges' ratings of the trainees' performance.

In reviewing several case studies of supervisory relationships, Conant (1977) noted a trend among supervisors' and trainees' ratings on the BLRI which suggested that the level of perceived conditions in the supervisory relationship is important for learning by trainees. In general, the studies reviewed here suggest that the facilitative conditions offered by the supervisor are in some way related to the trainee's performance in counseling. The BLRI was used in the present study to examine the facilitative conditions offered from the perspective of the trainee and the supervisor and to compare these perceptions with the measures of language complexity described above.

THE COUNSELOR EVALUATION RATING SCALE (CERS)

Myrick and Kelly (1971) have developed the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) as an instrument "which would enable respondent to rate a counselor's performance in counseling and supervision" (p. 331). As was discussed earlier, the CERS yields three scores: a) counseling; b) supervision; and c) total. The authors intended the instrument to serve to reduce some of the vagueness in assessment of performance by providing some specific criteria for judging that performance.
Several studies have made use of the CERS. Myrick, Kelly, and Wittmer (1972) used the CERS ratings by supervisors in an unspecified fashion to identify 20 "effective" and 20 "ineffective" counselors among a group of student counselors in Counselor Education. The data from a pre-evaluation administration of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) was then submitted to an analysis to determine if there were significant differences by sex or "effectiveness" groupings. Results indicated that the effective counselors were significantly more outgoing, stable, warm, assertive, happy-go-luck, casual, venturesome, and sensitive than those categorized as ineffective. Female counselors overall were found to be more casual and imaginative than their male counterparts, while males were more conscientious and persistent and more practical than females.

Jones (1974) criticized the above study for using the CERS scores as a measure of "effectiveness" when they had not previously been shown to be related to any measure of counseling outcome. After questionably asserting that levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness could serve as such criterion measures, he proceeded to compare ratings on these dimensions by trained judges of counseling tapes by 19 practicum students in Counselor Education with CERS ratings of the same students by their supervisors. Jones (1974) found only a single positive relationship between the rating on the supervision subscale of the CERS and the level of respect ratings by judges. Although the author has rightfully criticized the use of CERS scores as outcome criteria, his study based on assumed outcome variables has done little to contribute to empirically evaluating the CERS as an outcome measure.
A study by Borman and Ramirez (1975) was carried out to determine if there were significant differences in the CERS between self-ratings of counseling practicum students, and ratings by their supervisor and practicum assistants. The ratings by these groups of 25 practicum students were analyzed by items for differences. Nine of the 27 items showed significant differences. On 3 items related to the supervisory process (e.g., "is sensitive to self dynamics in supervision") the practicum assistants gave significantly lower ratings than the supervisors or students. On 5 items, students' ratings than those of the practicum assistants, a fact which the authors attributed partially to the students' "natural tendency" to rate themselves higher and partially to the assistants' being in the process of learning the supervisory routine. The students rated themselves more highly than did the supervisor or assistants on being relaxed and comfortable in the supervisory session. Borman and Ramirez (1975) concluded that in spite of differences the CERS was helpful aid to communication among these three groups.

In the most recent study published on the CERS, Loesch and Rucker (1977) submitted the ratings of 404 interns and practicum students by 35 supervisors to oblique principal axes factor analyses. The original analysis yielded 6 primary factors entitled: (I) general counseling performance; (II) professional attitude; (III) counseling behavior; (IV) counseling knowledge; (V) supervisory attitude; (VI) supervision behavior. A subsequent analysis yielded 2 second order factors: one composed of primary factors I, III, and IV; and another of primary factors II, V, and VI. The authors concluded that although the
supervisors were apparently able to separate evaluations of counseling from those of supervision, the evaluations were not as global as Myrick and Kelly (1971) intended. Caution was urged in the use of the subscales because of commonalities that account for part of the evaluation of both.

