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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Health and development of human beings has long been a source of concern to people working in and among the helping profession, and a recurrent theme among popular theorists and researchers is that change is inevitable. People either grow or they die. Abraham Maslow (1962) advanced this concept as it relates to the field of psychological thought through the development of a "third force" referred to as humanistic psychology. When integrated into the counseling setting, Buhler and Allen (1972) have stated that humanistic psychology puts an emphasis on "human qualities such as choice, creativity, valuation, and self realization, as opposed to thinking about human beings in mechanistic and reductionistic terms." Bugenthal (1971) has established the main tenets of humanistic psychology in this school's application to psychotherapy:

1. The individual alone is responsible for his/her own actions and experiences.
2. An "I-Thou" relationship (Buber, 1958) between people is the ideal.
3. Experiencing takes place only in the everpresent here-and-now.
4. Emotions such as pain, anger, grief, and guilt are to be valued and understood.
5. Growth facilitating experiences are the main ingredients of the humanistic ethic.
Self-actualization is firmly based in these tenets and has been emphasized by Maslow as a reasonable goal of counseling. Maslow defines the concept of self-actualization as the "process of being what one is and of becoming more of what one can be (Shostrom, 1976)."

The rise of the Third Force in psychology has placed an increased amount of emphasis on the interaction between the counselor and client (Dreyfuss, 1967) in the counseling process. Carl Rogers (1957) has been a pioneer in the therapist-patient relationship and has emphasized the importance of a positive relationship as a factor in counseling. Other writers have stressed the importance of the therapeutic relationship (Buber, 1958; Jourard, 1964; Maslow, 1962; Bugenthal, 1965) as a genuine personal encounter. Rogers (1953) has formulated his "necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change" which have eventually evolved into the Rogerian constructs of empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness. Other theorists and researchers have since operationally defined and refined these constructs, more commonly referred to as "core conditions" (Truax, 1961; Carkhuff, 1969; Barrett-Lennard, 1962). Buhler and Allen (1972) state that in the professional literature, the only variable highly correlated with 'successful' therapy is that of the counselor-client relationship.

Humanistic psychology has recognized the importance of the relationship between counselor and client, and the group process has been a comparatively recent and rapid social development by which growth toward self-actualization can take place (Shostrom, 1976). The spectacular popularity of the group movement has become "the most spreading social intervention of the century, and probably the most potent (Rogers, 1968)."
Group experiences have helped to mold new kinds of constructive and meaningful interrelationships which can lead members to a state of being akin to the religious experience (Greening, 1971). Peterson (1974) views the group as a new community in a complex and pluralistic world with the capacity for working through conflict and confusion.

Groups, an outgrowth of the Third Force in psychology, are a small microcosm of society where members come together to experience each other. Within the counseling group, Yalom (1975) has written that there must be a consistent, positive relationship between counselor and client. Maslow (1954, 1970) has stated the need to study self-actualizing individuals. In light of this, relationships between Maslow's concept of self-actualization and the counselor-client relationship need to be examined.

This study dealt specifically with nursing students. In the literature on group process, the importance of nursing students as members and leaders of groups has already been cited (McLaughlin, White, and Byfield, 1974; Loomis, 1979; Marram, 1978). Nursing schools have attempted to prepare nurses to work with varied groups of people within the context of health care settings by requiring undergraduate nursing students to participate in varied group experiences in order to become knowledgeable about the dynamics of group functioning. As a result, additional studies are needed to develop a greater understanding of these groups, their impact on students and in the view of this study, the nature of the process itself.
Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of this study to explore the extent to which the level of the group-counselor/group-member relationship is related to group member's self-actualization during a growth group experience as part of a nursing training program. The study was designed to answer the following questions: To what extent are the group counselor and group member perceptions of the counseling relationship at three, six, and nine weeks, related to the group member's level of self-actualization?; What are the implications of these findings for counselors in counseling strategy for clients in regard to self-actualization and perception?

More specifically, the research questions were posed as follows:

1. What relationship exists between group member, group counselor, and group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as measured by the Relationship Inventory at three, six, and nine weeks?

2. What significant differences exist between group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as measured by the Relationship Inventory at three, six, and nine weeks and group members who score either high or low on their average Personal Orientation score?

3. What significant differences exist between group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as measured by the Relationship Inventory at three, six, and nine weeks and group members who
score high on Time Competence together with high or low on Inner-directedness scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory?

Rationale for the Study

Abraham Maslow echoed his concern in *Motivation and Personality* (1954, 1970) that much of "our present knowledge of personality dynamics of health and adjustment comes almost entirely from the study of sick people." More recently, Heath (1980) has stated that researchers seldom relate their focused studies to the healthy growth or adaptation of persons. Research indicates that there has been little emphasis placed on the fully functioning individual who is in the process of developing his/her potentials. In 1964, Shostrom developed the *Personal Orientation Inventory*, considered to be a valid assessment of self-actualization, which focuses on the more fully functioning individual. As a result, the concept of self-actualization has been examined by researchers in both educational and clinical settings using this tool.

Brammer and Shostrom (1968), Rogers (1951, 1961), Shostrom, Knapp, and Knapp (1975) have reflected that self-actualization is a reasonable goal of the psychotherapeutic process. Knapp (1975) has gone on to summarize much of the research on self-actualization. In regards to the effects of group experiences, the POI has been the instrument most widely used in assessing self-actualization as it "measures the things talked about by people in human relations training. For this reason it is an excellent training device (Pfeiffer and Heslin, 1973)."

Alperson, Alperson and Levine (1971), Byrd (1967), Guinan and Foulds
(1970), Seeman, Nidich, and Banta (1972), Young and Jacobson (1970) plus a host of others have investigated studies of change following a group experience. It is, however, important to note the limited amount of research examining the relationship between group member's level of self-actualization and the group counselor-client relationship, as experienced by the client.

Numerous researchers and theorists have focused on the relationship per se between the counselor and client. Lipkin (1954) found a positive association between the degree to which clients felt liked by their therapist and improvement in therapy. In 1956 Rogers postulated the "necessary and sufficient conditions for personality change." Halkides (1958) discovered associations between successful therapy and variables of unconditional positive regard, empathy, and congruence. Further study was carried out with Barratt-Lennard (1962) who postulated and confirmed that the client's experience is importantly related to outcome. More recently, there has been undisputed evidence validating the therapeutic relevance of counselor-offered conditions of empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler and Truax, 1967; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). Foulds (1969) studied the relationship between self-actualization and the communication of facilitative conditions during counseling and found a positive association between the well-being of the counselor and the ability to communicate empathy and genuineness.

A purpose in Nursing training programs has been to emphasize the role of people-helper for the nursing student (Dye, 1974). Mauksch (1963) goes on to say that people-helping can be an intense experience
and anxiety in the nursing student can be increased by working in unfamiliar environments. The nursing student, therefore, needs sufficient training and skill in interpersonal dynamics to understand one's own feelings while at the same time developing the ability to facilitate growth in patients in varied contexts (Gunter, 1969). Numerous group training programs for nursing students have enabled them to increase their personal awareness and ability to be supportive of other human beings, and studies are continually needed to expand knowledge in the area.

This study has contributed to the accumulation of knowledge in the areas of self-actualization, counselor client relationships, and nursing training programs. It attempts to follow the general postulate of Barrett-Lennard (1962) that it is the client's interpersonal experiencing of the relationship which is of significance and is, in turn, related to his/her level of self-actualization. Thus, a positive association may exist between the client's level of wellness and the ability to experience facilitative conditions of the counselor-client relationship. In a wider context, this study could also serve to assist counselors in being more attuned to the self-actualizing client, who is more fully-functioning than the non-actualizing individual (Shostrom, 1976).

**Definition of Terms**

For the purpose of this study the following definitions are offered for terms used in the study.

*Empathy:* . . . is conceived as the extent to which one person is
conscious of the immediate awareness of another. Qualitatively it is an active process of desiring to know the full present and changing awareness of another person . . . It is an experiencing of the consciousness "behind" another's outward communication, but with continuous awareness that this consciousness is originating and proceeding in the other . . . In particular it includes sensing the immediate affective quality and intensity of the other's experience, as well as recognizing its particular context (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p.3). For the purpose of this study, Empathy was defined as the score on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory empathy scale.

Level of Regard: . . . refers here to the affective aspect, either positive or negative, of one person's response to another . . . is the general tendency of the various affective reactions of one person in relation to another. More specifically, it may be 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 (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p.4). For the purpose of this study, Level of Regard was defined as the score on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory level of regard scale.

Unconditionality of Regard: . . . is specifically concerned with how little or much variability there is in one person's affective
response to another. It is defined as the degree of con­stancy of regard felt by one person for another who com­municates self-experience to the first (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p.4). For the purpose of this study, Unconditionality of Regard was defined as the score on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory unconditionality of regard scale.

Congruence: The degree to which one person is functionally inte­grated in the context of his relationship with another, such that there is absence of conflict or inconsistency between his total experience, his awareness, his overt communication (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p.4). For the purpose of this study, Congruence was defined as the score on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory congruence scale.

Self-actualization: Self-actualization is a developmental process whereby an individual is striving to work toward his/her potentialities so that one is becoming all that one is capable of becoming (Shostrom, 1976). Maslow (1954, 1962, 1967) has defined it as living a more enriched life and developing all of one's unique capabilities. For the purpose of this study, self-actualization was defined as the score on the Personal Orientation Inventory.

High self-actualizer: For the purpose of this study, a high self-actualizer is operationally defined as an individual who scores at least 49 or above on the average Personal Orientation Inventory score.

Low self-actualizer: For the purpose of this study, a
low self-actualizer is operationally defined as an individual who scores at least 49 or below on the average Personal Orientation Inventory score.

Personal Growth Group: For the purpose of this study, a personal growth group is a nursing training group between 5-8 group members and a group leader, having as their goal the exploration of personal growth issues through interpersonal and intrapersonal communication with the focus of the experience being on education and self-enhancement.

Group Member: For the purpose of this study, a group member will be identified as a member of a personal growth group.

Group Counselor: For the purpose of this study, a group counselor will be identified as the facilitator of the personal growth group.

Limitations

For this study, the population was limited to fourth year nursing students enrolled at The Ohio State University School of Nursing during the 1979-1980 academic year. During the course of the senior year, nursing students were required to take a Nursing 506 class entitled "Nursing Transactions with Patients and Families in Recurring Crises." A group dynamics module was a component of the course, and students were required to participate in a nursing training group in order to expand understanding of group process. The sample consisted of forty-two volunteer participants in the Nursing 506 class during Autumn quarter of 1979. Two students enrolled in the course declined to parti-
cipate in the study but continued in the group. The sample group of forty-two participants were considered representative of fourth year nursing students. They were randomly divided into six different groups; each group was conducted by a group counselor who had successful experience as a group leader. Each of the group counselors was associated with the Nursing faculty. None had any of the participants as students.

The Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1963) was administered to assess self-actualization of group members primarily in small group settings prior to the initial group experience. It is one of the available instruments to measure the self-actualization of subjects. Therefore, the definition of self-actualization is limited to the Personal Orientation Inventory.

The Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1959) was administered to group counselors and group members in order to assess the level of counselor-client relationship after the third, sixth, and ninth group sessions. The definition of the counseling relationship is limited to the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory definition. The original form of the Barrett-Lennard was used. In completing the counselor form of the Barrett-Lennard, group counselors rated their experience with each individual group member before proceeding to the next item of the inventory. Responding in this manner may have caused the group counselors to respond to each group member on the inventory in a similar fashion. On the other hand, the same halo effect would have been possible influencing assessment in students if each student were assessed through all items on the Relationship Inventory.

The procedures used for this study involved the conducting of
groups for nine consecutive weeks for a period of one and one-half hours per week. They were facilitated by experienced female counselors whose self-actualization level was within the range of self-actualizing people as defined by the Personal Orientation Inventory.

Research designs were both correlational and ANOVA. Limitations, therefore, exist for the statistical analysis of the data and should be adhered to. Specific to the coefficients of correlation, the strength of the relationship measured was influenced by the small number of subjects examined for use of the data.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

The first chapter is comprised of an introduction to the study and is followed by a statement of the problem, rationale for the investigation, definition of terms, and limitations of the study. A review of the literature and research comprises the second chapter and contains research on self-actualization limited to the Personal Orientation Inventory and Group Work, research on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory as it relates to groups, and professional development limited to Nursing Education. Chapter three describes the methodology used in the study. Chapter four presents findings of the investigation by analyzing the data. The fifth chapter concludes with a summary of the study together with conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

This chapter investigates the writings of various authorities as they relate to this study and summarizes significant research according to the following three areas: 1) Research on self-actualization through the use of the POI using group work; 2) Research on the RI in group experiencing; 3) Professional development in Nursing Education limited to group process experiences.

Self-actualization, POI, and Group Work

Self-actualization theory differs from other schools of psychology which tend to study the negative, abnormal or deviant qualities of man. It tends to focus more on the positive aspects of people who are working toward the development of their potentialities. Numerous theorists have labeled this process differently. Buhler (1962) and Von Bertalanffy (1966) emphasize the process of bringing values to materialization. Horney (1950) and Fromm (1941) developed the concept of the healthy persons's "endgoal" being that of self-realization. Rogers (1961) refers to it as a growth process where there is an urge to expand, extend, develop, and mature.

Abraham Maslow has been a foremost contributor to self-actualization theory, and Maslow (1954) describes the self-actualized person as
one who makes fullest use of his/her talents and capacities. Shostrom (1963) views the self-actualized person as one who is living a more enriching life than the average person. In identifying self-actualizing people, Goble (1970) attempts to expand on Maslow's concepts and lists characteristics associated with self-actualization:

1. Heightened sense of reality
2. Clearer sense of right and wrong
3. More accurate self-perception
4. Creativity
5. A sense of duty, responsibility
6. Integrated personality
7. High level of independence

Maslow (1971) goes on to state various behaviors leading toward self-actualization:

1. Full concentration and absorption
2. Listening to one's inner voice
3. Being honest rather than dishonest
4. Making growth choices
5. Taking responsibility
6. Actualizing one's potentialities
7. Having peak experiences

In assessing positive mental health, Shostrom (1963) has developed the POI, a comprehensive measure of values and behaviors deemed important in the development of self-actualization. Knapp (1971) has pointed out the need for and acceptance of this instrument while focusing on the wide diversity of research stimulated by the POI. A review of human
relations training instruments has brought Pfeiffer and Heslin (1973) to state that the POI measures the things most talked about in human relations training. A review of some of the empirical research demonstrating the sensitivity of the POI with groups follows.