Although the CERS is a relatively new instrument which has yet to be related to empirical outcome measures, its value as a measure of evaluations by personal perception seems sound. Just how practicum students' evaluations by self and by supervisor relate to language behavior was subject to initial exploration here.

SUMMARY

The contents of this appendix were offered to provide a more detailed coverage of the research and other literature available which is related to facets of the present study. The material presented is by no means exhaustive of that available in these areas but is meant merely as a guide to increased understanding of the concepts considered in the study and their related measures. In addition, it was the author's intention to illuminate the potential for relationships among these various theoretical areas which he observed and set out to investigate.
APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY FOR CASE GRAMMAR
GLOSSARY OF VERB TYPES AND RULES FOR CLASSIFICATION

(After Cook, 1972b, and Pepinsky et al., 1977)

STATIVE (S): The verb defines a property or state of the object (animate or inanimate), and is usually followed by a noun or adjectival object.

   e.g., He is a boy.
   I was jealous.

STATIVE EXPERIENCER/COGNITIVE (SEC): The verb defines an experiencer's cognitive state or activity and may take a noun or adjectival object.

   e.g., I know the book well.
   I thought about it.

STATIVE EXPERIENCER/AFFECTIVE (SEA): The verb defines an experiencer's affective state or activity and may take a noun or adjectival object.

   e.g., I want something sweet.
   I feel glad.

STATIVE BENEFACTIVE (SB): The verb describes someone or something as the beneficiary of some state or the owner of some object.

   e.g., The baby has four teeth.
   John's got class.
   I own a yacht.

STATIVE PASSIVE (SP): This verb is in the passive voice, and at least part of the verb phrase is a past participle. Frequently, the past participle is preceded by a form of the verb to be.

   e.g., She was married by the minister yesterday.
   Given what was said, he has been forgotten.

PROCESS (P): The verb describes something happening or having happened to an animate or inanimate object, without reference to a causal agent. It is usually intransitive.

   e.g., He died quietly.
   The chair collapsed.
PROCESS EXPERIENCER (PE): The verb defines a sensation or perception which is conveyed by an object to an experiencer. If the object precedes the verb rather than the experiencer, the verb may take an adjectival object as well.

  e.g., I heard a cat.
  It puzzled him.
  It looked bad to me.

PROCESS BENEFACTIVE (PB): The verb defines someone or something as being the beneficiary of some noun object as the result of some action.

  e.g., I received a new pen.
  The firm acquired a new partner.
  He lost the evidence.

AGENTIVE (A): The verb defines something or someone acting as an agent to make something happen (intransitive). A particular verb in this category may take an essential case object; but in the case that it does, it is typed as AGENTIVE PROCESS (see below).

  e.g., John laughed.
  He walked to the store.

AGENTIVE-PROCESS (AP): The verb describes someone or something acting as an agent to make something happen to an object filling the essential case slot (transitive). In some cases this essential case slot may be filled by another verb form.

  e.g., Put the books down.
  The soldier shot the man.
  He tried to go.

AGENTIVE EXPERIENCER (AE): The verb describes someone or something acting as an agent to provide an experience to an experiencer. By definition this primarily includes verbs of speech (e.g., talk, question) since an implied auditor is understood. (See Agentive-Process Experiencer if specific essential case object is present.)

  e.g., They spoke to him.
  I questioned her.

AGENTIVE BENEFACTIVE (AB): The verb defines someone or something acting as an agent to give something to a beneficiary when that something is not stated as an essential case object but is implied in the verb. (See Agentive-Process Benefactive if specific essential case object is present.)

  e.g., He paid me yesterday.
  Joe equipped the team.
AGENTIVE-PROCESS EXPERIENCER (APE): The verb describes something acting as an agent in relation to an experiencer with regard to some specific essential case object. Verbs of speech with an essential case object (including direct quotes) and an implied or stated experiencer to whom the object is directed fit here.

e.g., She teaches French and Spanish.
    I told him my name.
    I said, "Go home."

AGENTIVE-PROCESS BENEFACTIVE (APB): The verb defines someone or something acting as an agent to give some specific essential case object to a beneficiary. The beneficiary may be present as an essential case, within a peripheral phrase, or in some cases is understood.

e.g., I lent him money.
    The court awarded damages to the plaintiff.

EXPERIENTIAL-AGENTIVE (EA): The verb defines someone acting as an agent to provide himself/herself with an experience. It may take an essential case object.

e.g., He listened carefully.
    George read the sign slowly.
    Anne watched for some hint.
Table 8  Verb Types in a Case Frame Matrix  
(adapted from Cook, 1979; McCarthy, 1978)

**ESSENTIAL CASE FRAMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC</th>
<th>EXPERIENER</th>
<th>BENEFACITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requires</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>requires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Obj-N</th>
<th>Exp-N</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>(Obj-J or N)</td>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was</td>
<td></td>
<td>(J or N)</td>
<td>own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Obj-N</th>
<th>Exp-N</th>
<th>Ben-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>Obj-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was married</td>
<td></td>
<td>(J or N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was said</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Obj-N</th>
<th>Exp-N</th>
<th>Ben-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obj- (J or N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>lose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collapse</td>
<td>puzzle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Agt-N</th>
<th>Agt-N</th>
<th>Agt-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>Exp*</td>
<td>equip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walk</td>
<td>questioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>pay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Agt-N</th>
<th>Agt-N</th>
<th>APB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoot</td>
<td>say</td>
<td>Obj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>try</td>
<td>teach</td>
<td>Obj-N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N or verb form)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exp*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Agt-N</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Obj-N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**  S = Stative; SP = Stative Passive; SEA = Stative Experiencer/Affective; SEC = Stative Experiencer/Cognitive; SB = Stative Benefactive; P = Process; PE = Process Experiencer; PB = Process Benefactive; A = Agentive; AE = Agentive Experiencer; AB = Agentive Benefactive; AP = Agentive-Process; APE = Agentive-Process Experiencer; APB = Agentive-Process Benefactive; EA = Experiential-Agentive; Obj = Object; Exp = Experiencer; Ben = Benefactor; Agt = Agent; N = Noun; J = Adjective; ( ) indicates options.

* may be embedded in a prepositional phrase or clearly understood and not actually present with some verbs.
APPENDIX C

DATA SHEETS, COUNSELOR EVALUATION RATING SCALES, AND BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORIES FOR SUPERVISORS AND TRAINEES
I would also like some demographic data for use in this study. Please provide this information as accurately as possible with regard to yourself and your current supervisee. Thank you.

Approximate in years the amount of experience you have had as a counseling supervisor.

If you feel that you have a theoretical orientation in your own personal counseling which can best be described by one of the following terms (or some other brief one), please note it below.

BEHAVIORAL  COGNITIVE  ANALYTIC  GESTALT  CLIENT-CENTERED REALITY

Other ________________________________

Supervisee name ____________________________

Have you ever served as a supervisor of counseling with this individual before?

YES  NO

If so, when? _______________________________

On the scale below, please describe how well you feel that you know this person whom you will be supervising.

1  2  3  4  5
very well not at all

On the scale below, please describe your perception of how well you are known by this new supervisee.

1  2  3  4  5
very well not at all

How long have you known this supervisee? _____________________

In what capacity or capacities have you known this supervisee (e.g., student, advisee, or other)? ____________________________________________.
I am again requesting your assistance in completing my research on supervision. Below are some informational questions to be carefully filled out prior to completing the accompanying survey forms. Please complete this sheet and the survey forms as soon as possible following your final individual supervision with the supervisee who has participated in this study with you.

Remember, this information will be kept confidential and will not be revealed to your supervisee or others unless you specifically request it.

I will contact you regarding the results of the study upon its completion, and I will be happy to talk with you about your own responses if you would desire this. Thank you once again for your participation.