A number of studies have demonstrated the effect of group counseling using the POI in a college environment. Stephenson (1970) found group counseling proved effective in facilitating the growth of elementary education majors in inner-directedness, existentiality, spontaneity, capacity for intimate contact, self-disclosure, and discrimination of facilitative communication. In a study designed to determine the effects of a humanistic group counseling procedure for Teacher Corps interns, Haynes (1973) determined that group counseling had no apparent effects on group member level of self-actualization as measured by the Time and Reactivity Orientation of the POI. In addition, it was concluded that group counseling had differential effects on group members as some members manifested large overall gains from the experience while others only had appreciable or small gains.

While investigating whether university students enrolled in a preservice teacher training course, who were exposed to group counseling procedures, could demonstrate change in self-actualization when compared with similarly enrolled students who had not been exposed, findings (Shoemaker, 1972) revealed that there was significant increase in self-actualization for both the experimental and control groups. No significant difference in growth toward self-actualization was found between groups.

Montgomery (1975) also used a college student population in con-
junction with group using the POI. Her study sought to investigate effects of career and group counseling on retention and self-actualization among selected college freshmen. Significant differences in degree of self-actualization were found with students receiving both career and personal group counseling in comparison to career, personal, or control groups alone. No significant difference was found in retention rate between students participating in career or in personal group experiences. The career group had an attrition rate of 15 percent, the personal group 10 percent, and the control group experienced a high of 50 percent.

A study reported by Wirth (1973) investigated subjects from four universities to determine whether relationships between positive growth of group participants is a function of counselor positive mental health as measured by the POI. Both experimental and control groups were used in the study. Experimental groups received fifteen hours of group counseling while the one control group consisted of subjects receiving three or more hours of individual counseling. The other control group received no treatment. Analysis confirmed that subjects in individual counseling achieved significantly more growth than group participants. Groups conducted by higher positive mental health counselors significantly achieved more growth than groups facilitated by lower positive mental health counselors. Only lower positive mental health participants achieved significant growth with lower mental health counselors. Higher positive mental health participants in higher positive mental health counselor groups and lower positive mental health participants in lower positive mental health counseling groups achieved significant
growth in comparison with no treatment controls.

In addition to university populations, research with the POI and group counseling has been conducted in other settings. In determining the effects of group counseling with tenth grade high school students on self-actualization as measured by the Time Competent and Inner Support scales of the POI, Mirrow (1977) found that significant differences did appear between experimental and control groups in the direction of increased self-actualization. Meanwhile, group counseling with heroin addicts (Mehr, 1972) did effect changes on self-actualization variables of Nature of Man, Existentiality, Spontaneity, and Acceptance of Aggression; but it did not effect change on the variable of internal control.

In addition to group counseling itself, several studies have examined the effects of different types of group counseling using the POI. Lamb (1968) was concerned with determining the consequences of directive and client-centered group counseling techniques as used with individuals demonstrating internal and external reward expectancies. No change was noted in self-actualization levels for the groups. The same results were duplicated by Rowe (1971) as he found that treatment effects of a cognitive learning experience could not be demonstrated using any of the scales of the POI.

Examining the effects of behavioral group counseling on self-actualization with students who failed to meet minimum academic standards at the college level, Oliver (1970) obtained positive results. In an analysis of data comparing the mean difference scores between experimental and control groups, direction of change significantly
favored the experimental group on six scales of the POI: Support-ratio, Inner-Directedness, Existentiality, Feeling Reactivity, Spontaneity, and Capacity for Intimate Contact. With tenth grade boys, Murphy (1977), meanwhile, compared the effectiveness of peer-led and counselor-led cognitive behavioral counseling groups with controls in level of self-actualization and locus of control. No significant difference between the groups was found, and counselor led behavioral groups reached a significantly higher level of leadership performance than the peer counselors.

Rosenthal (1976) studied the effects of psychodrama on self-actualization, and results provide little evidence that it influenced participant growth and behavior change among volunteers from a university community. Meanwhile, Papantones (1977) determined the extent to which a Transactional Analysis Group Program would increase self-actualization of male adolescents attending a residential camp. Findings indicated that both experimental and control groups were significantly more self-actualized when comparing pre-test to post-test results of the POI, but no significant differences were obtained between groups.

While examining the effects of two new group treatment methods, movement exploration and Zazen meditation, in their ability to promote growth, Maher (1978) found that both can be self-actualizing agents. With the meditation group, analysis of the data revealed that three of the POI scales were significant in enhancing growth toward self-actualization: Time Competence, Existentiality, and Spontaneity. Five of the scales for the movement exploration group were significant: Time
Competence, Spontaneity, Inner-directedness, Feeling Reactivity, and Self-Regard. Statistical analysis between experimental groups indicated significance on the Existentiality scale for the Meditation group while the Feeling Reactivity scale was significant for the Movement Exploration group.

A number of studies have examined the effects of the encounter group experience using the POI and three such studies have examined the use of different methods. Bolan (1973) explored differences resulting from two approaches to encounter groups: designed nonverbal activities group in combination with verbal activity and a primarily verbal activity group. Results comparing gain scores for experimental and control groups revealed no significant difference in mean gains on any of the scales between groups. For the experimental group, three scales showed great differential movement in gain scores: Time Competence, Inner-Directedness, and Self-Acceptance.

In a study designed to compare the effects of programmed led encounter groups with led non-programmed encounter groups in promoting personal growth and self-actualization, results (Venino, 1973) showed significant differences between groups on only one of twelve scales, Capacity for Intimate Contact.

An interesting study examining nonspecific factors in weekend encounter groups was conducted by McCardel and Murray (1974). Two control groups were used for this study: an at-home and an on-site. The at-home control group was left at home while the on site control group was led to believe that they were an active training group during the weekend encounter; however, they were only engaged in recreational
activities during the course of the weekend. In addition, three en­
counter groups were compared; highly structured, exercise-oriented,
and non-structured. It was expected that to the extent that nonspeci­
fic factors operated in this weekend experience, the on-site control
group would demonstrate changes similar to those found in the three
encounter groups. Results showed significant overall effects across
the groups and were found for the scales on the POI of: Time Competence,
Inner-Directedness, Acceptance of Aggression, and Capacity for Inti­
mate Contact. Little variation was found between the three encounter
groups when the means were examined. Furthermore, little difference
was found between the on-site control group and the three encounter
groups; however, the at-home control group was significantly different
from one or more of the encounter groups on seven of the twelve POI
scales. The at-home control was significantly different from the on­
site control on three of the scales. These changes were attributed
to numerous nonspecific factors operating in the encounter group through­
out the course of the weekend.

The effects of marathon encounter groups have also been studied
using the POI in assessing self-actualization changes. Results of
several studies employing non treated controls indicate positive results
(Guinan and Foulds, 1970; Foulds, 1971; Young and Jacobson, 1970;
Alperson, Alperson, and Levine, 1971). An interesting sidelight to the
Guinan and Foulds study (1970) was that differences were found between
those subjects who volunteered for the group experience and those from
the same population who volunteered to be in "an experiment." Those
who volunteered for personal growth experiences were depicted as being
less self-actualized than those who volunteered to be in "an experi­
ment." They were described as being more other-directed, less spon­
taneous, having lower self-regard and self-acceptance, and experienc­
ing difficulty in establishing close interpersonal relationships.

Some studies of marathon groups, though, have yielded some negative results (Counseling Staff of University of Massachusetts, 1972; Treppa and Fricke, 1972). The Counseling Staff at the University of Massa­chusetts compared three types of sensitivity groups, contract time restricted, time extended, and marathon with untreated controls. Re­results indicated that no significant differences occurred among the groups for any of the twelve POI scales. The hypothesis that group participation would produce greater change in self-actualization was not supported. The Treppa and Fricke Study (1972) also looked at the comparative effects of a marathon group and a control group on POI test scores and found an interaction effect between groups and test conditions to be significant on only one POI scale, Spontaneity. It was, therefore, concluded by the researchers that the marathon group experience did not yield positive results.

Lately, several empirical studies have presented evidence of longer term effects of marathon groups (Kimball and Gelso, 1974; Jones and Medvene, 1975). The initial study by Kimball and Gelso (1974) studied the self-actualization effects of a weekend marathon of college stu­dents one and four weeks following the group experience. The relation­ship between ego strength and extent of change in self-actualization was also examined. Results indicated that significant differences appeared at first post-test on the Inner-directedness, Spontaneity, Self-Regard,
Self-acceptance, and Synergy scales. At the four weeks post-test three other scales of the POI reached significance suggesting the possibility of a sleeper effect. With regards to ego strength, it was found to be positively related to self-actualization to begin with but was not associated with changes in self-actualization following participation in the group experience. In addition, those high and low in ego strength manifest higher levels of self-actualization to about the same extent.

The Jones and Medvene study (1975) was basically a duplication of the Kimball and Gelso study (1975). Their results, however, differed as they found that marathon groups do not positively effect self-actualization. Gains in self-actualization as a result of a marathon group depends upon an individual’s level of ego strength on entering the group. High and medium ego strength subjects undergo increased positive feelings about self, spontaneity, and synergy. Low ego strength participants do not evidence such gains.

In summary, the POI does seem to be a sensitive instrument in measuring self-actualization levels and growth toward self-actualization in varied types of group experiences. On the basis of the research having been done with the POI, group experiences do somewhat promote therapeutic change as evidenced by this self-report measure. However, an emerging picture is that individuals who gain most from growth group experiences as measured by the POI are those who are normal as opposed to having psychological deficits (Foulds, 1970). No studies appeared to examine the relationship between group process of members and their level of self-actualization.
BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY AND GROUP EXPERIENCE

A review of the research indicates that the RI has been used in basically three areas in relationship to group experiences: counselor training and supervision, teacher education, and group counseling.

In reference to training and supervision, Gray (1969) studied the effect of group process in counselor trainee's integration of empathy, positive regard, and genuineness. Subjects were practicum students in counselor training at a mid-western university. In addition, control groups from counselor education were used. The California Psychological Inventory and the RI were the measures used to test change and relationship as a result of practicum student's participation in a basic encounter group. Results indicated: 1) little correlation between the two inventories, 2) no significant variations between high and low functioning trainees related to growth after training, 3) no significant differences between controls and practicum students after the experimental time period, and 4) significant changes in criteria measured in the trainees after the experimental period.

Desrosiers (1967) designed a study to determine whether change in the self-concept of counseling trainees is a function of therapeutic conditions offered by their supervisors and their supervisory groups. The subjects were thirty-three graduate students in counseling psychology who were enrolled in an introductory practicum course. These subjects met weekly in small groups and were facilitated by a supervisor who was a doctoral candidate in counseling. The main ob-
jective of the group was to assist counselor trainees to become more aware of their reactions. Instruments used included the RI, Rotter's Incomplete Sentence Blank and Truax' Rating Scales. Findings were interpreted that change in self-concept was related to level of therapeutic conditions. Furthermore, level of regard and unconditionality of regard seemed to play a significant role in change in self-concept while personality changes were not related to level of therapeutic conditions.

Two studies have examined the effects of different types of supervision using the RI. Lanning (1971) investigated the relation between individual and group supervision and three dependent measures: trainee's perception of the supervisory relationship, trainee's expectations of the counseling relationship, and client perceptions of the trainee's counseling relationship. Subjects consisted of counselor trainees and supervisors and high school clients. Little evidence was found yielding one method of supervision being significantly different from the other though differences among supervisors were found between each of the methods of supervision. Findings also indicated that more than 50 percent of the variance in how a trainee expected to be perceived by his/her clients was accounted for by knowing how he/she perceived his/her supervisor.

Bradley (1974) studied a modified Interpersonal Process Recall technique as an influence on four dimensions of the RI: level of regard, unconditionality of regard, empathic understanding, and congruence. Subjects for the study were advanced graduate students enrolled in a counseling practicum course. It was hypothesized that groups which
underwent the experimental treatment would demonstrate greater growth on the four measured conditions of counseling. An analysis of covariance revealed that there was no significant difference between the groups on the four dimensions of the RI.

Hansen (1963) conducted research to determine the extent to which the level of the supervisor-trainee relationship is related to the trainee's self-awareness and the trainee's level of experiencing. Population for the study consisted of twenty-eight trainees in practicum who were randomly divided into three groups with three different supervisors. The RI assessed the supervisory relationship while the other instruments used were Stern's Activities Index, the Counselor Self-Questionnaire, and Gendlin's Experiencing Scale. The trainees who perceived the highest experiencing scores perceived their supervisory relationship highest while the reverse was true for the group of trainees achieving the lowest experiencing score. Basically, each of the three supervisory groups established different relationships with their trainee groups, and these relationships seemed to be related to differences in trainee's behaviors. In regards to perceptions of the relationship, one group perceived a good relationship being related to their increase in self-awareness; in the second group it was related to a decrease; the third group failed to demonstrate significant correlations. Little or no significant relationship existed between the trainees level of self-awareness and the supervisor's perceptions or discrepancy in perceptions of the relationship.