How many individual supervisory sessions excluding the initial get-acquainted session did you participate in with this supervisee? Please be precise.

Estimate the average length of time per supervisory session with this supervisee?

How many counseling sessions by this supervisee did you observe during the quarter?

How many clients did you observe this supervisee with during the quarter?

On the scale below, describe how well you feel that you know this person whom you have supervised:

1 2 3 4 5
very well not at all

On the scale below, describe your perception of how well you are now known by this supervisee:

1 2 3 4 5
very well not at all
RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY -- FORM MO-64 (supervisor)

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

Please consider each statement with reference to what the relationship with your supervisee is like.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel it is true, or no true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel that it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel that it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. I respect him/her as a person.
2. I want to understand how he/she sees things.
3. The interest I feel in him/her depends on the things he/she says or does.
4. I feel comfortable and at ease with him/her.
5. I really like him/her.
6. I understand his/her words, but I do not know how he/she actually feels.
7. Whether he/she is feeling pleased or unhappy with himself/herself does not change the way I feel about him/her.
8. I am inclined to put on a role or front with him/her.
9. I feel impatient with him/her.
10. I nearly always know exactly what he/she means.
11. Depending on his/her behavior, I have a better opinion of him/her sometimes than I do at other times.
12. I am real and genuine with him/her.
13. I appreciate him/her.
14. I look at what he/she does from my own point of view.
15. My feeling toward the him/her doesn't depend on how he/she feels toward me.
16. It makes me uneasy when he/she talks about certain things.
17. I am indifferent toward him/her.
18. I usually sense or realize what he/she is feeling.
19. I want him/her to be a particular kind of person.
20. What I say expresses exactly what I am feeling and thinking as I say it.
21. I find him/her rather dull and uninteresting.
22. My own attitudes toward some of the things he/she does or says prevent me from understanding him/her.
23. He/She could be openly critical or appreciative of me without really making me feel any differently about him/her.
24. I want him/her to think that I like or understand him/her more than I really do.
25. I care for him/her.
26. Sometimes I think he/she feels a certain way because that's the way I feel.
27. I really like certain things about him/her, and there are other things I do not like.
28. I do not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
29. I disapprove of him/her.
30. I realize what he/she means even when he/she has difficulty saying it.
31. My attitude toward him/her stays the same: I am not pleased with him/her sometimes and am critical or disappointed at other times.
32. Sometimes I am not at all comfortable, but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
33. I just tolerate him/her.
34. I usually understand the whole of what he/she means.
35. If he/she shows that he/she is angry with me, I become hurt or angry with him/her too.
36. I express my true impressions and feelings with him/her.
37. I am warm and friendly with him/her.
38. I take no notice of some things he/she thinks or feels.
39. How much I like or dislike him/her is not changed by anything that he/she tells me about himself/herself.
40. At times I am not aware of what I am really feeling with him/her.
41. I really value him/her.
42. I appreciate exactly how the things he/she experiences feel to him/her.
43. I approve of some things he/she does and plainly disapprove of others.
44. I am willing to express whatever is actually on my mind with him/her, including any feelings about myself or about him/her.
45. I don't like him/her for himself/herself.
46. At times I think he/she feels a lot more strongly about a particular thing than he/she really does.
47. Whether he/she is in good spirits or feeling upset does not make me feel any more or less appreciative of him/her.
48. I am openly myself in our relationship.
49. He/She irritates and bothers me.
50. I did not realize how sensitive he/she is about some of the things we discuss.
51. Whether the ideas and feelings he/she expresses are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference toward how I feel toward him/her.
52. There are times when my outward response to him/her is quite different from the way I feel underneath.
53. At times I feel contempt for him/her.
54. I understand him/her.
55. Sometimes he/she is more worthwhile in my eyes than he/she is at other times.
56. I do not try to hide certain things from myself that I feel about him/her.
57. I am truly interested in him/her.
58. My response to him/her is usually so fixed and automatic that he/she really doesn't get through to me.
59. Nothing he/she says or does really changes the way I feel about him/her.

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

61. I feel deep affection for him/her.

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

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

64. I have feelings I do not tell him/her about that are causing difficulties in our relationship.
COUNSELOR EVALUATION RATING SCALE

Below are listed some statements which are related to evaluation in supervising a counseling experience. Please consider each statement with reference to your knowledge of your supervisee.

Mark each statement in the left hand blank according to how strongly you agree and disagree. Do not mark in parentheses. Please mark every statement. Write in +3, +2, +1 or -1, -2, -3, to represent the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>I strongly agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>I agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>I slightly agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>I slightly disagree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>I disagree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>I strongly disagree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Demonstrates an interest in client's problems.
2. Tends to approach clients in a mechanical, perfunctory manner.
3. Lacks sensitivity to dynamics of self in supervisory relationship.
4. Seeks and considers professional opinion of supervisors and other counselors when the need arises.
5. Tends to talk more than client during counseling.
6. Is sensitive to dynamics of self in counseling relationships.
7. Cannot accept constructive criticism.
8. Is genuinely relaxed and comfortable in the counseling session.
9. Is aware of both content and feeling in counseling sessions.
10. Keeps appointments on time and completes supervisory assignments.
11. Can deal with content and feeling during supervision.
12. Tends to be rigid in counseling behavior.
13. Lectures and moralizes in counseling.
14. Can critique counseling tapes and gain insights with minimum help from supervisor.
15. Is genuinely relaxed and comfortable in the supervisory session.
16. Works well with other professional personnel (e.g., teachers, counselors, etc.).
17. Can be spontaneous in counseling, yet behavior is relevant.

18. Lacks self-confidence in establishing counseling relationships.

19. Can explain what is involved in counseling and discuss intelligently its objectives.


21. Can express thoughts and feelings clearly in counseling.

22. Verbal behavior in counseling is appropriately flexible and varied, according to the situation.

23. Lacks basic knowledge of fundamental counseling principles and methodology.

24. Participates actively and willingly in supervisory sessions.

25. Is indifferent to personal development and professional growth.

26. Applies a consistent rationale of human behavior to counseling.

27. Can be recommended for a counseling position without reservation.

Comments:
DATA SHEET (TR.)

I would also like some demographic data for use in this study. Please provide this information as accurately as possible, and answer any question concerning your supervisor with regard to your current supervisor for the present quarter. Thank you.

Age: _____  Sex: M  F

Are you in the counseling psychology program?  YES  NO

If yes, what year of the program?  _____

If no, state program and present status.  ____________________________

How many quarters of supervised practicum (PSYCH 885 or 886) completed?  _____

If you have had any counseling experience or significant supervisory (of counseling) relationships other than PSYCH 885 or 886, please describe them. Please include length of time and an indication of the intensity of supervision in your description.

In total how many counseling supervisors have you been supervised by?  _____

Have you ever been supervised by your present faculty supervisor before?  YES  NO

On the scale below, describe how well you feel that you know this person who will be supervising you.

1  2  3  4  5
very well  not at all

On the scale below, describe your perception of how well you are known by your new supervisor.

1  2  3  4  5
very well  not at all

How long have you known your new supervisor?  _____

In what capacity or capacities have you known this supervisor (e.g., instructor, advisor, or other)?  ____________________________

If you feel that you have already developed a predominant theoretical orientation in your personal counseling which is best described by one of the following terms (or some other brief one), please note it. If not, leave this question blank.  BEHAVIORAL  COGNITIVE  ANALYTIC
I am again requesting your assistance in completing my research on supervision. Below are some informational questions to be carefully filled out prior to completing the accompanying survey forms. Please complete this sheet and the survey forms as soon as possible following your final individual supervision with the supervisor who has participated in this study with you.

Remember, this information will be kept confidential and will not be revealed to your supervisor or others unless you specifically request it.