The RI has also been used in teacher education as it relates to group work as Sutton (1968) developed a study to assess whether
sensitivity training for teachers would result in changes of student perceptions of teachers. These perceptions were examined in relation to the teacher's effectiveness, as measured by the Pupil Rating of Teacher Scale and the student-teacher relationship, as measured by the RI. Both tests were administered twice, once, prior to the sensitivity training and again, five weeks later upon completion of twenty-five hours of sensitivity group experience. Subjects were 414 seventh and eighth grade students in parochial schools in a large Catholic diocese. Procedures involved dividing the teachers into three groups, the experimental group whose teachers volunteered for and received sensitivity training, the comparison group whose teachers volunteered for but did not receive sensitivity training, and another comparison group whose teachers did not volunteer for nor receive sensitivity training. Findings did not support the hypothesis that sensitivity training would bring about changes in student perceptions of teachers. Overall, regressive results were found from pre-test to post-test in all three groups. Students perceived their teachers less favorably upon completion of the five weeks period whether the teachers had experienced sensitivity training or not. However, the students of the experimental group and the first comparison group showed significantly less regressions than the second comparison group suggesting that volunteer teachers for sensitivity training are perceived by their students in a more favorable manner than non-volunteer teachers.

Boller (1971) and Cooper (1975) were also interested in the effects of sensitivity training and teaching and conducted similar studies. One difference, though, resided in the fact that Boller did not use
a control group. In his study, twenty-four teachers went through a one-day workshop designed to introduce the teachers to a wide variety of group approaches and promote self, group, and other awareness. The subjects completed the RI one week prior to the experience and again two weeks afterwards. A "group form" of the inventory was modified so that a measure of anticipated relationships as well as outcome could be taken. Boller anticipated that upon completion of the one day workshop, teacher's expectations of the type of relationship they might encounter in a sensitivity group would differ significantly from an assessed evaluation. Results of mean differences indicated significant change in the four attitude scores concerning the level of relationship as evidenced by pre and post-test RI scores. In essence, the relationship perceived by the teachers developing in sensitivity groups were significantly more positive than had been anticipated.

Cooper (1975), meanwhile, was interested in the impact of a marathon encounter on teacher student relationships from the student's perspective. This study did make use of a control group as the RI was administered to two classes of university students at the beginning and the end of the academic term. One class, the experimental group, participated in a 24 hour marathon at the outset of the course while the second class, the control group, did not. The control group, though, was provided with group seminars to control for absolute group time. Findings revealed that students in the experimental group, who had participated in the marathon group experience, showed significant increases in their perceptions of their teachers on the sub-scales
of the teacher's level of regard and congruence plus there was movement in the direction of significance for empathy. Contrasting, the control subjects demonstrated no change on any of the RI scales.

Reviewing the research with the RI and group therapy, Abramowitz (1974) investigated psychological mindedness as a predictor of outcome in both insight and non-insight oriented group therapies. Subjects were twenty-six undergraduates who indicated interest in participating in an interpersonal adjustment group. They were administered a battery of reliability and outcome measures including the RI, an anxiety inventory, an alienation and self-esteem scale, and a pressing problem severity index. Prior to the initial group session, subjects were divided into either an insight or non-insight oriented group where a single therapist conducted a ten session fifteen hour treatment. Findings indicated that members of the insight oriented group, who had greater psychological sophistication, made more psychosocial gains while the members of the non-insight oriented group fared no better than less psychologically minded members. In reference to perceived therapist relatability as being a moderator of change, doubtful results were found.

Another study using the RI with group therapy was conducted by Roback and Strassberg (1975) with hospitalized chronic schizophrenics as they studied the relationship between a patient's perception of therapist-offered conditions and therapeutic outcome. Perceptions were measured by the RI, while outcome was assessed by the subjects pre-post test results on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), Self-concept Checklist, the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS), and by nurses through behavioral observations on the Hospital
Adjustment Scale (HAS) and the Wittborn Psychiatric Rating Scale. On the pre-test, only the Self-concept Checklist revealed that high and low scores on the RI differed. Upon post-test, the HAS and the WAIS revealed differences; however, after subjects were divided into high and low outcome groups, no significant differences were found on the RI. It was thereby concluded that perceived therapeutic conditions were unrelated to outcome with this specific population.

Using a population of deaf college students who participated in a series of 20 counseling sessions, using the RI Stewart (1970) focused on the perceptions of both client and counselor in group counseling and analyzed the association between these perceptions and independent ratings of group counseling outcome. Stewart discovered significant differences between both deaf subjects and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship in group counseling. In addition, deaf subject perceptions of the counseling relationship tended to be relatively consistent, but counselor perceptions significantly varied from initiation to termination of the group. It also revealed no significant correlations between both deaf subjects and counselor perceptions of the relationship and independent ratings of group counseling outcome.

Lee (1969) was interested in the effect a basic group encounter experience would have on changing the self-concepts of college low achievers and effecting certain conditions of interpersonal relationships with peers. Both experimental and control groups were used. The experimental group was made up of students who volunteered for and received the group encounter experience while the control group consisted of students who volunteered for but did not receive the group
experience. For each of the subjects, a RI and one of the Semantic Differential measurements, others' perceived self-concept, was completed by a roommate. The subjects completed the self and social self-concept of the SD measurement during a pre and post-test. Results indicated an appreciable change in the interpersonal relationship between experimental students and peers from pre to post-test. Statistically significant difference was found between the two groups in regard to the total effect of change from pre to post-test. It was also noted that the subtests of empathy, congruence, and unconditional regard yielded change in a positive direction for the experimental group. Additionally, self-concept changes were found to be positive for students participating in the intensive group experience.

Also investigating the group experience was Friedman (1969), who studied the effects of sensitivity training on various aspects of college student personality. Three groups were used for the study: Experimental Group A, which received five weeks of sensitivity training; Experimental Group B, which received thirteen weeks of sensitivity training; and a Control group, which received normal class instruction. The RI and the Sixteen Personality Factor Test (16PF) was administered to both experimental groups while only the 16PF was administered to the control group. Basically, two conclusions were made: 1) No significant personality change was found on the 16PF for any of the groups; 2) Perceptual change using the RI was more for Experimental Group B as compared to Experimental Group A. It was concluded that sensitivity training does effect perceptions commensurate with the amount of time spent in the group.
The preceding research has indicated that the RI has been used in conjunction with varied group experiences: counselor training and supervision, teacher education, and group counseling. The inventory has made it possible to study critical variables of the counseling relationship associated with positive therapeutic change as assessed from the perceptions of the client or counselor. While focusing on the importance of the counselor/client relationship and how it is experienced, the RI has been used quite effectively. It has helped to lend support to the notion that it is the interperceptions of either the counselor or client which assist in forming significant relationships.

**Group Process in Professional Development in Nursing Education**

Two concerns surrounding nursing education have been the provision of an environment whereby the nursing student may reach toward the fulfillment of his/her potential and the development of an emotional climate to encourage a patient's level of wellness (Gunter, 1969). These two concerns, however, are interrelated since the nurses will affect the emotional climate to be established with the patient. As a result, Patterson (1966) points out that it is extremely important then to focus on the professional development of the nurse.

Smith (1966) states that the nursing setting and experience are highly intense. Mauksh (1963) notes that this awareness produces an increase in the nurses' anxiety as a person functioning in an unfamiliar environment. Dye (1974) concludes that the student, there-
fore, must learn to cope with a repertoire of stereotypical, role-
dictated behaviors as demonstrated by staff and faculty members.

According to Simms (1965), deficits in human interaction serve
to contribute to the phenomenon of adjustment anxiety among nursing
students. Dye (1974) goes on to point out that training experiences
are needed to enhance and maintain, rather than destroy, the student's
will to help as he/she acquires necessary knowledge and skills.

Within the nursing literature, the increasing involvement of
nursing students as members and leaders of small groups has been doc­
cumented (McLaughlin, White, and Byfield, 1974; Loomis, 1979). Marram
(1978) identifies the group as being a powerful tool in assisting the
professional development of nurses to become aware of 1) their moti­
vation for leading groups, 2) their capacities and limitations as
leaders, and 3) how others view the nurses participation in the group.

Geitgey (1966) studied the effects of sensitivity training on
the performance of students in associate degree programs of nursing
education related specifically to quality of nursing care, interper­
sonal relations with patients, teachers and peers, grades, and attri­
tion rates. An experimental group was provided with thirty hours
sensitivity training within one week prior to the start of school plus
follow up training one day per month for four months. A control
group received instructions on human relations training during the
same hours the experimental group experienced the intensive training.
Statistically significant findings at the .05 level, favoring the
experimental group, existed between groups for: patient and instructor
evaluation of nursing care, interpersonal relations with instructors
and with peers. Trends favored the experimental group in regards to attrition rates while no trends were identified in reference to grades.

Cohn (1972) and Breen (1974) were both interested in the effects of group counseling with first year nursing students. Cohn tested the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between group counseled and non-counseled nursing students in increasing dogmatism, authoritarianism, and in improving self-concept. Using client centered group counseling, Cohn found evidence that group counseling may be effective in stimulating growth among beginning nursing students in the areas of decreased dogmatism and authoritarianism, improving self-concept and interpersonal relationships. In addition, it can be suggested that interaction dynamics inherent in the nursing classroom does not alone provide significant improvement in students' attitudes toward others and themselves.

Breen (1974), meanwhile, investigated effects of group counseling using the theoretical framework of Ellis' A-B-C theory of personality with three groups of first year student nurses. Group one consisted of interventionist group counseling lasting an entire academic year, 22 sessions; group two consisted of interventionist group counseling for one semester, 11 sessions; group three consisted of a control group receiving no counseling during the academic year. Results indicated that interventionist group counseling, when compared to no group counseling, demonstrated trend differences in behavioral and personal dimensions. Furthermore, one semester of group counseling was suggested to be sufficient enough to produce desired results.

Keenan (1974) raised the question of whether student nurse popu-
lations who were exposed to the humanistic experiences of sensitivity training, informal sessions, field trips would bring about a more positive attitude and better interpersonal relationships as evidenced by greater self-motivation, achievement, and professional growth. A control group utilizing a randomly selected group of freshman nursing students was also used for the study. Findings indicated that participants in the humanistic experiences did show a significant gain in self-concept as measured by the Edwards Friendship Scale. Grade point averages of the experimental and control group, examined over a period of time, indicated a possible correlation between self-concept and improved achievement. Measurements of self-actualization as measured by the POI were not significant between groups.

Moaley and Peterson (1974) conducted a study similar to that of Keenan (1974) as they investigated the self-actualization of nursing students resulting from a course in psychiatric nursing, which consisted of a personal growth group experience. Results identified that inner-directedness was a major area of personality change resulting from participation in a psychiatric nursing course consisting of group experiences. Nine of ten other factors also showed improvement from pre to post-course levels.

Moore (1977) was interested in the relationship of group counseling and personality factors to attrition in nursing students. General findings revealed that neither cognitive nor affective group counseling significantly reduced attrition rates when compared to nursing students who received no counseling. Findings, however, did reveal scholastic, vocational interest, and personality factors to be related
An overview of the research in Nursing Education indicates that growth group experiences have proven to be effective in promoting the professional development of student nurses. Furthermore, numerous theorists have advocated that it is extremely important for the nursing student to know oneself and one's interpersonal patterns. Schutz (1967) has echoed the viewpoint that the dynamic processes of growth should be initiated to help the student transcend mere intellectualizing and become a better, more fulfilled person. In attempting to achieve the goal of quality Nursing Education, groups have resulted in positive effects upon the nursing student as evidenced by the research.

**Summary**

This chapter reviewed the literature on the instruments used in this study and on group process in nursing education. Chapter three described the methodology of the study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This study was initiated to explore the extent to which the level of the group counselor-group member relationship is related to the group member's self-actualization during a growth group experience. The target population identified by the research was fourth year nursing students at The Ohio State University School of Nursing who were participating in a group experience as a part of a required course. The research also examined the implications for counselors in regards to the self-actualizing group members.

Setting

The setting for this study was The Ohio State University, a comprehensive state institution and land grant university, which carries on numerous instructional, research, and public service activities. Geographically, the school is located in the central part of the state in the city of Columbus, Ohio. During Autumn quarter of the 1979-1980 academic school year 57,938 students attended one of five university locations. The majority of students, 54,102, attended the main campus while 3,836 were enrolled at the regional campuses. Undergraduates of The Ohio State University may enroll in no less than 18 degree-granting colleges, schools and divisions and may select from more than 225 majors.
in planning their baccalaureate programs (Minnick, 1979).

**Population and Sample**

The general population to which this research study was limited consisted of 747 students enrolled in the undergraduate nursing program at The Ohio State University School of Nursing during Autumn quarter of the 1979-1980 academic year. The actual population for the study consisted of 287 senior nursing students at The Ohio State University enrolled Autumn quarter of 1979. The program offered by the School of Nursing is approved by the State of Ohio Board of Nursing Education and Nurse Registration, and the baccalaureate degree program is accredited by the National League for Nursing Department of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs. The four year course of study leads to a Bachelor of Science degree and graduates of the School of Nursing qualify for admission to licensing examination.

The sample was comprised of forty-two full-time senior nursing students who had registered for the Nursing 596 course: "Individual and Families in Psychiatric Mental-Health Crises." A stated course requirement was that those students enrolled in the course must participate in a personal growth group to be led by a group counselor. Forty-two of forty-four students who completed the course Autumn quarter agreed to participate in the study. Two members completed the course but did not participate in the study. A demographic description of the subjects is presented as Figure 1.

Forty-four subjects initially agreed to participate in the study and were randomly assigned to one of six personal growth groups by the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Profile of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in School</strong>: All 42 subjects were seniors majoring in Nursing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong>: Range=20-32 years  Mean=21.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single 34=81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married 8=19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 37=88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 5=12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point Average</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-4.0 12=29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.5 18=42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-3.0 12=29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group Mean GPA=3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Preference</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic 19=45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant 13=31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish 1=2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 9=22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

facilitator of the group dynamics module. The subjects were randomly assigned into six separate groups, and group leaders were randomly assigned to facilitate one of the groups. Initially, there was a total of between 7-8 members for each group. However, two subjects in Group 4 declined to participate in the study: one voiced objections after an initial testing session, the other subject withdrew after the second measure was administered. Because of these dropouts, groups were thereby composed of between 5-8 members who agreed to participate in the study. This eventually left a total of 42 subjects.
subjects who participated in and completed the research study. A description of subjects in each group is listed below in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 group members</td>
<td>7 group members</td>
<td>8 group members</td>
<td>5 group members (2 declined to participate)</td>
<td>7 group members</td>
<td>7 group members</td>
<td>42 group members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Grouping

Figure 2

Instrumentation

Two instruments were selected for use in the study. The **Personal Orientation Inventory (POI)** was used to measure self-actualization. The **Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (RI)** was used to measure counselor-client relationship.

**Personal Orientation Inventory (POI)**

The POI was developed by Shostrom (1963) to assess levels of self-actualization. It consists of 150 paired, forced-choice items which are scored twice; once, for the two basic scales of time competency and inner directedness; and again for ten subscales which measure significant ingredients of self-actualization. A copy of the POI is located
in Appendix.

For the purposes of this study an overall score for self-actualizing was used by the researcher. The two basic scales of inner-directedness and time competence were singled out as being of major concern. Shostrom (1976) provides an explanation of both the inner-directed and time competent individual.

**Time Competent (Tc)**-This individual is capable of living in the present and is not controlled by past life experiences, nor pre-occupied with future goals, expectations, events. The past and the future are woven together into the present in meaningful continuity. The time competent person appears to be less burdened by guilt, resentments, and regrets than a non self-actualizing individual. Scores falling above the mean indicate that the individual is probably functioning relatively effectively in his/her development toward self-actualization. A low score indicates that this individual is basically time incompetent and does not discriminate well between past of future.

**Inner-directed (I)**-The inner-directed person possesses a significant degree of independence and obeys his/her own "inner" voices. The source of direction is guided by internal motivation as opposed to external influences. A low score seems to indicate that one is oversensitive to others opinions and, therefore, employs manipulative behaviors to seek the constant approval of others. Again, scores falling above the mean indicate that this type of individual is probably functioning effectively in his/her development toward self-actualization.

Other subscales included in the POI were not used in this study. Knapp (1965, 1974) has indicated that the two major scales are the most
representative measures of self-actualization. In addition, the time competence and inner-directed scales do not have overlapping items as they represent two independent dimensions. With regard to the subscales, there are a number of overlapping items which make interpretation of subscale intercorrelations difficult to make. However, as Bloxom (1972) points out, the two major scales are free of this problem if used by themselves.

Validity data indicate that the POI is a good measure of the self-actualizing individual. In a study done by Shostrom (1964) tests administered to two groups of individuals, selected self-actualizers and non self-actualizers as nominated by clinical psychologists, indicated that the self-actualizing group scored significantly higher on eleven out of twelve scales on the POI. Overall, studies by Fox, Knapp, and Michael, (1968); Zaccaria and Weir, (1966); Weir and Gade, (1969); and Fisher, (1973), indicate that the POI is a valid measure of the more fully-functioning individual since self-actualizers tend to score significantly higher on the POI scales than non self-actualizers.

Reliability data (Buros, 1978) indicate correlations range from a .55 to a high of .85. Three subscales can be considered substandard: anger, nature of man, and feeling reactivity. A possible explanation for anger and feeling reactivity is that they are affect oriented and, therefore, tend to be transient since they fluctuate from day to day. In a study by Klavetter and Mogar (1967) reliability coefficients for the major scales of time-competence and inner-directedness were .71 and .77, while subscale coefficients ranged from a low of .52 to a high of .82. In a study of nursing students who were retested over a period
of one year, Ilardi and May (1968) reported correlation coefficients ranging from .32 to .74.

**Relationship Inventory (RI)**

The RI was developed by Barrett-Lennard (1962) at the University of Chicago. It is a rating scale for measuring the nature of the counseling relationship as defined by Roger's Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change (1958). The inventory consists of two separate and parallel forms which were both used in this study. The first, the client form, measures variables of therapist response from the group member's frame of reference. Example: "She (counselor) respects me." The group member records his/her perceptions of the nature of the relationship with the group counselor by responding to 69 statements about the group counselor according to how strongly he/she feels each statement is true or not true. Three grades of "yes" responses, represented by +1, +2, +3 and three grades of "no" responses, represented by -1, -2, -3 were identified by the respondents.

The counselor form is completed by the group counselor as she responds to the same 69 items on the inventory according to how she experiences the group members. Example: "I respect her/him (client)." The form is identical to the client's form with the exception of a change in pronouns. Again, three grades of "yes" and "no" response identical to the client form are identified by the group counselor.

In this study, four variables of therapist response were measured by the RI: Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and
Congruence. An overall score was compiled with scores for each of the subscales. Scoring procedures involved face value weighting of the numerical answers for each of the four RI dimensions on a 1-6 scale. Totals were then summed to give a subscore for each variable while subscores were summed to yield a total score for the RI. Since some of the items in the inventory were stated in a theoretically negative direction, they had to be reversed prior to summing the sub and total score. A copy of the counselor and client form of the RI is located in Appendixes C and D.

Content validity for the inventory was accomplished by having five client-centered counselors classify each item on the RI as either a positive or negative indicator of the variable in question. Perfect agreement was reached between all the judges in classifying an item as '+' or '-' on all except four items. Three of the items were discarded in the original form of the measure (Barrett-Lennard, 1962). Having been used extensively in research, the RI has been demonstrated to be related to client improvement by Barrett-Lennard and Jewell, (1966) and, thereby, be a valid measure.

Barrett-Lennard (1962) reported split-half reliability coefficients based on client rating for four RI scales ranging from .82 to .93. With reference to test-retest reliabilities, results were as follows: Level of Regard, r=.84; Empathy, r=.89; Congruence, r=.86; Unconditionality of Regard, r=.90.

Procedures

Before the initial group session, both group members and group
leaders were oriented as to the purpose of the personal growth group by the coordinator of the group dynamics module. It was stated that the purpose was to allow group members an opportunity to work on current growth issues. The group itself was considered to be a system, and members would be required to observe, participate in, and evaluate the group process. Actual objectives of the growth group were presented according to the following outline.

1. To develop increased awareness and understanding of group dynamics and the effect of one's own participation on the group process.
   A. Identify group needs and goals, and relate one's own needs and goals to these.
   B. Assume responsibility for the group's productivity.
   C. Identify and practice techniques enabling group members to pursue group goals.
   D. Participate verbally in group discussions.
   E. Question ideas and beliefs in the interest of promoting understanding.
   F. Try to communicate ideas so that they are understood by others.
   G. Try to understand others' ideas.

2. To explore the validity of one's own and others' behavior.
   A. Share verbally one's own experiences with others in the group.
   B. Try to identify concepts which might help the group to arrive at an understanding about the issues under consideration.
C. Try to think about own experiences in terms of the concepts identified by the entire group or by the group leader.

3. To increase sensitivity to others.
   A. Listen to and try to understand the meaning of others' communication, including their thoughts and feelings.
   B. Respond to others' communications.
   C. Thoughtfully consider others' ideas, especially when they are foreign or contradictory to own. Try to understand why others think or feel as they do.
   D. Evaluate own effect on others, and how others effect self.

The groups spent time dealing with personal growth issues. Some topics the personal growth groups dealt with but were not limited to were: values and morals, professional future, social relationships, personal relationships, social activities, dating, sex, and marriage.

Groups were relatively unstructured. Structured exercises were not a part of the group process. There was an absence of kissing, touching, expression of physical attraction in the group. A general discussion was the most typical mode of communication. It was very rare that the group used a type of formal go-round. Rarely did one individual monopolize the group, and dialogue between group members was not unusual.

The group leaders emphasized the importance of molding the group and understanding the process of group formation and development. Group member self-exploration was encouraged by group leaders. Members were also invited to freely interact with one another and seek feedback. An emphasis was placed on an awareness and understanding of one's feel-
ings, thoughts, and behaviors.

In addition, it was also stressed that the group members were expected to attend group meetings regularly and to be accountable to the group when absent. During the nine week period in which the groups were conducted, the researcher and coordinator of the group module met with the group leaders three times in group sessions to assure that the objectives of the group were being adhered to and that group procedures were consistent.

Groups were conducted approximately one and one-half hours per week for nine consecutive weeks in small classrooms in the Medical Complex at The Ohio State University. The same explanation of the purposes and objectives of the group were given to all group leaders and group members.

In the selection of group leaders to conduct the personal growth groups, consideration was given experienced group facilitators. All of the facilitators were females and had completed both bachelor and master degrees in the helping professions. At the same time, all of the group leaders were successfully working with clients in a helping profession setting. Each facilitator had completed at least one successful group experience and had previous experience working with clients individually. The facilitators were faculty members but not of these students at this time.

Data Collection

Prior to the study, permission to proceed was sought and granted from the Human Subjects Committee and the Director of the Nursing
School at The Ohio State University. In an orientation session before the initiation of the testing, subjects were given an oral presentation by the researcher explaining the nature of the research study. Subjects were further informed as to their role and the role of the researcher. Verbal permission from participants was secured, and subjects were informed that results would remain anonymous and be treated with complete confidentiality. Participants were told that the outcome of the study would be available from the researcher upon request. An outline of the oral presentation is located in the Appendix.

The data were gathered over a period of nine weeks during Autumn quarter of 1979. Data from the POI were obtained in six different group sessions during the first meeting of the initial growth group session.

POI test instructions from the researcher were given by the group leaders to group participants according to the following format:

1. Administer the POI to the group during the initial 30 minutes of the first group session.

2. Have the group members complete the information in the upper right hand corner of the answer sheet.

3. Ask the group to read through each statement just once and then respond immediately by putting down the answer they feel is true or mostly true on the provided answer sheet. Reassure the group that there are no right or wrong answers. Please request that they do not write in the test booklet and that they respond to all items.

4. Establish a time limit of approximately 30 minutes. Doing so encourages the group members to respond to their first impulse and decreases the likelihood of pondering over a response.

5. Please collect the POI test booklets and answer sheets after everyone is finished. Proceed with the group.

Previous arrangements were made by the researcher to collect the
data from the leaders. Those subjects who were absent from the POI testing session were contacted immediately by the researcher and requested to complete the POI according to the same format as above. All subjects complied.

For the RI, data were collected from group members during the final 15-20 minutes of group sessions three, six, and nine. Group leaders began to fill out the counselor form of the RI during this same time span, but extra time was needed to complete their task since they needed to respond individually to each group member. As a result, group leaders were requested to complete the remainder of the Counselor Form of the RI as soon as possible upon the completion of these group sessions. No group leader took longer than one day to complete the RI. All group leaders followed these directives. Actual test instructions from the researcher were given to the group leaders and group participants according to the following format.

1. Please take the RI during the final 20 minutes of group sessions three, six, and nine. Group members respond to the client form, and group counselors respond to the counselor form.

2. Group members: Please do not write in the test booklets. Record your answers on the provided answer sheet (client form) and put your initials in the upper right hand corner of the form. Group Counselors: Please record your answers in the test booklet of the RI (counselor form). Record your name and group sessions number in the spaces provided. When responding to each group member, put group members initials at the top of each column on the test booklet.

3. Please read each statement through once and respond according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. Record your first impulse. NOTE: Remember to respond to how each of you perceives your relationship (group members with group counselor and group counselor with each group member) in the present and not how you would like the relationship to be or thinks it should be.
4. When the inventory has been completed, put the answer sheets (for group members) or test booklets (for group counselors) in the provided envelope and then seal the envelope. Group Counselors: please collect all the materials.

Previous arrangements were made by the researcher to collect the data from the group leaders. Subjects who were absent from the testing sessions were immediately contacted by the researcher and requested to complete the RI according to the same format as above before the next group session. All absent subjects complied.

Data Analysis

Answer sheets for both the POI and RI were hand scored and a personal data summary sheet was developed for each group. Scores were transcribed onto IBM cards and processed at The Ohio State University computer processing center. Before submitting the data cards to statistical analysis, data cards were rechecked to insure that all data was copied correctly. A research consultant from the Educational Research and Consultation Service in Educational Foundations and Research at The Ohio State University assisted in writing up the computer programs for the research questions. The research consultant also provided assistance in the interpretation of the data.

Research Question 1: An SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) computer program was selected to analyze the data for this research question. Group member and counselor perceptions of each of the RI measures were analyzed separately. Pearson Product Moment Correlations were calculated to investigate the relationship of each of these measures at three and six, three and nine, and six and nine
weeks. In addition, at each time period of three, six, and nine weeks, group member perceptions were correlated with group counselor perceptions for each RI measure. Means were also computed using this program. .05 level of confidence was accepted as the level of significance.

Research Questions 2 and 3: ANOVA (analysis of variance) and CO-VARIANCE including repeated measures were selected as the appropriate statistical techniques to examine for these research questions. The computer program selected for analysis was BMDP2V, a sub-program within the Biomedical Computer Program package. Means and standard deviations were examined. The F statistic was used to determine significant differences, and the .05 level of confidence was selected as the acceptable level of statistical significance with all comparisons. The ANOVAS were used to test main effects for three sources of variation: group, status, and time and any higher order interactions between/among these variables.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This study was conducted for the purpose of determining relationships between self-actualization of fourth year nursing students participating in a growth group experience and perceptions of the counseling relationship held by both the group member and group counselor.

The POI was administered to 42 senior nursing students who were randomly divided into six groups of between 5-8 members each. Each group was conducted for a period of nine weeks for approximately one and one-half hours per week and was facilitated by an experienced female counselor. Upon completion of the third, sixth, and ninth group sessions, group members and group counselors completed the RI measures. Group members filled out the client form of the questionnaire thereby recording their perceptions of the counseling relationship with regards to the facilitator. Group counselors filled out the counselor form of the RI and assessed their feelings toward each individual group member.

For the purposes of this study, research questions were posed. Both SPSS and BMDP computer programs were used to analyze the data. This chapter includes the data obtained and the statistical procedures followed.
Results of Research Questions

Question 1. What relationship exists between group member, group counselor, and group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as measured by the RI at three, six, and nine weeks?

Results: For the purposes of this research question, small group means of the six training groups are first presented in Tables 1 and 2 and contain scores of both member and counselor perceptions of the RI. An examination of the Total RI scores in Tables 1 and 2 indicated that in group 1, the group members mean score was 292.50, 300.37, and 327.50 at three, six, and nine weeks. The group counselor mean score was 322.00, 331.12, and 350.50 for these three test intervals. Results of group 2 revealed that at three and six weeks, Total RI scores for group members were 290.28 and 274.85, and 253.00 at nine weeks. Group counselor perceptions for group 2 were 258.00, 273.00, and 275.42 on the repeated measures. The Total RI scores for groups 3 and 4 indicated that group counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship were 361.62, 332.00, 341.00 and 266.00, 284.40, 265.40 respectively at time periods three, six, and nine. Group member perceptions at three, six, and nine weeks for the same groups were 319.25, 314.00, 319.50 and 260.00, 243.40, 254.80. Groups 5 and 6 showed mean scores of 308.00, 310.28, 299.00 and 299.85, 299.57, 295.00 for the Total RI scores of group members, and 292.57, 258.00, 265.57 and 270.28, 280.71, 280.42 for group facilitators.

Results for the group member RI sub-measures of Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence for group 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Measures-3 weeks</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>79.95</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>89.87</td>
<td>73.20</td>
<td>85.28</td>
<td>88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>71.57</td>
<td>77.25</td>
<td>66.40</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>70.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>66.87</td>
<td>62.14</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>69.14</td>
<td>65.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>75.12</td>
<td>73.57</td>
<td>83.62</td>
<td>60.40</td>
<td>76.14</td>
<td>75.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>292.50</td>
<td>290.28</td>
<td>319.35</td>
<td>260.00</td>
<td>308.00</td>
<td>299.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Measures-6 weeks</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>83.37</td>
<td>78.42</td>
<td>86.37</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>86.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>69.75</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>66.40</td>
<td>76.28</td>
<td>72.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>69.12</td>
<td>60.28</td>
<td>67.12</td>
<td>54.40</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>78.12</td>
<td>69.85</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>73.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>300.37</td>
<td>274.85</td>
<td>314.00</td>
<td>243.40</td>
<td>310.28</td>
<td>299.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Measures-9 weeks</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>93.12</td>
<td>74.85</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>70.20</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>83.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>75.62</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>78.87</td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td>74.57</td>
<td>70.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>65.28</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>85.50</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>84.25</td>
<td>62.20</td>
<td>74.14</td>
<td>74.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>327.50</td>
<td>253.00</td>
<td>319.50</td>
<td>254.80</td>
<td>299.00</td>
<td>295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI Measures-3 weeks</td>
<td>Group 1 (N=1)</td>
<td>Group 2 (N=1)</td>
<td>Group 3 (N=1)</td>
<td>Group 4 (N=1)</td>
<td>Group 5 (N=1)</td>
<td>Group 6 (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>87.75</td>
<td>93.71</td>
<td>110.87</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>95.85</td>
<td>75.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>59.20</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>58.71</td>
<td>76.12</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td>63.28</td>
<td>63.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>55.71</td>
<td>87.62</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>70.42</td>
<td>64.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>322.00</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>361.62</td>
<td>266.00</td>
<td>292.57</td>
<td>270.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Measures-6 weeks</th>
<th>Group 1 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 3 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 4 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 5 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 6 (N=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>94.50</td>
<td>93.28</td>
<td>98.75</td>
<td>84.60</td>
<td>87.57</td>
<td>81.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>78.37</td>
<td>59.14</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>64.80</td>
<td>50.71</td>
<td>66.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>74.12</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td>70.50</td>
<td>60.40</td>
<td>57.28</td>
<td>66.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>84.12</td>
<td>56.28</td>
<td>79.75</td>
<td>79.60</td>
<td>62.42</td>
<td>66.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>331.12</td>
<td>273.00</td>
<td>332.00</td>
<td>289.40</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>280.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Measures-9 weeks</th>
<th>Group 1 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 3 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 4 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 5 (N=1)</th>
<th>Group 6 (N=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>99.50</td>
<td>98.85</td>
<td>99.50</td>
<td>76.80</td>
<td>85.85</td>
<td>78.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>81.75</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>84.37</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>74.87</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>63.14</td>
<td>69.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>92.25</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>82.25</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>66.57</td>
<td>67.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>350.50</td>
<td>275.42</td>
<td>341.00</td>
<td>265.40</td>
<td>265.57</td>
<td>280.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
yielded results of: 79.95, 71.00, 66.87 75.12 at three weeks; 83.37, 69.175, 69.12, 78.12 at six weeks; 93.12, 75.62, 73.25, 85.50 at 9 weeks. Group counselor perceptions at the same test intervals were: 87.75, 76.75, 70.00, 87.50; 94.50, 78.37, 74.12, 84.12; 99.50, 81.75, 77.00, 92.25.

In group 2, at three, six, and nine weeks, group counselors scored Level of Regard 93.71, 93.28, 98.85; Unconditionality of Regard 47.00, 59.14, 53.57; Empathy 58.71, 64.71, 62.00; Congruence 55.71, 56.28, 61.00. Group members scored the counseling relationship at three, six, and nine weeks 83.00, 78.42, 74.85 for Level of Regard; 71.57, 66.28, 57.85 for Unconditionality of Regard; 62.14, 60.28, 55.28 for Empathy; 73.57, 69.85, 65.00 for Congruence.

Group 3 revealed that at three, six, and nine weeks the group counselor scores for Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence were 110.87, 87.00, 76.12, 87.62 and 98.75, 83.00, 70.50, 79.75 and 99.50, 84.37, 74.87, 82.25 respectively. Group member scores for the four variables were 89.87, 77.25, 68.25, 83.62 at three weeks, 86.37, 78.50, 67.12, 82.00 at six weeks, and 88.87, 78.87, 67.50, 84.25 at nine weeks.

The findings for group 4 showed that for Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard group member scores at the three test intervals were as follows: 73.20 and 66.40 at three weeks, 67.00 and 66.40 at six weeks, 70.20 and 65.40 at nine weeks. Empathy and Congruence yielded scores of 60.00 and 60.40, 54.40 and 55.60, 57.00 and 62.20. Group counselor scores for group 4 were 80.40, 84.60 and 76.80 for Level of Regard; 59.20, 64.80, and 64.60 for Unconditionality of Regard;
57.80, 60.40, and 54.00 for Empathy; 68.60, 79.60, and 67.00 for Congruence.

The results of group 5 revealed that group counselors scored Level of Regard 95.85, 87.57, 85.85 at three, six, and nine weeks. Group members scored the same variable 85.28, 87.00, 85.00. Unconditionality of Regard was scored 63.00, 50.71, 50.00 by group counselors while group members recorded scores of 77.42, 76.28, and 74.57 at three, six, and nine weeks. Group members recorded the following scores for Empathy and Congruence respectively: 69.14, 76.14 at three weeks; 70.00, 77.00 at six weeks; 65.28, 74.14 at nine weeks. Counselor perceptions for the same variables were: 63.28, 70.42 at three weeks; 57.28, 62.42 at six weeks; 63.14, 66.57 at nine weeks.

For group 6, group member mean scores for the repeated RI measure were: Level of Regard 88.00, 86.85, 83.14; Unconditionality of Regard 70.14, 72.28, 70.57; Empathy 65.85, 67.00, 67.00; Congruence 75.85, 73.42, 74.28. Again, at three, six, and nine weeks, group counselors recorded scores of 75.71, 81.28, 78.28 for Level of Regard, 66.00, 66.42, 65.00 for Unconditionality of Regard, 63.71, 66.71, 65.00 for Empathy, 64.85, 66.28, 67.85 for Congruence.

Table 3 shows the Product Moment Coefficients of Correlation of RI measures between group member and group counselor scores on the RI at three, six, and nine weeks for small groups 1 through 6. From this table it can be seen that in group 1, member and counselor scores did not correlate significantly for any RI measures at three weeks. At six weeks, there were significant correlations (P=.05) for Level of Regard (r=.72), Empathy (r=.80), and the Total RI score (r=.79). At
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Measures-3 Weeks</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>.3825</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.0537</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>-.436</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.5983</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.2276</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>.1591</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.6433</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.1914</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>.6055</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.694</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.0428</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Measures-6 Weeks</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>.7249</td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td>-.490</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.5872</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.5251</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.6890</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.5547</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.8076</td>
<td>.015*</td>
<td>-.655</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.6642</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>.5548</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.4927</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>.7994</td>
<td>.017*</td>
<td>-.378</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.7950</td>
<td>.018*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Measures-9 Weeks</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>.6466</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.4255</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.0105</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.1011</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.1744</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.1906</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.7649</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>.7551</td>
<td>.030*</td>
<td>-.640</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.3258</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>.6567</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.1009</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level
nine weeks, Congruence was the only variable to reach significance with an $r$ of .75.

Looking at groups 2 and 5, results indicated that there were no significant correlations between member and counselor perceptions at any of the three test intervals of three, six, or nine weeks for any of the RI measures.

In group 3, the only measure to reach significance ($P<.05$) at three, six, or nine weeks was the Total RI measure at six weeks with an $r=.79$. Group member and counselor scores in group 4 correlated significantly ($r=.985$) at three weeks for the RI sub-measure, Empathy. All other correlations of the group member and group counselor variables at three, six, and nine weeks failed to reveal significant findings. The correlations presented in group 6 indicated that Unconditionality of Regard, $r=.76$ at six weeks was the only RI measure to reach significance between the group member and group counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

After looking at the relationship between member and counselor perceptions in the six small groups, data was computed based on the perceptions of the entire large group of 42 group members and the perceptions of group counselors toward group members. Large group ranges and means for the RI at three, six, and nine weeks are presented in Table 4. From this table, it can be seen that at three weeks group member mean scores and ranges respectively were: 83.69 and 42 for Level of Regard; 72.66 and 44 for Unconditionality of Regard; 65.78 and 46 for Empathy; 75.02 and 39 for Congruence; 297.16 and 155 for Total RI.

Counselor mean score and range at three weeks, meanwhile, was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=42</td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=42</td>
<td>N=6</td>
<td>N=42</td>
<td>N=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X=83.69</td>
<td>X=91.61</td>
<td>X=82.35</td>
<td>X=90.57</td>
<td>X=83.52</td>
<td>X=90.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R=42</td>
<td>R=38</td>
<td>R=47</td>
<td>R=39</td>
<td>R=48</td>
<td>R=41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X=72.66</td>
<td>X=67.57</td>
<td>X=71.95</td>
<td>X=67.83</td>
<td>X=71.04</td>
<td>X=67.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R=44</td>
<td>R=42</td>
<td>R=39</td>
<td>R=35</td>
<td>R=69</td>
<td>R=37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X=65.78</td>
<td>X=65.66</td>
<td>X=65.30</td>
<td>X=66.19</td>
<td>X=64.85</td>
<td>X=68.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R=46</td>
<td>R=25</td>
<td>R=30</td>
<td>R=21</td>
<td>R=48</td>
<td>R=27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X=75.02</td>
<td>X=73.35</td>
<td>X=73.83</td>
<td>X=71.52</td>
<td>X=75.30</td>
<td>X=73.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R=39</td>
<td>R=39</td>
<td>R=49</td>
<td>R=35</td>
<td>R=56</td>
<td>R=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X=297.16</td>
<td>X=298.69</td>
<td>X=293.45</td>
<td>X=296.04</td>
<td>X=294.73</td>
<td>X=300.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R=155</td>
<td>R=117</td>
<td>R=137</td>
<td>R=109</td>
<td>R=208</td>
<td>R=126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
91.61 and 38 for Level of Regard; 67.57 and 42 for Unconditionality of Regard; 65.66 and 25 for Empathy; 73.35 and 39 for Congruence, and 298.69 and 117 for the Total RI.

At six weeks, group members recorded a mean score of 82.35 and group counselors a 90.57 for Level of Regard. Ranges were 47 and 39 respectively. The variable, Unconditionality of Regard, revealed a member score of 71.95 with a range of 39. At the same time the counselor score was 67.83 with a range of 35. Group counselor perceptions of Empathy and Congruence recorded means of 66.19 and 71.52 while ranges were 21 and 35. Member perceptions of Empathy were 65.30, range of 30 while for Congruence, the mean score was 73.83, range of 49. The Total RI mean for group members was 293.45, range of 137 and for group counselors was 296.04, range of 109.

Results at nine weeks for group members indicated that for the respective variables Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, Congruence, and Total RI, mean scores were 83.52, 71.04, 64.85, 75.30, and 294.73. Ranges were 48, 69, 48, 56, and 208. Counselor scores of the same variables were 90.88, 67.42, 68.11, 73.78, 300.21 respectively. Ranges were 41, 37, 27, 35, and 126.

Table 5 presents Pearson Product Moment Correlations of RI measures for group members and group counselors at three and six weeks, six and nine weeks, and three and nine weeks. The correlations were derived after administering a repeated measures of the RI at three, six, and nine weeks. This analysis revealed that at three and six weeks, six and nine weeks, and three and nine weeks, group members had statistically significant correlations (P=.001) for the four RI measures: Level of
### TABLE 5

PRODUCT MOMENT COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF RI MEASURES OF GROUP MEMBER AND GROUP COUNSELOR PERCEPTIONS AT 3&6 WEEKS, 6&9 WEEKS AND 3&9 WEEKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>3&amp;6 Weeks</th>
<th>6&amp;9 Weeks</th>
<th>3&amp;9 Weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members N=42</td>
<td>Counselors N=6</td>
<td>Members N=42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>r .7033</td>
<td>.6186</td>
<td>.7461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>r .5753</td>
<td>.7982</td>
<td>.7217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>r .7584</td>
<td>.6401</td>
<td>.8327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>r .7754</td>
<td>.8415</td>
<td>.8237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RI</td>
<td>r .7743</td>
<td>.7500</td>
<td>.8306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regard, Unconditionalitv of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as well as the Total Score.

Analysis of the group counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship at three and six, six and nine, and three and nine weeks also revealed statistically significant correlations ($P=.001$) for Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, Congruence, as well as the Total RI Score.

Coefficients of Correlation between group member and group counselor RI measures at three, six, and nine weeks are presented in Table 6. This table shows that at three weeks there were significant correlations at the .05 level between group members and group counselors on the RI measures of: Level of Regard, ($r=.27$), Empathy ($r=.29$), Congruence ($r=.29$), and the Total Score ($r=.33$). The measure, Unconditionality of Regard, failed to reach significance ($P=.106$) between group member and counselor perceptions at three weeks.

Looking in Table 6 at correlation coefficients at six weeks, it can be seen that none of the RI measures produced significance between group member and group counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

When the repeated RI measure was administered to both group members and group counselors at nine weeks, significant correlations ($05$) appeared for all four variables plus the Total Score. Level of Regard recorded an $r$ of .37. Unconditionality recorded an $r$ of .38. Empathy recorded and $r$ of .45. Congruence recorded an $r$ of .62. The Total RI score recorded an $r$ of .53.
TABLE 6
PRODUCT MOMENT COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF RI MEASURES BETWEEN
GROUP MEMBER AND GROUP COUNSELOR SCORES AT 3, 6, AND 9 WEEKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measures</th>
<th>3 Weeks</th>
<th>6 Weeks</th>
<th>9 Weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td>.2738†</td>
<td>.2300</td>
<td>.3718†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td>.1964</td>
<td>.1295</td>
<td>.3882†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.2892†</td>
<td>.1949</td>
<td>.4577†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>.2910†</td>
<td>.1199</td>
<td>.6237†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Relationship Inventory</td>
<td>.3399†</td>
<td>.2148</td>
<td>.5300†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computations based on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory scores of 42 group members and 6 counselors working with the 42 group members. *significant at the .05 level

Question 2. What significant differences exist between group member and group counselor perception of Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as measured by the Relationship Inventory at three, six, and nine weeks and group members who score either high or low on the average Personal Orientation Inventory score?

Results: The POI average score was used as the self-actualization measure, which was divided into high and low self-actualizers. Group members who scored at least 49 or above were considered high self-actualizers. Group members who scored 49 or below were con-
sidered low self-actualizers. The two groups were evenly divided with 21 group members designated as being high self-actualizers and 21 group members designated as being low self-actualizers.

Tables 7 and 8 summarize the means and standard deviations of both group members and group counselors for the four RI measures of high and low self-actualizers. In looking at the variable Level of Regard, it can be noticed that group counselors recorded scores of 93.33, 91.28, 93.23 for high self-actualizers and scores of 89.90, 89.85, 88.52 for low self-actualizers at three, six, and nine weeks. For group members, low self-actualizers recorded scores of 86.80, 85.52, 86.00 while high self-actualizers recorded scores of 80.57, 79.19, 81.04 at three, six, and nine weeks.

The second variable which was analyzed was Unconditionality of Regard, and upon glancing at Tables 7 and 8, at three, six, and nine weeks it can be observed that low self-actualizing group member perceptions of the counseling relationship were 73.23, 72.19, 73.42 while high self-actualizing member perception scores were 72.09, 71.71, 68.66. Counselor perceptions during the same test intervals indicated that high self-actualizers had scores of 66.14, 67.23, 66.66. Low self-actualizers recorded scores of 69.00, 68.42, 68.19.

Empathy was the third RI measure to be analyzed, and the data from Tables 7 and 8 indicate that group member perceptions of the Empathy variable for low self-actualizers at three, six, and nine weeks were 67.85, 66.85, 67.42. High self-actualizer scores were 63.61, 63.76, 62.28. In reference to group counselor perceptions, scores for high self-actualizers were 65.09, 66.09, 68.09 while low self-actualizers had
TABLE 7
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR RI MEASURES
(MEMBER PERCEPTIONS) OF HIGH AND LOW
SELF-ACTUALIZERS AT 3, 6, AND 9 WEEKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measure</th>
<th>High Self-Actualizers</th>
<th>Low Self-Actualizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>80.57</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>79.19</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Weeks</td>
<td>81.04</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>72.09</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>71.71</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Weeks</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>63.61</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>63.76</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Weeks</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>72.19</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>72.57</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Weeks</td>
<td>72.95</td>
<td>13.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR RI MEASURES (COUNSELOR PERCEPTIONS) OF HIGH AND LOW SELF-ACTUALIZERS AT 3, 6, AND 9 WEEKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Inventory Measure</th>
<th>High Self-Actualizers</th>
<th>Low Self-Actualizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>91.28</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Weeks</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>66.14</td>
<td>15.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>67.23</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Weeks</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>15.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>65.09</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>66.09</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Weeks</td>
<td>68.09</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeks</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>70.42</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Weeks</td>
<td>73.80</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scores of 66.23, 66.28, 68.14 again, at three, six, and nine weeks.

The final RI measure to be subjected to analysis was Congruence. Again, Tables 7 and 8 represent the means and standard deviations for Congruence of both high and low self-actualizers. As can be observed, group member scores of Congruence were 77.85, 75.09, 77.66 for low self-actualizers at the three test periods of three, six, and nine weeks. Scores for high self-actualizers were 72.19, 72.57, 72.95. Meanwhile, group counselors recorded scores of 73.00, 70.42, 73.80 for high self-actualizers and scores of 73.71, 72.61, 73.76 for low self-actualizers.

Four separate ANOVAS were performed on the four dependent variables: Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence. Both main effects and interaction effects were then observed. The critical test of this research question was revealed by the interaction effect of group (high and low self-actualizers), status (group member/group counselor perceptions), and time (3, 6, 9 weeks).

Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12 present main order effects for group, status, and time as well as both second and third order interactions. A glance through Tables 9 through 12 reveal that there was no significance found for the main effects of group (high and low self-actualizers) for any of the four variables on the RI: Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence. In reference to the main effect of status, the perceptions of either group members or group counselors, significance was found only for Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard. Empathy and Congruence did not register any significant main effects. The main effect of the time variable reached significance only for Congruence. Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, and Empathy
did not reveal any significance.

Looking at the second order interaction of group (A) and status (B), it can be observed that none of the variables with the exception of Level of Regard demonstrated significant findings. Another second order interaction of group (A) and time (C) revealed no significant differences for any of the four RI variables. When status (B) and time (C) were analyzed, Empathy revealed significance for this second order interaction; however, none of the other variables were found to be significant. Third order interactions of group (A), status (B), and time (C) did not reach significance for any of the four RI measures.

An analysis of variance for the first dependent variable, Level of Regard (Table 9), revealed no significant difference for the main effects of group, \(F=.32, P=.574\), and time, \(F=.57, P=.57\). Examination for the main effect of status revealed a significant difference, \(F=25.05, P=.001\).

The analysis of variance also revealed a significant interaction effect between status and group, \(F=8.32, P=.006\). No significant interactions were revealed by the interactions of either time and group, \(F=.53, F=.588\) or status, time, and group, \(F=.21, P=.812\).

Figure 3 depicts the second order interaction found for group and status, (A) X (B). From this figure it can be seen that group members and group counselors were responding differently to high and low self-actualizers for the RI measure, Level of Regard. Low self-actualizing group members responded to the variable Level of Regard at a higher level than high self-actualizers. At the same time, group counselors experienced the counseling relationship variable, Level of Regard, at a higher level for high self-actualizers in comparison to low self-
TABLE 9
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE-RI-LEVEL OF REGARD:
GROUP BY STATUS BY TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>110.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110.67</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (B)</td>
<td>3865.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3865.75</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B)</td>
<td>1284.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1284.76</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>60.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (C)</td>
<td>57.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) X (C)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B) X (C)</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

FIGURE 3

INTERACTION OF HIGH AND LOW SELF-ACTUALIZERS FOR RI MEASURE-
LEVEL OF REGARD: MEMBER AND COUNSELOR PERCEPTIONS
actualizers. Thus, there exists the interaction effect.

Looking at the second dependent variable, Unconditionality of
Regard, no significant differences were found in an analysis of var-
iance (Table 10) for the main effect of group, $F=.57$, $P=.456$; however,
significant difference was found when the effect of status was analyzed,
$F=4.69$, $P=.036$. In other words, group members responded differently
to the RI measure, Unconditionality of Regard, than group counselors.
An examination of the interaction of group and status did not reveal
any significant interaction effects for the two sources of variation,
$F=.00$, $P=.945$. The main effect of time also failed to produce any sig-
nificance, $F=.47$, $P=.628$. When both group and time plus status and time
were crossed, again no significant interactions occurred, $F=.74$, $P=.478$

**TABLE 10**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE-RI-UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD:
GROUP BY STATUS BY TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (B)</td>
<td>1152.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1152.86</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (C)</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) X (C)</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B) X (C)</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level
and F=3.8, P=.684. A three way test of the interaction effects of group, status, and time did not yield any significance, F=1.16, P=.319.

Table 11 represents an analysis of variance for the Empathy variable. No significant differences were found for any of the three main effects of: group, F=1.49, P=.228; status, F=1.12, P=.296; time, F=.87, P=.421. For second order interactions, only one of three sources of variation were found to be significant. When status and time were crossed, the results yielded an F of 3.97, significant at the .022 level. The other two second order interactions of both group and status, F=2.16, P=.149 and group and time, F=.41, P=.663 indicated that there was no significant relationship between the two sources of variation. A third order interaction of group, status, and time produced an F of .47, non-significant at .629.

Figure 4 depicts the significant interaction which was found when status and time were crossed for the RI measure of Empathy. Generally speaking, from this figure it can be seen that group counselor perceptions tended to be higher than group member perceptions at the three test intervals with the exception of the initial test at three weeks.

Table 12 records an analysis of variance for the final RI measure of Congruence. Group did not yield any significant findings, F=1.08, P=.305. The third main effect of time did produce significant results, F=3.69, P=.029. None of the tests for second order interactions produced any significant findings: group and status, F=.90, P=.348; group and time, F=.22, P=.800; status and time, F=.14, P=.871. A third order interaction of group, status, and time also failed to produce any significance, F=1.35, P=.266.
### TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE-RI-EMPATHY:
GROUP BY STATUS BY TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>340.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>340.67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (B)</td>
<td>113.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113.33</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B)</td>
<td>219.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>219.14</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (C)</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) X (C)</td>
<td>126.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.34</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B) X (C)</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

### FIGURE 4

INTERACTION OF GROUP MEMBER AND GROUP COUNSELOR PERCEPTIONS OF RI MEASURE-EMPATHY-AT 3, 6, AND 9 WEEKS
TABLE 12
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE-RI-CONGRUENCE:
GROUP BY STATUS BY TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>434.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>434.76</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (B)</td>
<td>211.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211.75</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B)</td>
<td>176.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.67</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>165.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (C)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) X (C)</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B) X (C)</td>
<td>71.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

Question 3. What significant differences exist between group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as measured by the RI at three, six, and nine weeks and group members who score high on Time Competence together with high or low on Inner-directedness and group members who score low on Time Competence together with high or low on Inner-directedness scales of the POI?

Results: The Time Competence and Inner-directedness scales of the POI were used to divide the group members into four groups. Group members who scored a 48 or above on Time Competence and a 50 or above on Inner-directedness comprised the high-high group, and it consisted of 15 subjects. Group members who scored a 49 or above on Time Competence
and a 49 or below on Inner-directedness comprised the high-low group, and it consisted of 7 subjects. Group members who scored 47 or lower on Time Competence and 50 or above on Inner-directedness comprised the low-high group, and it, too, consisted of 7 subjects. Group members who scored a 47 or lower on Time Competence and a 49 or lower on Inner-directedness comprised the low-low group, and it consisted of 13 subjects.

Again, four separate ANOVAS were conducted on the four dependent variables of the RI (Tables 13-16): Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence. Both main and interaction effects were then observed. The critical test of the research question was revealed by the interaction effect of group, status, and time. Tables 13-16 present the main order effect for group, status, and time as well as second and third order interactions.

Looking at Tables 13-16, it can be observed that results for this research question were identical to research question 2. There were no main order effects for group on any of the RI measures. Status was significant for Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard. Empathy and Congruence failed to yield any significant results for this source of variation. Time, the third main order effect, proved to be significant only for Congruence.

The second order interactions of group and status revealed that Level of Regard was the single RI measure to reach significance. When group and time were crossed, none of the RI measures produced significant results. Status and time yielded significant findings only for Empathy. No statistically significant results were found when a third order interaction crossing group, status, and time was analyzed.
### TABLE 13

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE-RI-LEVEL OF REGARD: GROUP BY STATUS BY TIME-HH, HL, LH, LL GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>610.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>203.37</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (B)</td>
<td>3346.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3346.87</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B)</td>
<td>1906.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>635.50</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>85.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.73</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (C)</td>
<td>282.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47.03</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) X (C)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B) X (C)</td>
<td>280.34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.72</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

### TABLE 14

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE-RI-UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD: GROUP BY STATUS BY TIME-HH, HL, LH, LL GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>504.96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>168.32</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (B)</td>
<td>1370.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1370.00</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B)</td>
<td>504.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>168.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>27.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (C)</td>
<td>329.81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.96</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) X (C)</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B) X (C)</td>
<td>118.81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level
### TABLE 15

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE-RI-EMPATHY: GROUP BY STATUS BY TIME-HH, HL, LH, LL GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>116.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (B)</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B)</td>
<td>277.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92.36</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>33.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (C)</td>
<td>96.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) X (C)</td>
<td>114.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B) X (C)</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level

### TABLE 16

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE-RI-Congruence: GROUP BY STATUS BY TIME-HH, HL, LH, LL GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>334.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>111.45</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (B)</td>
<td>418.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>418.95</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B)</td>
<td>1096.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>365.38</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (C)</td>
<td>146.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.07</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (C)</td>
<td>55.48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) X (C)</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) X (B) X (C)</td>
<td>212.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conceived to study relationships between self-actualization and the counselor-client relationship within the context of a growth group experience among fourth year nursing students at The Ohio State University. The purpose of the investigation was to examine significant differences between group member and group counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship and the group member's level of self-actualization.

The importance and rationale of the study were discussed and the review of the research was divided into three areas: research on self-actualization through the use of the POI using group work; research on the RI in group experiencing; professional development in Nursing Education limited to group process experiences.

Self-actualization was discussed primarily in terms of a synopsis of related literature with Abraham Maslow being emphasized. Shostrom developed the POI, a measure of values and behaviors which are important in the development of self-actualization. Studies specifically relating to the POI and group work were cited, thereby, demonstrating the sensitivity of the instrument.

The RI, which measures the nature of the counseling relationship according to Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and
Congruence, was reviewed in basically three areas in relationship to
group experiences: counselor training and supervision, teacher educa-
tion, and group counseling. Research indicated that the RI has been
used effectively with varied group experiences.

Professional development in Nursing Education was discussed pri-
marily in terms of the group experience. A literature review revealed
the significance and power of the group in nursing while an overview
of the research in Nursing Education indicated that growth group exper-
iences have proven to be effective in promoting the professional devel-
opment of nurses.

Three separate research questions were formulated for the study:
What relationships exist between group member, group counselor, and
group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard, Uncon-
ditionality of Regard, Empathy, Congruence as measured by the RI at
three, six, and nine weeks? What significant differences exist between
group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard, Uncon-
ditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as measured by the RI
at three, six, and nine weeks and group members who score either high
or low on their average POI score? What significant differences exist
between group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard,
Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence as measured by the RI
at three, six, and nine weeks and group members who score high on
Time Competence together with high or low on Inner-directedness and
group members who score low on Time Competence together with high or
low on the Inner-directedness scales of the POI?

Forty-two full-time senior nursing students at The Ohio State Uni-
versity enrolled in a psychiatric nursing course during the 1979-1980 academic school year served as subjects. The procedures used to test the research questions were to have the group members, who were randomly divided into six groups, rate the counselor-client relationship with their group counselor on the RI at three, six, and nine weeks. In turn, group counselors rated the relationship they had with each group member on the counselor form of the RI at three, six, and nine weeks. Additionally, before the initiation of the first group sessions, group members completed the POI, a self-actualization measure. The data were then analyzed on an SPSS and BMDP computer program as Pearson Product Moment correlations of coefficient and ANOVAS were conducted. The .05 level of confidence was selected as the acceptable level of statistical significance.

Differences in mean scores were observed depending on both small group and group member or counselor perceptions. With the exception of group 1, few significant relationships existed between group member and group counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship. With group 1, however, at six weeks, the Total RI measure plus two sub-measures, Level of Regard and Empathy, revealed that high scores of group members were associated with high scores for group counselors. The same held true for the variable, Congruence, at nine weeks. Other isolated significant relationships could be noted for the Total RI score in group 3 at six weeks, for Empathy in group 4 at three weeks, and Unconditionality of Regard in group 6 at six weeks.

Both group member and group counselor perceptions during the three time frames studied indicated positive correlations significant at the
.001 level for all four RI measures. Group member and group counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship were highly consistent at three and six, six and nine, and three and nine weeks.

Significant relationships appeared between group member perceptions of the counseling relationship and group counselor perceptions at three and then again at nine weeks. The RI measure of Unconditionality of Regard at three weeks, plus all four measures at six weeks, failed to reach significance between group member and group counselor perceptions.

There was no significant difference between high or low self-actualizing group member responses to each of the four RI measures.

Findings for the main effect of status for the four RI measures were somewhat varied. The main effect of status revealed significance only for Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard as group members and group counselors responded differently to this source of variation. When group and status were crossed, however, Level of Regard was the only RI measure to reach significance. Group counselors experienced more positive feelings of respect, liking, appreciation, and affection for high self-actualizers in comparison to low self-actualizers.

The third source of variation measuring the overall main effect for Time, yielded significance at the .05 level only for the RI measure, Congruence. The other three RI measures failed to reach any significance.

None of the RI variables produced significance when group was crossed with time, which meant that there were not any differences between high and low self-actualizer perceptions of Level of Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence at three, six, or
nine weeks.

When the second order interactions of status and time were crossed, the only RI variable to reach significance was that of Empathy. This meant that both group member and group counselor perceptions of the Empathy variable were statistically meaningful at three, six, and nine weeks. An interaction occurred in that group members perceived the counseling relationship variable of Empathy to be highest at three weeks in comparison to six or nine weeks, while group counselors scored Empathy lowest at this time interval. Again, at nine weeks group members scored Empathy lowest while at the same time group counselors perceived this variable to be at its highest in comparison to six and nine weeks.

Third order interactions of group, status, and time failed to yield significant findings for any of the four RI measures.

The ANOVAS performed on the four dependent variables of the RI in research question three yielded identical results to the ANOVAS performed on the four dependent variables of the RI in research question two.

Conclusions

A first conclusion drawn from the finding that there was a general absence of significant relationships between group member and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship within the six small groups, was that each individual's experience of the counseling relationship was unique. What one may have perceived herself/himself to be within the nature of the relationship as a client, may not have been what the
counselor in turn experienced. When examined on the basis of individual
responses, differences in client and counselor perceptions appeared in
the experience.

A second conclusion evolves from the fact that there existed a
high degree of consistency with which the large group of 42 group mem­
ers and 6 group counselors responded to the counseling relationship.
Experienced counselors facilitated the growth groups in this study.
It would be expected that they exhibit significant levels of Level of
Regard, Unconditionality of Regard, Empathy, and Congruence. It might
be expected therefore that counselors presented themselves in a highly
consistent manner, which was evident by the significant level of cor­
relations. Working with a psychologically healthy population such as
student nurses may have also contributed to the consistency and high
level of significant correlations for the group member perceptions.
Another explanation for these results may have resided in the nature
of the study itself, a repeated measures. The assessments were given
at three, six, and again at nine weeks. Because of the fact that an in­
dependent sample was not being used and the same people and same sample
were being retested, there was a strong possibility that correlations
would tend to be significant for both group members and group counse­
lors when studies of this kind are conducted.

A third conclusion stems from the lack of significant relation­
ships between group member and group counselor perceptions of the coun­
seling relationship found at six weeks. It may have been possible that
at this crucial time period group members were at a critical stage in
the process of the group's development. It would be expected that they were dealing with resistances, complaints, and changing/modifying behavior. Their experiencing of the group counselor could have been affected by these negative attitudes and in turn they might not have perceived the counselor in a positive manner. As can be observed correlations did increase between the perceptions of group members and group counselors at nine weeks. This again may reflect another stage of group development, closure. Group members and counselors started off and wound up seeing the relationship similarly. Upon completing a growth group, it would be expected that the problems have been dealt with and resolved. The high levels of significant correlations have indicated that successful resolution did occur and as time progressed group counselor and group member perceptions of the counseling relationship became more congruent.

The fourth finding was that no significant difference existed between high and low self-actualizer responses to the four RI measures. A possible conclusion may be the recognition that psychological well-being has nothing to do with how an individual experiences his/her counselor. In other words, the client experiences that which effects him/her directly, regardless of his/her level of mental health. Positive support for this hypothesis was confirmed by the findings for the total group of high/low self-actualizers.

A fifth conclusion was based on the finding that the group member and group counselor perceptions of Level of Regard and Unconditionality of Regard differed significantly. It is conceivable that this occurred
because both these variables were concerned with one person's affective response to another. The feeling reactions of one individual toward another tends to be transient and a particular feeling one may have communicated may not always have been what the other person experienced.

An interesting sidelight resides in the fact that according to group member perceptions, low self-actualizers perceived higher levels of respect, liking, appreciation, and affection than high self-actualizers for the variable Level of Regard. A possible explanation could be that although group counselors experienced higher Level of Regard for high self-actualizers, they were not congruent in how this was communicated or they only experienced these feelings at the affective level.

A sixth conclusion stems from the fact that as the group progressed group counselors felt more Empathy toward group members while group members experienced less empathic understanding as time progressed. Evidently during the period of the growth group, group counselors felt themselves to be sensing higher levels of the affective quality and intensity of the group member's experience; however, what actually occurs is that as time progressed, group members perceive decreasing levels of Empathy. A possible reason may be that group counselors were incongruent in how empathic understanding was being communicated to the group members. Verbal and non-verbal communication may have been at odds with each other. Group counselors may have actually felt Empathy, but failed to verbally communicate this therapeutic variable to group members.

Final conclusions would suggest that within the context of the
nursing program group facilitators need to be aware of how group members may be experiencing them. Group leaders should continue to develop the ability to foster a good relationship with group members and, thereby, understand their feelings and experiences. Nursing training programs, therefore, should continue to emphasize the relationship with nursing students as opposed to overemphasizing specified training techniques.

In this respect, there needs to be continued evaluation of the dynamics of the processes of the growth groups with the nursing students and outcomes need to be examined.

With regard to group leaders, continued supervision is suggested so the facilitators can be more open and sensitive to the group member's experience. It is recommended that group leaders outside the nursing faculty conduct the personal growth groups to examine their effectiveness.

Recommendations

Recommendations for further research are made based on the findings of this study.

First, further investigation should be conducted with different populations to determine how self-actualizers representing another group respond in the counseling relationship.

Second, different variables should be examined such as academic performance, ethnic background, economic status, religious background, gender, age, moral development, maturity which may reveal additional information relative to self-actualization and perceptions of the coun-
saling relationship.

Third, since the group leader is a vital component in the therapeutic process, a study correlating the self-actualization level of group leaders with group members should be conducted. Additionally, a study examining the self-actualization level of the group leader and/or group members and degree of member growth is suggested.

Fourth, additional instruments should be developed to assess self-actualization and used to validate the present findings.

Finally, further research also should be conducted with high and low self-actualizers to see "if" and "how" they respond differently both inside and outside of the counseling environment.
APPENDIX A

Summary of Oral Presentation Given to Participants

by the Researcher
SUMMARY OF ORAL PRESENTATION GIVEN TO SUBJECTS BY THE RESEARCHER

I. Introduction

A. My name: Edward Wilgus

B. Who am I?: Ph.D. candidate in Counseling and Guidance

C. Why I am here? Interested in research for dissertation

II. Research Study Itself

A. Role of Researcher:

1. To inform subjects of the purpose and nature of the study:
   a study of healthy personalities and perceptions

2. To discuss confidentiality of data and assure anonymity

3. To discuss time commitment

4. To obtain permission from participants and assure participation in the study is voluntary

5. To answer any questions

6. To collect and organize data

B. Role of the Subjects

1. Group Members: to participate in completing the POI during initial group sessions

2. Group Members and Group Counselors: to participate in completing the RI after the third, sixth, and ninth sessions

3. To consent to participate in the study

C. Outcome of Study: will be available to participants upon request
APPENDIX B

Personal Orientation Inventory
DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of pairs of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If the first statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "a". (See Example Item 1 at right.) If the second statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "b". (See Example Item 2 at right.) If neither statement applies to you, or if they refer to something you don't know about, make no answer on the answer sheet. Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND START WITH QUESTION 1.
1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
   b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.

2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.
   b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.

3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.
   b. I do not always tell the truth.

4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.
   b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.

5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
   b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.

6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
   b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.

7. a. I am afraid to be myself.
   b. I am not afraid to be myself.

8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
   b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.

9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
   b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.

10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.
    b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.

11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
    b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.

12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
     b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.

13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.
     b. Anger is something I try to avoid.

14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
     b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.

15. a. I put others' interests before my own.
     b. I do not put others' interests before my own.

16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.
     b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.

17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.
     b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.

18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
     b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
     b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.

20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.
     b. My moral values are self-determined.

21. a. I do what others expect of me.
     b. I feel free to not do what others expect of me.

22. a. I accept my weaknesses.
     b. I don't accept my weaknesses.

23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.
     b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.

24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.
     b. I am hardly ever cross.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.
b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.

26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.
b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.

27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.

b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.

29. a. I fear failure.
b. I don't fear failure.

30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.

31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.

32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.
b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.

33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.

34. a. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.
b. It is not important to make an issue of rights and privileges.

35. a. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.
b. I avoid "sticking my neck out" in my relations with others.

36. a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.
b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.

37. a. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.
b. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.

38. a. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
b. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.

39. a. I trust my ability to size up a situation.
b. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.

40. a. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
b. I do not believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.

41. a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.

42. a. I am bothered by fears of being inadequate.
b. I am not bothered by fears of being inadequate.

43. a. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.
b. I believe that man is essentially evil and cannot be trusted.

44. a. I live by the rules and standards of society.
b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.

45. a. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.
b. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.

46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.
b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.
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47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.
    b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.
48. a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
    b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
49. a. I like everyone I know.
    b. I do not like everyone I know.
50. a. Criticism threatens my self-esteem.
    b. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.
51. a. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.
    b. I do not believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes people act right.
52. a. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.
    b. I feel free to be angry at those I love.
53. a. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
    b. My basic responsibility is to be aware of others' needs.
54. a. Impressing others is most important.
    b. Expressing myself is most important.
55. a. To feel right, I need always to please others.
    b. I can feel right without always having to please others.
56. a. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.
    b. I will not risk a friendship just to say or do what is right.
57. a. I feel bound to keep the promises I make.
    b. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.
58. a. I must avoid sorrow at all costs.
    b. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.
59. a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
    b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in the future.
60. a. It is important that others accept my point of view.
    b. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.
61. a. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.
    b. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.
62. a. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
    b. There are very few times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
63. a. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
    b. I do not welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
64. a. Appearances are all-important.
    b. Appearances are not terribly important.
65. a. I hardly ever gossip.
    b. I gossip a little at times.
66. a. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
    b. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
67. a. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
    b. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
    b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
89. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.

90. a. I hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
b. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.

91. a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.

92. a. I accept inconsistencies within myself.
b. I cannot accept inconsistencies within myself.

93. a. Man is naturally cooperative.
b. Man is naturally antagonistic.

94. a. I don’t mind laughing at a dirty joke.
b. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.

95. a. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.
b. Happiness is an end in human relationships.

96. a. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.
b. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.

97. a. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.
b. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.

98. a. Self-interest is natural.
b. Self-interest is unnatural.

99. a. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
b. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.

100. a. For me, work and play are the same.
b. For me, work and play are opposites.

101. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.

102. a. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
b. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.

103. a. I like only masculine men and feminine women.
b. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.

104. a. I actively attempt to avoid embarrassment whenever I can.
b. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.

105. a. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.
b. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.

106. a. I feel that a person should be silly only at the right time and place.
b. I can be silly when I feel like it.

107. a. People should always repent their wrongdoings.
b. People need not always repent their wrongdoings.

108. a. I worry about the future.
b. I do not worry about the future.

109. a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.

110. a. I prefer to save good things for future use.
b. I prefer to use good things now.

111. a. People should always control their anger.
b. People should express honestly-felt anger.
92. a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.
   b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.
93. a. I am able to express my feelings even when they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
   b. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.
94. a. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel bubbling up within me.
   b. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.
95. a. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
   b. I have never had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
96. a. I am orthodoxly religious.
   b. I am not orthodoxly religious.
97. a. I am completely free of guilt.
   b. I am not free of guilt.
98. a. I have a problem in fusing sex and love.
   b. I have no problem in fusing sex and love.
99. a. I enjoy detachment and privacy.
   b. I do not enjoy detachment and privacy.
100. a. I feel dedicated to my work.
    b. I do not feel dedicated to my work.
101. a. I can express affection regardless of whether it is returned.
    b. I cannot express affection unless I am sure it will be returned.
102. a. Living for the future is as important as living for the moment.
    b. Only living for the moment is important.
103. a. It is better to be yourself.
    b. It is better to be popular.
104. a. Wishing and imagining can be bad.
    b. Wishing and imagining are always good.
105. a. I spend more time preparing to live.
    b. I spend more time actually living.
106. a. I am loved because I give love.
    b. I am loved because I am lovable.
107. a. When I really love myself, everybody will love me.
    b. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.
108. a. I can let other people control me.
    b. I can let other people control me if I am sure they will not continue to control me.
109. a. As they are, people sometimes annoy me.
    b. As they are, people do not annoy me.
110. a. Living for the future gives my life its primary meaning.
    b. Only when living for the future ties into living for the present does my life have meaning.
111. a. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your time."
    b. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."
112. a. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.
    b. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.
113. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.
    b. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.
114. a. I have had an experience where life seemed just perfect.
    b. I have never had an experience where life seemed just perfect.
115. a. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.
    b. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which hurts good.
116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.
    b. A person can never change his essential nature.

117. a. I am afraid to be tender.
    b. I am not afraid to be tender.

118. a. I am assertive and affirming.
    b. I am not assertive and affirming.

119. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.
    b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.

120. a. I see myself as others see me.
    b. I do not see myself as others see me.

121. a. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.
    b. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets conceited.

122. a. Men should be assertive and affirming.
    b. Men should not be assertive and affirming.

123. a. I am able to risk being myself.
    b. I am not able to risk being myself.

124. a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
    b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.

125. a. I suffer from memories.
    b. I do not suffer from memories.

126. a. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.
    b. Men and women must not be both yielding and assertive.

127. a. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.
    b. I do not like to participate actively in intense discussions.

128. a. I am self-sufficient.
    b. I am not self-sufficient.

129. a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
    b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.

130. a. I always play fair.
    b. Sometimes I cheat a little.

131. a. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
    b. I never feel so angry that I want to destroy or hurt others.

132. a. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
    b. I feel uncertain and insecure in my relationships with others.

133. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
    b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

134. a. I can accept my mistakes.
    b. I cannot accept my mistakes.

135. a. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.
    b. I never find any people who are stupid and uninteresting.

136. a. I regret my past.
    b. I do not regret my past.

137. a. Being myself is helpful to others.
    b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.

138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.
    b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.
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139. a. People have an instinct for evil.
    b. People do not have an instinct for evil.

140. a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
    b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.

141. a. People are both good and evil.
    b. People are not both good and evil.

142. a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
    b. My past is a handicap to my future.

143. a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
    b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.

144. a. For me, past, present and future is meaningful continuity.
    b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.

145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
    b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.

146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
    b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.

147. a. People are basically good.
    b. People are not basically good.

148. a. Honesty is always the best policy.
    b. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.

149. a. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.
    b. I feel uncomfortable with anything less than a perfect performance.

150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.
    b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
APPENDIX C

Relationship Inventory-Counselor Form
Below are listed a variety of ways that one person could feel or behave in relation to another person. Please consider each statement with respect to whether you think it is true or not true in your present relationship with your group members. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. Please mark every one. Write in +1, +2, +3; or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+1: I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
+2: I feel it is true.
+3: I strongly feel that it is true.

-1: I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: I feel it is not true.
-3: I strongly feel that it is not true.

Please put group members names at the top of the columns.

1. I respect her.
2. I try to see things through her eyes.
3. I pretend that I like her or understand her more than I really do.
4. My interest in her depends partly on what she is talking to me about.
5. I am willing to tell her my own thoughts and feelings when I am sure that she really wants to know them.
6. I disapprove of her.
7. I understand her words but not the way she feels.
8. What I say to her never conflicts with what I think or feel.
9. I always respond to her with warmth and interest—or always with coldness and disinterest.
10. I tell her my opinions or feelings more than she really want to know them.
11. I am curious about "the way she ticks," but not really interested in her as a person.
12. I am interested in knowing what her experiences mean to her.
13. I am disturbed whenever she talks about or asks about certain things.
14. My feeling toward her does not depend on how she is feeling towards me.
15. I prefer to talk only about her and not at all about me.
16. I like seeing her.
17. I nearly always know exactly what she means.
18. She feels that I have unspoken feelings or concerns that are getting in the way of our relationship.
19. My attitude toward her depends partly on how she is feeling about herself.
20. I will freely tell her my own thoughts and feelings, when she wants to know them.
21. I am indifferent to her.
22. At times I jump to the conclusion that she feels more strongly or more concerned about something than she actually does.
23. I behave just the way that I am, in our relationship.
24. Sometimes I respond to her in a more positive and friendly way than I do at other times.
25. I say more about myself than she is really interested to hear.
26. I appreciate her.
27. Sometimes I think that she feels a certain way, because I feel that way.
28. She does not think that I hide anything from myself that I feel with her.
29. I like her in some ways, dislike her in others.
30. I adopt a professional role that makes it hard for her to know what I am like as a person.
31. I am friendly and warm toward her.
32. I understand her.
33. If she feels negatively toward me I respond negatively to her.
34. I tell her what I think about her, whether she wants to know it or not.
35. I care about her.
36. My own attitudes toward some of the things she says or does, stops me from really understanding her.
37. I do not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
38. Whether she is expressing "good" feelings or "bad" ones seems to make no difference to how positively—or negatively I feel toward her.
39. I am uncomfortable when she asks me something about myself.
40. I feel that she is dull and uninteresting.
41. I understand what she says from a detached, objective point of view.
42. She feels that she can trust me to be honest with her.
43. Sometimes I am warmly responsive to her, at other times cold or disapproving.
44. I express ideas or feelings of my own that she is not really interested in.
45. I am interested in her.
46. I appreciate what her experiences feel like to her.
47. I am secure and comfortable in our relationship.

48. Depending on my mood, I sometimes respond to her with quite a lot more warmth
   and interest than I do at other times.

49. I want to say as little as possible about my own thoughts and feelings.

50. I just tolerate her.

51. I am playing a role with her.

52. I am equally appreciative—or equally unappreciative—of her, whatever she is
telling me about herself.

53. My own feelings and thoughts are always available to her, but never imposed
   on her.

54. I do not really care what happens to her.

55. I do not realize how strongly she feels about some of the things we discuss.

56. There are times when she feels that my outward response is quite different
   from my inner reaction to her.

57. My general feeling toward her varies considerably.

58. I am willing for her to use our time to get to know me better, if or when she
   wants to.

59. I seem to really value her.

60. I respond to her mechanically.

61. She doesn't think that I am being honest with myself about the way I feel
   toward her.
62. Whether she likes or dislikes herself makes no difference to the way I feel about her.

63. I am more interested in expressing and communicating myself than in knowing and understanding her.

64. I dislike her.

65. She feels that I am being genuine with her.

66. Sometimes I respond quite positively to her, at other times I seem indifferent.

67. I am unwilling to tell her how I feel about her.

68. I am impatient with her.

69. Sometimes I am not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.

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

71. I am willing to tell her my actual response to anything she says or does.

72. I feel deep affection for her.

73. I usually understand all of what she says to me.

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

75. Whether she feels fine or feels awful makes no difference to how warmly and appreciatively—or how coldly and unappreciatively—I feel toward her.

76. I tend to evade any attempt that she makes to get to know me better.

77. I regard her as a disagreeable person.
78. What I say gives a false impression of my total reaction to her.

79. She can be very critical of me or very appreciative of me without it changing my feelings toward her.

80. At times I feel contempt for her.

81. When she does not say what she means at all clearly I still understand her.

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

83. My general feeling toward her (of liking, respect, dislike, trust, criticism, anger, etc.) reflects the way that she is feeling toward me.

84. I try to understand her from my own point of view.

85. I can be deeply and fully aware of her most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them myself.

REGARD

UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD

EMPATHY

CONGRUENCE

TOTAL SCORE
APPENDIX D

Relationship Inventory-Client Form
RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY-Client Form

Name: ____________________________  Group Facilitator: ____________________________

Group Session #: ____________________

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person could feel or behave in relation to another person. Please consider each statement with respect to whether you think it is true or not true in your present relationship with your therapist. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. Please mark every one. Write in +1, +2, +3: or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+1: I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
+2: I feel it is true.
+3: I strongly feel that it is true.

-1: I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: I feel it is not true.
-3: I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. She respects me.
2. She tries to see things through my eyes.
3. She pretends that she likes me or understands me more than she really does.
4. Her interest in me depends partly on what I am talking to her about.
5. She is willing to tell me her own thoughts and feelings when she is sure that I really want to know them.
6. She disapproves of me.
7. She understands my words but not the way I feel.
8. What she says to me never conflicts with what she thinks or feels.
9. She always responds to me with warmth and interest—or always with coldness and disinterest.
10. She tells me her opinions or feelings more than I really want to know them.
11. She is curious about "the way I tick," but not really interested in me as a person.
12. She is interested in knowing what my experiences mean to me.
13. She is disturbed whenever I talk about or ask about certain things.
14. Her feeling toward me does not depend on how I am feeling towards her.
15. She prefers to talk only about me and not at all about her.
16. She likes seeing me.
17. She nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
18. I feel that she has unspoken feelings or concerns that are getting in the way of our relationship.
19. Her attitude toward me depends partly on how I am feeling about myself.
20. She will freely tell me her own thoughts and feelings, when I want to know them.
21. She is indifferent to me.
22. At times she jumps to the conclusion that I feel more strongly or more concerned about something than I actually do.
23. She behaves just the way that she is, in our relationship.
24. Sometimes she responds to me in a more positive and friendly way than she does at other times.
25. She says more about herself than I am really interested to hear.
26. She appreciates me.
27. Sometimes she thinks that I feel a certain way, because she feels that way.
28. I do not think that she hides anything from herself that she feels with me.
29. She likes me in some ways, dislikes me in others.
30. She adopts a professional role that makes it hard for me to know what she is like as a person.
31. She is friendly and warm toward me.
32. She understands me.
33. If I feel negatively toward her she responds negatively to me.
34. She tells me what she thinks about me, whether I want to know it or not.
35. She cares about me.
36. Her own attitudes toward some of the things I say, or do, stop her from really understanding me.
37. She does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
38. Whether I am expressing "good" feelings or "bad" ones seems to make no difference to how positively--or negatively--she feels toward me.
39. She is uncomfortable when I ask her something about herself.

40. She feels that I am dull and uninteresting.

41. She understands what I say, from a detached, objective point of view.

42. I feel that I can trust her to be honest with me.

43. Sometimes she is warmly responsive to me, at other times cold or disapproving.

44. She expresses ideas or feelings of her own that I am not really interested in.

45. She is interested in me.

46. She appreciates what my experiences feel like to me.

47. She is secure and comfortable in our relationship.

48. Depending on her mood, she sometimes responds to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than she does at other times.

49. She wants to say as little as possible about her own thoughts and feelings.

50. She just tolerates me.

51. She is playing a role with me.

52. She is equally appreciative—or equally unappreciative—of me, whatever I am telling her about myself.

53. Her own feelings and thoughts are always available to me, but never imposed on me.

54. She does not really care what happens to me.

55. She does not realize how strongly I feel about some of the things we discuss.

56. There are times when I feel that her outward response is quite different from her inner reaction to me.

57. Her general feeling toward me varies considerably.

58. She is willing for me to use our time to get to know her better, if or when I want to.

59. She seems to really value me.

60. She responds to me mechanically.

61. I don't think that she is being honest with herself about the way she feels toward me.
Whether I like or dislike myself makes no difference to the way she feels about me.

She is more interested in expressing and communicating herself than in knowing
and understanding me.

She dislikes me.

I feel that she is being genuine with me.

Sometimes she responds quite positively to me, at other times she seems indifferent.

She is unwilling to tell me how she feels about me.

She is impatient with me.

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

She likes me better when I behave in some ways than she does when I behave in
other ways.

She is willing to tell me her actual response to anything I say or do.

She feels deep affection for me.

She usually understands all of what I say to her.

She does not try to mislead me about her own thoughts or feelings.

Whether I feel fine or feel awful makes no difference to how warmly and appreciatively--
or how coldly and unappreciatively--she feels toward me.

She tends to evade any attempt that I make to get to know her better.

She regards me as a disagreeable person.

What she says gives a false impression of her total reaction to me.

I can be very critical of her or very appreciative of her without it changing her
feeling toward me.

At times she feels contempt for me.

When I do not say what I mean at all clearly she still understands me.

She tries to avoid telling me anything that might upset me.

Her general feeling toward me (of liking, respect, dislike, trust, criticism, anger,
extc.) reflects the way that I am feeling toward her.

She tries to understand me from her own point of view.

She can be deeply and fully aware of my most painful feelings without being
distressed or burdened by them herself.
APPENDIX E

Personal Data Summary Sheet
GROUP MEMBER PERCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Av Tc Id</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP COUNSELOR PERCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