I will contact you regarding the results of the study upon its completion, and I will be happy to talk with you about your own responses if you would desire this. Thank you once again for your participation.

How many supervisory sessions excluding the initial get-acquainted session did you participate in with this supervisor? Please be precise.

_____

Estimate the average length of time per supervisory session with this supervisor.

_____

State the total number of supervisory sessions you have participated in overall (i.e., with any supervisor) this quarter

_____

How many counseling sessions with the client(s) observed by this supervisor did you have?

_____

State the total number of counseling sessions (i.e., with any client) you participated in this quarter.

_____

How many clients did you see during the quarter under the supervision of this supervisor?

_____

How many clients were new to you as a counselor among these? _____.

How many were "carry-over" clients among these? _____.

How long had each of the clients seen by you under the supervision of this supervisor been coming to you for counseling?

_____

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the supervision you received from this supervisor this quarter on the following scale. Circle a number.

very satisfied 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 satisfied
On the scale below, describe how well you feel that you know this person who has supervised you:

1  2  3  4  5  
very well not at all

On the scale below, describe your perception of how well you are now known by this supervisor:

1  2  3  4  5  
very well not at all
Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement with reference to what the relationship with your supervisor is like.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel that it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel that it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. He/She respects me as a person.
2. He/She wants to understand how I see things.
3. His/Her interest in me depends on the things I say or do.
4. He/She is comfortable and at ease in our relationship.
5. He/She feels a true liking for me.
6. He/She may understand my words, but he/she does not see the way I feel.
7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way he/she feels about me.
8. I feel that he/she puts on a role or front with me.
9. He/She is impatient with me.
10. He/She nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
11. Depending on my behavior, he/she has a better opinion of me sometimes than he/she has at other times.
12. I feel that he/she is real and genuine with me.
13. I feel appreciated by him/her.

14. He/She looks at what I do from his/her own point of view.

15. His/Her feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him/her.

16. It makes him/her uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.

17. He/She is indifferent to me.

18. He/She usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.

19. He/She wants me to be a particular kind of person.

20. I nearly always feel that what he/she says expresses exactly what he/she is feeling and thinking as he/she says it.

21. He/She finds me dull and uninteresting.

22. His/Her own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him/her from understanding me.

23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him/her without making him/her feel any different about me.

24. He/She wants me to think that he/she likes me or understands me more than he/she really does.

25. He/She cares for me.

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

27. He/She likes certain things about me, and there are other things he/she does not like.

28. He/She does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.

29. I feel that he/she disapproves of me.

30. He/She realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.

31. His/Her attitude toward me stays the same; he/she is not pleased with me sometimes and is critical or disappointed at other times.

32. Sometimes he/she is not at all comfortable, but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.

33. He/She just tolerates me.

34. He/She usually understands the whole of what I mean.

35. If I show that I am angry with him/her, he/she becomes hurt or angry with me, too.
13. I feel appreciated by him/her.
14. He/She looks at what I do from his/her own point of view.
15. His/Her feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him/her.
16. It makes him/her uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.
17. He/She is indifferent to me.
18. He/She usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.
19. He/She wants me to be a particular kind of person.
20. I nearly always feel that what he/she says expresses exactly what he/she is feeling and thinking as he/she says it.
21. He/She finds me dull and uninteresting.
22. His/Her own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him/her from understanding me.
23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him/her without making him/her feel any different about me.
24. He/She wants me to think that he/she likes me or understands me more than he/she really does.
25. He/She cares for me.
26. Sometimes he/she thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he/she feels.
27. He/She likes certain things about me, and there are other things he/she does not like.
28. He/She does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
29. I feel that he/she disapproves of me.
30. He/She realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.
31. His/Her attitude toward me stays the same; he/she is not pleased with me sometimes and is critical or disappointed at other times.
32. Sometimes he/she is not at all comfortable, but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
33. He/She just tolerates me.
34. He/She usually understands the whole of what I mean.
35. If I show that I am angry with him/her, he/she becomes hurt or angry with me, too.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>He/She expresses his/her true impressions and feelings with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>He/She is friendly and warm with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>He/She just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>How much he/she likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell him/her about myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>At times I sense that he/she is not aware of what he/she is really feeling with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I feel that he/she really values me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>He/She appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>He/She approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>He/She is willing to express whatever is actually in his/her mind with me, including feelings about himself/herself or about me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>He/She doesn't like me for myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>At times he/she thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make him/her feel any more or less appreciative of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>He/She is openly himself/herself in our relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I seem to irritate and bother him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>He/She does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Whether the ideas and feelings I express are &quot;good&quot; or &quot;bad&quot; seems to make no difference to his/her feeling toward me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>There are times when I feel that his/her outward response to me is quite different from the way he/she feels underneath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>At times he/she feels contempt for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>He/She understands me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Sometimes I am more worthwhile in his/her eyes than I am at other times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I have not felt that he/she tries to hide anything from himself/herself that he feels with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>He/She is truly interested in me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>His/Her response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him/her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he/she feels toward me.

60. What he/she says to me often gives a wrong impression of his/her whole thought or feeling at the time.

61. He/She feels deep affection for me.

62. When I am hurt or upset, he/she can recognize my feelings exactly without becoming upset himself/herself.

63. What other people think of me does (or would, if he/she knew) affect the way he/she feels toward me.

64. I believe that he/she has feelings he/she does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.
COUNSELOR EVALUATION RATING SCALE (SELF)

Below are listed some statements which are related to evaluation in supervising a counseling experience. Please consider each statement with reference to your knowledge of yourself.

Mark each statement in the left hand blank according to how strongly you agree or disagree. Do not mark in parentheses. Please mark every statement. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to represent the following:

+3 I strongly agree.
+2 I agree.
+1 I slightly agree.
-1 I slightly disagree.
-2 I disagree.
-3 I strongly disagree.

( ) ___ 1. Demonstrate an interest in client's problems.
( ) ___ 2. Tend to approach clients in a mechanical, perfunctory manner.
( ) ___ 3. Lack sensitivity to dynamics of self in supervisory relationship.
( ) ___ 4. Seek and consider professional opinion of supervisors and other counselors when the need arises.
( ) ___ 5. Tend to talk more than client during counseling.
( ) ___ 6. Am sensitive to dynamics of self in counseling relationships.
( ) ___ 7. Cannot accept constructive criticism.
( ) ___ 8. Am genuinely relaxed and comfortable in the counseling session.
( ) ___ 9. Am aware of both content and feeling in counseling sessions.
( ) ___ 10. Keep appointments on time and complete supervisory assignments.
( ) ___ 11. Can deal with content and feeling during supervision.
( ) ___ 12. Tend to be rigid in counseling behavior.
( ) ___ 13. Lecture and moralize in counseling.
( ) ___ 14. Can critique counseling tapes and gain insights with minimum help from supervisor.
( ) ___ 15. Am genuinely relaxed and comfortable in the supervisory session.
( ) ___ 16. Work well with other professional personnel (e.g., teachers, counselors, etc.).
( ) 17. Can be spontaneous in counseling, yet behavior is relevant.

( ) 18. Lack self-confidence in establishing counseling relationships.

( ) 19. Can explain what is involved in counseling and discuss intelligently its objectives.

( ) 20. Am open to self-examination during supervision.

( ) 21. Can express thoughts and feelings clearly in counseling.

( ) 22. Verbal behavior in counseling is appropriately flexible and varied, according to the situation.

( ) 23. Lack basic knowledge of fundamental counseling principles and methodology.

( ) 24. Participate actively and willingly in supervisory sessions.

( ) 25. Am indifferent to personal development and professional growth.

( ) 26. Apply a consistent rationale of human behavior to counseling.

( ) 27. Can be recommended for a counseling position without reservation.

Comments: