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INTRODUCTION

The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia, 1964) stimulated a growing interest by teacher educators to include in their teacher training programs instruction related to the affective domain. This investigation and research traces some developments from that period, and takes up the suggestion put forward by Lett (1976) regarding the desirability of including human relations training in teacher training programs.

Lett, in discussing the need for human relations training for teachers referred to a study carried out by Williams (1974) the results of which pointed to a need "for a systematic human relations method which has more direct links with everyday classroom communication". Such a program, according to Lett "would require emphasis to be placed on the degree of structure used in training, clarification of objectives sought, the selection of participants, and stress on a continuing working relationship rather than a temporary association".

This study focusses on some particular aspects of Human Relations training and incorporates a research involvement that attempts to avoid some of the weaknesses
in the research already undertaken in this area, and at the same time meet some of the essential requirements for such research as set down by Lett.

The major purpose of the study is to investigate the effects of a Human Relations training program on groups of teachers training to be teachers of handicapped children. These effects would be gauged in terms of performance as assessed in the categories of the Carkhuff Scales. (Appendix A) The general question asked in this investigation is whether a particular Human Relations training program, carried out in a particular way, is an effective method for bringing about changes in some areas of functioning which are considered to be important aspects of a teacher's interaction with his students.

A further question asked is whether the training program is effective only with those teachers who are receptive to change. The Machiavellian Scale devised by Christie and Geis is used to gain "receptive to change" score. (Appendix D)

Basic to this investigation is the contention that a teacher training program should have as one of its results the improvement of the person's teaching skills, and thus his effectiveness as a teacher. The Human Relations program therefore aims at assisting the teacher to develop a more effective level of professional functioning. This form of training has been referred
to by humanistically oriented scholars such as Rogers, Maslow and May, as a method of tapping unused human potential. Egan (1970) takes up this point and states that the problem in education of unused human potential and the maximizing of a pupil's abilities outweighs the problem of the frequency of emotional disorders, but is not seen as a serious public health concern because its effects are not so dramatic or visible.

Traditionally, the task of devising ways of developing and achieving a pupil's optimum ability level has been given to education authorities. However, Rogers (1969) suggests that formal teacher training programs have failed to develop in teachers the skill of unfettering that human potential. Furthermore, Egan (1970) says that people have to learn how to interact with others rather than living in separate or parallel fashion, and studies by Aspy (1969) which are reported in detail later in this study indicate that a particular type of interactory situation is more conducive to learning and to the attainment of potential.

This study, therefore, represents an attempt to explore the above issues, and to add to the slowly mounting research in the area of Human Relations Training and its effect in an education context.
Defining Human Relations Training

A review of the literature concerning Human Relations Training and its use in teacher preparation programs brings an awareness that it is not a well defined area. There is a strong impression that there are far more "articles of faith" than controlled research findings. However, in recent years, as well as an increase in the number of books reporting first-hand experiences, there has also been an increase in research oriented discussions in which consideration of methods and techniques have been predominant. Many of the "experience" books carry the impression of testimonials and only occasionally is there any critical appraisal of those experiences and of the approaches upon which these testimonials are based. Also, rarely are the details of the actual training programs included in these books. The wide range of terms used in the broad Human Relations area tends to lead to confusion and to difficulties in focusing on key issues. An illustration of this range can be seen in the way that terms such as Human Relations Training, Encounter Groups, Sensitivity Training, T-Groups, Group Life Laboratories and others tend to merge with each other in many of the reports. One explanation of this
merging could be that these methods are all a part of a humanistic view of interrelationships, and in each method the goals, interests and feelings of the participants are considerations of prime importance. Thus the activities and directions of the experience rarely stay in the pure or unique form that the titles may suggest. To exert the control necessary to approximate a pure experience in any of the areas listed above could possibly lead to a significant negation of some aspect of the program. Therefore, when a particular approach is stipulated it is probably more correct to say that this is the focus of the program and that there will probably be elements of other programs infiltrating and, of lesser focus.

Most Human Relations Training programs incorporate a strong element of training in sensitivity to the feelings and actions of the other person. Training for sensitivity is generally conducted in a small group setting and such a setting is characteristic of Human Relations programs. Similarity with the Group Laboratory approach can be seen in a number of aspects. The Group Laboratory approach utilizes a face-to-face, largely unstructured interaction as the learning setting. The activities are usually planned, but permit individuality in the direction that the studies may take. There is an emphasis on giving feedback of thoughts and feelings, and on an analysis of the information that is brought forward in the sessions. There
is also a consideration of the effects of such feedback and analyses on the participants, possibly leading to a reformulation of concepts, values and behavior. Human relations training focusses on the personal and interpersonal issues that occur within a group and between people. It is the relationship of the effects of Human Relations training to teacher training programs, and ultimately to the classroom functioning of both the child and the teacher that is the major interest in this study.

Not surprisingly the researcher in this study was not able to arrive at a single definition for Human Relations training and thus during this study he will delineate training approaches and behaviors that the treatment program utilizes and which are common to most Human Relations training situations. Justification for this standpoint is derived from the following definitions which refer to a wide range of activities and varying types of emphases that cumulatively result in a flexibility that permits the modification of programs to meet individual needs.

Firstly, there is a statement from Blank, Gottsegen and Gottsegen (1971), that refers mainly to effects and purposes:

Human Relations training . . . serves the specific purpose of increasing a person's awareness of his own behavior, his effect on others, the effect others have on him, and the effect people have on each other. It also provides an opportunity to experiment with new behaviors and to discover their effects. (p. 371)
O'Banion and O'Connell (1970) state:

Being sensitive (to others) means hearing, feeling, responding and articulating. Most of us are insensitive because we do not hear, we do not listen. To listen we must focus attention on the here-and-now, concentrate on the individual who is communicating, and at the same time be aware of self and others in the group. (p. 160)

Then there is a statement by Borton (1970):

The purpose of (Human Relations) group was to encourage each individual to gain a greater insight into himself, an increased sensitivity to the feelings of others, and an awareness of how these two were interrelated. It differed from an ordinary working group in that it provided for maximum feedback of personal feelings. Most of us, most of the time, do not say what we feel, even if we pride ourselves on saying what we think. And yet the undercurrent of feelings often determines our behavior and the responses of others to us. The training group provides a setting in which enough trust is created so that it is possible for us to find out what others think of us. It is a bit like talking to a good friend, except that in a training group there are a number of people in which to mirror one's self, and therefore, a greater check on the accuracy of perceptions. (pp. 146-7)

While there are different emphases in the definitions, each statement introduces the notion of interpersonal relationships in which the participants strive for greater depth of understanding of each other. A problem arises however, in that there is no one agreed program which gives a recipe as to how this understanding is to be achieved in each Human Relations training situation. The difficulty makes it almost impossible to get a close replication of research. Furthermore, very few of the research reports on Human Relations training include
precise details of the treatment program, and even where these details are available their value is limited because of the unique way the training develops. The trainer's role in Human Relations training is to be alert to the growth rate and pattern of the group of participants, and usually he has to tune his leadership functioning to the initiatives taken by the participants. Thus each situation tends to be a unique experience - one which is very difficult to predict, and afterwards to reproduce. Probably what most leaders in Human Relations tend to do is to follow some rather general prescriptions of technique and content as those listed below. The following five points have been identified by Seashore (1972) who believes that these points characterize most Human Relations training situations.

1. Each participant enters the training situation with the undertaking that he is largely responsible for his own learning. (Note that Carkhuff (1971) and Egan (1973) criticized those leaders who resorted to an almost complete abdication of leadership responsibility.)

2. Leadership that reacts to the needs of the participants does not negate the leader's role but rather emphasizes his function which is to facilitate the examination of, and the understanding of the interactory processes in a group. The leader helps the participants to focus on the way the group is working; the manner of an individual's participation, and the issues that are facing
3. The leader aims to maintain a group climate in which each participant feels free to examine experiences in detail, and to gain emotional support where this examination tends to threaten or challenge functioning or self-image.

4. A person is most free to learn when he establishes authentic relationships with other people and thereby increases his sense of self-esteem, and decreases his defensiveness. In these authentic relationships persons can be open, honest and direct with each other so that they are communicating what they are actually feeling rather than masking their feelings.

5. Such openness leads to the development of new skills in relating to others, and assists the person to examine the basic values underlying his behavior. The group allows the person to practice this new behavior and obtain feedback on the effects that this behavior has on others.

Whereas these five aspects are evident in the programs operated by Borton (1970), Rogers (1969), and Schutz (1967), they come in for a considerable amount of criticism from Carkhuff (1971) who makes a strong plea for a more structured, systematic approach
to the training program. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) built a program around focussing on certain behaviors, called core dimensions. These core dimensions were identified as empathic understanding, genuineness, confrontation, interpersonal respect and specificity of expression. Truax and Carkhuff's dimensions and type of training have tended to strongly influence the Human Relations field since the publication of their book *Introduction to Counselling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice* (1966), and their approach is consistent with the shift in emphasis towards regarding Human Relations training as being important in both "process" as well as "outcome". Furthermore, the Truax and Carkhuff approach has provided a controlled training model or process situation based on both discrimination and communication exercises in the areas of the core dimensions listed above. Thus, whereas Rogers, Schultz, Mann and Borton would focus on the core dimension behaviors in a somewhat random fashion, Carkhuff employed leader-directed and controlled presentation of various exercises.
The Assessment of Human Relations Behaviors

The assessment of the outcomes of Human Relations training seems to take its beginnings from the work of Truax and Carkhuff (1967) and, Carkhuff and Berenson (1967). In both instances the researchers set up and then refined rating scales for the behaviors for each of the core dimensions. They were attempting through these rating scales not to judge mastery of the vocabulary, the facts, the principles and the theories of the training but rather to measure the extent to which participants demonstrated the behaviors in their normal functioning, or in other words the quality of their interpersonal relationships. The usefulness of the scales for identifying behavioral change was reported by Carkhuff (1971) in which he indicated that groups of people including parents, students, school faculty and educational administrators were all shown to made significant changes of behavior in the core dimension areas following a training program.

However, one of the doubts surrounding the reported improvements using the Carkhuff scales arises from the consideration that the scores may represent acquired abilities to verbally respond in a more empathic, more genuine, etc. way, rather than an actual improvement in the quality of functioning in these core dimensions. It is suggested therefore that the reported results may have been more credible if the rating scales which employ the same
terminology as that used in the training program, had been supplemented by a different measuring instrument. There would appear to be considerable value in using the Carkhuff rating scales to focus on the core dimensions during the training program but there must be some doubt as to the usefulness of those same scales when they are the only rating instruments to be employed at the end of the program. The question to be raised is whether the honesty and genuineness hopefully generated during the treatment program is sufficiently adequate to ensure that an accurate self-appraisal is made at the termination of the program. One way of keeping a check on this accuracy is to require the self-respondents to meet with the leader following their completion of the Carkhuff scales. This post-test discussion permits a form of interobserver reliability because the respondent is permitted to modify his self-responses if he so wishes. Any such modifications would result as a clarification of feelings and ideas concerning one's functioning at the end of the treatment program.

A further consideration related to the above issues is whether human relations training develops an ability which is context-specific or whether that ability carries over to other settings. If it is context-specific then the results following from a particular training program could not be expected to generalise to functioning outside that particular training situation. A study carried out by Cline and
Richards (1960) provides data supporting the view that the abilities arising from the training are not context-specific. Cline and Richards tested subjects on twelve different inventories or scales, all of which purported to measure some aspects of human relations functioning. These inventories and scales sampled a wide range of situations and behaviors, and found that subjects generally scored at similar levels on all tests. However, these findings were based on self rating situations that did not seem to include a check rater contingency. It would seem desirable in the above rating situations that some attempt should be made to obtain an interobserver check. This then, would provide some data in assessing whether felt change correlates with observed behavioral change, and also whether the Human Relations training is largely context-specific or whether it tends to generalise to other everyday situations.

The Carkhuff scales and the core dimensions on which they are based can be seen to be attempts to explore the interpersonal area in specific behavioral characteristics. Carkhuff's research also attempted to identify the separate-ness of outcome and process as separate aspects of study in the Human Relations field. For example, Cronbach (1955) isolated, defined and measured components of sensitivity, an important element in the Human Relations field, but was seemingly only concerned with the outcome aspect of the dimension. Cronbach's components deal more with the
characteristics of the rater (i.e. How sensitive am I?),
than with the characteristics of the relationship (i.e.
How sensitive was I in that situation?). The focus of
sensitivity considerations as they are now used in Human
Relations training programs is concerned more with the
possession of those skills that enhance the interpersonal
functioning of a person and would enable a rater to
accurately perceive the level and type of another person's
functioning. Sensitivity is thus now seen as a process
activity, and training for the development of sensitivity
has taken a direction towards engaging in activities that
Carkhuff broadly refers to as "discrimination" and "commu­
nication" exercises rather than the earlier tendency
exemplified in the Cronbach approach in which "discrimina­
tion" exercises were predominant. The two-way or inter­
personal factor is now seen to be very important in most
of the dimensions in the Human Relations field. It is not
now sufficient to be able to sensitively interpret a
person's behavior. Such outcome seems to be regarded as
of little value unless there is a communication of resultant
feelings and thoughts to the other person, and it is probably
this two-way process that distinguishes empathy from sympathy.
Returning then to the definitions in the earlier part of
this paper it is significant to note the use by O'Banion
and O'Connell (1970) who include in their definition the
words, "hearing, feeling, responding and articulating".
The emphasis on definition is very much concerned with the two-way aspect of behavior between people and thus the assessment must likewise concern itself with probing the interpersonal aspects of functioning in relationships. Such functioning can be looked at from the point-of-view of both self-assessment as well as from outside observation. It is this dual form of assessment that is used in this study.
Effects of Human Relations Training

The Human Relations training area and the effects of that training has been researched by a number of people. These include Blank, Gottsegen and Gottsegen (1971), Bradford, Gibb and Benne (1964), Bugental (1967), Campbell and Dunette (1948), Carkhuff and Berenson (1967), Carkhuff and Truax (1967), Flanders and Amidon (1967), and Rogers (1969). A theme running throughout the writings of these researchers is that all interactions between persons designated by society as more knowing and less knowing can have either facilitative or retarding effects on the less knowing, and that the type of effects are largely dictated by the quality of the functioning of the more knowing person. Also, these researchers report that the consequences of these kinds of interactions may be constructive or deteriorative on intellectual as well as psychological indexes. Furthermore, their findings suggest that, to a large degree, the facilitative or retarding effects can be accounted for by a core of dimensions which are present in all interactive human processes. With regard to studies in the field of education, students of teachers who are functioning at high levels of these dimensions improve on a variety of criteria including classroom behavior and academic achievement, while students of teachers who are offering low levels on these dimensions tend not to improve on those same
(1967) noted a difference between the means on academic achievement levels of 1.6 years favoring the students of teachers who were functioning at high levels on the scales of the core dimensions. These dimensions have been operationally defined by Carkhuff (1969). (See Appendix B). Carkhuff states that the level of these dimensions determines to a large extent the quality of the interaction, and, in an educational setting, they seem to be significantly correlated with the amount of, and the quality of the student's learning.

In setting up these dimensions Carkhuff has used a five-point scale on which a numerical assessment of the level of interrelating can be determined. On each dimension Level 3 is defined as the minimally facilitative level of interpersonal functioning. Levels 1 and 2 denote functioning standards which either tend to hinder the relationship or lead to its deterioration. These scales provide a quantitative yardstick by which trainees or others can check their progress on the dimensions. Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) in a statement unsupported by research data noted that most teachers tended to respond to the content of their interaction with their students rather than the communicated feeling level, and thus the scales had the dual purpose of providing an index of level of functioning as well as highlighting various desired areas of interpersonal functioning. Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) reported
on an Aspy and Hadlock study which indicated that over a one-year period, pupils gained 2.5 years of reading achievement with teachers functioning at high levels on the core dimensions compared with a gain of 0.7 years for children receiving low levels of these conditions. A feature of the Aspy and Hadlock study is that there was no training involved but rather the researchers identified teachers who were functioning at high and low levels on the core dimensions and then carried out correlation studies involving academic achievement levels. These researchers were attempting to validate the effects of the core dimensions' qualities rather than any particular training program. A weakness in the Aspy and Hadlock research however, was the very restricted sample of students, and the use of verbal response situations only for ranking purposes. Truax and Tatum (1966) found that the more accurate a teacher's empathic understanding of his pupils, the better the teacher was able to elicit improvement from his pupils. Borton (1970) makes a similar point when he describes a teacher development situation in which trainee teachers set out to "help each other to look honestly at our personal interactions; to integrate our bodies, our emotions, our thinking". Borton found that this led to the growth of those personality characteristics seemingly the same as in the Carkhuff dimensions, and also led to a far greater responsiveness on the part of the students.
A comprehensive and well-controlled research study was carried out by Hefele (1971). Hefele set out to investigate relationships between the offered level of interpersonal skills of student teachers and the academic achievements of deaf pupils. Also, he sought to find out whether teachers could be trained in those interpersonal skills. He hypothesized that participants in an interpersonal process training program would experience more significant gains in their ability to discriminate both facilitative and deteriorative teaching situations, and would communicate more effectively with their classes than would non-participants in such a program; that the quality of interpersonal processes to which teacher trainees are exposed during the practicum experiences would relate positively to their own interpersonal functioning; and that the quality of interpersonal processes occurring in the classroom would relate positively to pupil achievement. Hefele's total research effort in this instance was divided into a process phase and an outcome phase. In the process phase Hefele sought to measure the impact of an interpersonal process training program on an experimental group of trainees teachers. This training program which focused on the Carkhuff core dimension areas was found to have a significant impact on the ability of trainee teachers to both recognize and implement those aspects of good teaching which are characterized by high levels on the interpersonal variables.
The trainee teachers selected as their training supervisors teachers who were on the average more than one half of a level higher (using the Carkhuff Scales) than did a control group of trainees who also had to select teacher supervisors. In the outcome phase two achievement measures were used. Firstly, the school supervisors were asked to make what seems to be a curious judgment in that they were asked to judge whether or not the child involved was performing at the level of competence that they would expect of a child with his considered abilities and for his grade level. Whereas it is reasonable to nominate average grade level expectations for a particular group of children there seems to be some controversy over the extent to which considered abilities can be accurately assessed. The results of that research indicated that the training program teachers succeeded in eliciting higher levels of academic achievement in reading and mathematics from their students than did the control teachers (p.<05). An interesting further finding by Hefele was that the teachers in the training program who made smaller gains on the scales' levels tended to deteriorate in their levels after the process stage had finished for two months. These findings suggest a lack of permanence for some teachers in retaining their level of functioning, and possibly also that the training itself does not promote permanency. In concluding the discussion to his research Hefele supports the inclusion
of interpersonal training in teacher preparation programs and says:

Training programs need to be provided to all parties concerned in order to maximise their interpersonal levels. Courage is also demanded for the task of excluding from teaching positions those persons who are unwilling or unable to respond to the training. Retention of ineffectuals can only yield harm for their colleagues and for their students.

Finally, it should be noted that when Hefele was referring to interpersonal programs he was referring to a somewhat restricted form of training in which only genuineness and empathy were being considered.

Another important research effort in this area was undertaken by Berenson (1971) who set out "to explore the effects of a human relations training program on the classroom performances of elementary school student teachers". Berenson's sample included only female students, and although there does not seem to have been any studies of the effects of Human Relations program on male teachers as compared to female teachers, this may well have been a sampling factor which could have limited the value of his research. Berenson took considerable care in design with the setting up of three control groups. Prior to the beginning of the treatment program all the students in the study were tested on three measures. One measure was the Communication Index of Interpersonal Functioning (C.I.I.F.) which established ratings of overall functioning through
a composite assessment on the dimensions of empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, immediacy, and confrontation. Another measure was the Student Teacher Competency Rating scale (S.T.C.R.) which was used to yield information concerning the student teacher's rated competencies as a person, as an understander of children, and of her knowledge of the teacher learning process. Finally, Berenson used the Teaching Situation Reaction Test (T.S.R.T.) which measured written reactions to teaching situations related to planning, management and teacher-pupil relationships. Following the battery of testing, the Experimental group (Ex) received 25 hours of training in the discrimination and communication of the interpersonal conditions of accurate empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, immediacy and confrontation. The training program which utilized the integration of the didactic, experimental and modelling sources of learning was conducted by a trainer who was reported as functioning well above level 3.0 on the Carkhuff scales. Twenty five hours of solely didactic training in Human Relations was given to subjects in the training control (Ct) but did not include any experiential training. Subjects in a Hawthorne Effect control group (CI) were informed of their participation in a study to determine the effects of a pre-student teaching workshop on their performance in the classroom and on their relationships with the pupils. Subjects in the randomly selected
control group proper (Cp) had no knowledge of their participation in the study. At the end of the treatment time for the Ex group the three measures were again administered. The student teachers' scores on the C.I.I.F. before training revealed no significant difference between groups, however, the post-training scores significantly favored the Ex student teachers over the Ct (p.<001), Cl (p.<001), and Cp (p.<001). On the understanding of children dimension of the T.S.R.T. the student teachers' Ex group rated significantly higher than each of the control groups (p.<001). On the T.S.R.T. which was concerned with teacher-pupil relationships the Ex group demonstrated significantly higher scores than the Ct (p.<001), the Cl (p.<001), and the Cp (p.<025). The study appears to support the efficacy of a training program which focusses on the conditions of empathy, positive regard, genuineness, immediacy, concreteness and confrontation and which systematically incorporates the experimental, didactic and modelling sources of learning. Another important finding was that the mean gain in functioning after the training period for the Ex group was approximately one full level on the Carkhuff scales. The next best gain was for the Ct group and was 0.21 of a level. Berenson said that the methods used in this study to create a Hawthorne Effect (Cl) did not produce a significant effect on the interpersonal skills of students
in those groups. One of the outcomes of the training for the Ex group was the finding that women student teachers could be trained in relatively short periods of time to lift their functioning significantly. However, it should be noted that the average level at the end of that short period was still only 2.61, which is still below the level of 3.0 which is reported by Carkhuff to be the level at which the teacher becomes minimally effective in lifting the functioning of her students. In this respect then, the Berenson study leaves unanswered the question of how much advance in functioning on the scales could be expected from a year's training program. The Berenson study is highly significant in this review because of its implications for teacher education. A high correlation was observed between the student teachers' level of interpersonal functioning and the appropriate use of training behaviors such as the positive reinforcements of praise and encouragement. It also demonstrated the desirability of not only providing training in the discrimination of interpersonal qualities but also in the communication of these.

**Leader Influence**

There are at least two ways in which the trainer and leader can have an important influence on the development within trainees of high levels of interpersonal functioning. These are through a Human Relations training program, and secondly, through a modelling effect. Carkhuff (1971) has
taken both of these aspects into account in his research and makes the assertion that a trainer functioning below level 3 on his scales may effect deteriorative behavioral change even though focussing in the training on very relevant procedures, and this finding suggests that the modelling effect is at least as important as the program influence in implementing interpersonal skill development. Thus, there would seem to be considerable importance in there being a high level of congruence between the leader's training program and the quality of his interpersonal functioning.

Carkhuff, who seems to be one of the more prolific of the researchers in this area of types of training programs, vigorously attacks those programs which do not have a fairly closely controlled body of experiences focussing on what he calls "discrimination and communication of interpersonal skills" exercises. He is critical of training programs that are largely free floating in content and approach, and of programs in which the leader does not assume a large amount of responsibility for the direction of that program. It is a weakness in Carkhuff's standpoint, however, that he does not cite research evidence concerning the comparative value of highly structured as against free floating studies, but rather seems to ask his reader to take it as an article of faith that the structured program is superior for the achievement of higher levels of interpersonal functioning. The reader is likewise required
accept the superiority of the structured approach on the basis of greater predictability of improvement areas. Thus while Carkhuff's claims could be seen to give strength to his reports of the potency of his training program, there would need to be a close examination of his actual research before the findings could be confidently accepted.

Research on leadership influence was also carried out by Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973). These researchers found that matched groups of tertiary students, receiving the same type of program, but having different leaders, can differ greatly in the development of their functioning on the core dimensions. Lieberman, Yalom and Miles ascribe differential resultant effects to the different personality characteristics of the leaders.

The Content of the Training Program

As well as being critical of the unstructured nature of some of the training programs, Carkhuff (1971) also criticized the unusual and unique nature of some of the exercises employed by leaders in those training situations. Carkhuff argued that those unstructured training situations because of their uniqueness do not facilitate a generalization of skill attainment to non-training situations and thus the skill attained has a very narrow applicability. However, it could be argued that the exercises that Carkhuff proposes for developing the core dimensions could also be regarded as being somewhat unique. In his training
program Carkhuff utilizes a considerable amount of role-playing. Perhaps the most significant difference between Carkhuff's training program and that used by the "unstructured" practitioners such as Otto (1970) is that Carkhuff's exercises were much more controlled by the leader. Otto's potpourri type program lists a number of seemingly unrelated exercises, and virtually invites the trainer to select from a wide range of training exercises those that best suit his needs, interests and skills. Gibb (1971) reports that in seventeen studies on the influence of Human Relations training in developing sensitivity to others, fourteen of those studies reported significant increases in ability to predict the responses of others - the other three studies reported no significant changes. The only common content element identified by Gibb in either the change or non-change results was that in ten of the change results there was a significant amount of usage of the "less authoritarian" approaches to the trainee. The research evidence thus indicates only broad areas of agreement as to the appropriate or desirable type of content in Human Relations training, and clearly in attempting to delineate the effects of training programs it is essential that the particular content used in any particular program be described as fully as possible. Such descriptions are crucial if we are to extend the value of research in this area.
The Question of Flexibility of Training Programs

In this context flexibility means the modification or adaption of training programs to increase the learning potential of those programs. Flexibility is thus seen as a method principle used both by practitioners and researchers that can be introduced when the leader and/or the participants feel that greater learning may result from some modification to the program. A study carried out by Joyce (1968) is pertinent with regard to this aspect. Joyce, who studied the effects of Human Relations training accepted the principle of allowing flexibility in approach and of permitting flexibility strategies in those training programs. To achieve this Joyce required a group of trainee teachers to observe children's coping behavior as a method of increasing their (the trainee teachers) awareness of the children's frame of reference. The teachers were required to practice modifying their teaching approach in response to the observed cognitive and affective orientations of their pupils. The results of this type of approach did not show any significant increase in the teacher's sensitivity to the children's needs. Unfortunately, Joyce's report did not specify how sensitivity was measured. This omission in information renders it impossible to determine relationships between method and outcome. Another aspect of the Joyce research was that the treatment program seemed to have a very small amount of actual practical interaction in the training situation, and certainly much
less than in the research studies of Carkhuff (1969), Berenson (1971) and Hefele (1971), and it seems that the practical interaction aspect has to be very prominent to permit flexibility strategies to take place. The concern with such strategies, however, is that apart from the difficulties of replicating a program they also permit a diffusion of behaviors in that program and thus exacerbates the problem of defining the field and practices of the Human Relations area. Thus while it may be useful and defensible to allow flexibility within the program it does obscure the attempts to accurately assess the effects of Human Relations training programs.

**Discrimination - Communication Training**

One of the types of training that is reported to facilitate change is that of discrimination and communication training. Significant gains in the area of discrimination and communication of the interpersonal core dimensions of empathy, honesty, and unconditional regard are reported by Bierman, Carkhuff and Santilli (1969) and Carkhuff and Griffin (1969). However, with the latter study the sample was comprised of 83 women and 1 man, all of whom were currently involved in helping programs of some type, and most of whom would have probably appreciated the need for empathy in their professional functioning. Furthermore, the treatment was evaluated in a limited way in that all that was required was a written response to a stimulus
situation. It is possible that such a response could be learned and thus written down, without the person necessarily functioning in that way in his professional practice. The possibility of such a discrepancy is described fully by Keisler, Collins and Miller (1969) in their studies on attitude change. They identified subjects who reported behavior changes that did not correlate with the observed behavior of those subjects. It is possible then that once the subject becomes aware of the content of the measurement scales and of the desired response, he may seek to give the appropriate response, or demonstrate the appropriate behavior in a test situation without it being necessarily a true reflection of that person's skill in interrelating with others in real-life situations. This is more likely to occur when the measuring scales do not accurately denote or describe instances of observable behavior. The more vague the description of the behavior the more susceptible is the rating of that behavior to distortion and inaccuracy.

Egan (1975) was a strong advocate for the inclusion of discrimination and communication exercises in Human Relations training programs. Egan accepts the notion put forward by Gazda (1973) that discrimination is an act of perception. Egan says that the helper attends carefully to the other person and listens to both the verbal and non-verbal messages. Communication, on the other hand he says is the ability to act in a facilitative or helping
way in social situations, and involves the translation of insights, perceptions and discriminations into effective interpersonal transactions. A good communicator then is an agent rather than just an observer.

The discrimination and communication behaviors have been operationalized in the Carkhuff rating scales referred to earlier. Just as the treatment program in this research has included strong elements of discrimination and communication training there has also been usage of the Carkhuff rating scales which spell out specific behaviors that can be observed and measured.

Studies of the Effects of Human Relations Training on Classroom Performance

There are some studies which attempt to gauge the extent to which self reported behavioral changes in classroom performance can also be seen by observers. Berenson's (1971) study attempted to overcome some of the limitations that may occur with self report behavior by taking a wider evaluation approach, which included both self and observer ratings of teachers' classroom functioning. Through this dual evaluation approach Berenson attempted to gain a better check on the degree of congruency between reported and actual behavior. Khanna and Khanna (1972) carried out a training program using Human Relations training activities which was directed towards improving the teachers' classroom performance. In particular they aimed to improve a range of classroom teaching skills.
They found that following the training program the teachers tried much harder to improve the quality of their teaching. Another finding, based largely on self report measures however, was that the teachers improved in their skill of tuning in to, and reacting appropriately to the feelings of others, and also, their self regard and self acceptance increased. In addition, those teachers developed improved skills in personal relationships with others. Observers' rating scales were given to the teachers' superiors who rated their teachers as relating more positively to their students. One of the problems with this and many other studies is that while they are useful in providing confirmatory support for the beneficial effects of Human Relations training in general, they rarely seek to investigate why certain individuals in the treatment program fail to move with the general trend of results. This observation could also be made with regard to the Shapiro and Ross (1972) study. Shapiro and Ross in a series of studies set out to examine both the processes and the outcomes of Human Relations training involving teachers. They evaluated various Human Relations procedures in terms of their value in training teachers to be more able to respond to student's needs in the classroom. Their results confirmed their hypothesis that Human Relations training is in general an effective tool for change, but as with other researchers they did not attempt to explain why some students failed to improve with the training.
A major impediment to obtaining significant findings in the area of the effects of Human Relations training on teachers classroom performance arises from the difficulty of linking teachers' behavior directly to students' outcomes in classroom settings. Some investigations (Coleman, 1966; Jencks, 1972) have minimized the importance of the role of the teacher in accounting for educational outcomes. These investigations point to the likely contaminating effects of family background, socio-economic status, and ethnicity as causal variables that should be taken into consideration when assessing the level of student achievement. Heath and Neilsen (1974) come out very strongly on the difficulties of postulating connecting links between teacher training programs and student achievement. They conclude firstly that there is no established empirical relation between teacher behavior and student achievement, and secondly they state that there are generally flaws in the research which are due to nonsensical statistical analyses, weak research designs, and sterile operational definitions of teacher behavior and student outcomes. Thirdly, they say that because of the strong association between omnibus measures of student achievement and socio-economic and ethnic status, the effects of teachers and their techniques on students' achievement is bound to be
trivial. These are serious criticisms of past research but must nevertheless not inhibit further attempts to refine, explore and research the concepts and practices in the relationships between Human Relations training for teachers and subsequent classroom outcomes.

The Relationship of Change Potential to Personality Characteristics

Earlier in this study the possibility was raised that Human Relations training may be more effective in bringing about change with some trainees rather than others, and that the potentiality for change may be related to certain personality characteristics. The writings of Geis (1970) and Lett (1973) are relevant to this aspect. Lett makes a point that receives little consideration by other researchers in this area. He says that the type and level of entering behavior of the participants, and the effects of that entering behavior on the subsequent functioning of the trainee is a consideration that should be taken into account when attempting to gauge treatment effects. Lett also speaks of the possibility of collision between the value system of the leader and the training group's value system, and that such a collision could create impediments to the growth of a facilitative training climate. Christie and Geis (1970) investigated the entering behavior notion and claim that their test entitled "Machiavellianism" can identify subjects who possess
certain personality characteristics which dispose them to be "encounter-prone" and other subjects who do not possess those characteristics and who are disposed to be "encounter-blind". In their Machiavellianism test Christie and Geis identified two groups of people who they called High Machiavellians (H.Ms.) and Low Machiavellians (L.Ms.). They found that the L.Ms. were encounter-prone, that is, likely to be changed by Human Relations training type experiences, while H.Ms., were encounter-blind, that is, not likely to be changed by those training experience. Furthermore, they asserted that L.Ms. were greatly concerned with interpersonal relationship factors whereas H.Ms. were distracted from interpersonal concerns by the demands of the task. Thus it would seem that there may be some identifiable personality characteristics which seem to correlate with the propensity to be changed by those Human Relations training experiences which utilize encounter notions and methods, and if this is so, then one could expect less change resulting from the training experiences with those trainees who had a low level of proneness. Nevertheless, Christie and Geis do not say that H.Ms. will not change in certain particular characteristics, but rather that the H.Ms. are resistant to the influence of the training. The encounter notions and methods noted above would include those aspects of confrontation, immediacy, empathy and genuineness. These aspects are
generally seen to be central facets of Human Relations training programs, and are certainly important in the Egan training program, the treatment program used in this research. It is suggested then that any research that sets out to estimate the effects of Human Relations training should make some attempt to gauge the extent to which the trainees in the program are likely to be affected by that training as a factor of their entering attitudes and behavior.

**Durability of Change**

The durability of change resulting from structured Human Relations training does not seem to have been researched, and perhaps this can be partly attributed to the newness of the training program, and thus the insufficient time lapse to usefully undertake such investigations. Another reason for lack of research in durability may be the realization that as the time lapse from the training increases, the number of intervening experiences also increases, thus making causal relationships more difficult to establish. There are a number of issues that bear on this matter. Teachers may undergo a training experience in a "closed" tertiary academic institution and then be confronted by a bewildered, bemused and questioning group of colleagues and/or students when the teacher attempts to utilize his newly acquired relationship skills in the work-face situation. Thus there is concern with the
generalisability and permanency of the acquired skills. Lett (1976) comments that there is little likelihood that the teacher will persist with those newly acquired skills if he is faced with a hostile, negative or even a non-understanding environment. Thus there may well be difficulties of retention of those skills even though the immediate effects of the trainee's training seems to indicate a strong change and a strong commitment to implementing the new skills acquired in the training program.

The Humanistic Context and Its Effects

A further criticism of research studies is the lack of attention given to the overall context of studies in which Human Relations is a component. If the studies are part of a teacher training program which emphasizes a humanistic or whole person philosophic approach then it is possible that the results that are being attributed to a segment of that program, that is, the Human Relations training, may be at least a part artifact of the overall training environment. On the other hand with Human Relations training as a segment of a different sort of program, such as one that has a heavy Behavioristic orientation it may be less likely that the total training environment is providing an enhancement of effect. It is the writer's impression that those more recent and better
documented studies such as by Berenson (1971), Hefele (1971) and Miller (1973) all tend to utilize more openly behavioral methodology and principles in the training or treatment programs. It may well be that with a trend towards the inclusion of increased behavioral considerations in teacher training programs, the accompanying trend towards more behavioral method in Human Relations training programs will lead to a new congruency between the training component and the total training context. In this situation the overall context will be more behavioral. The Carkhuff and Egan approach can be seen as a reflection of the trend towards the solid inclusion of behavioral technology in the training context.

It is thus important to make the observations that a range of types of training contexts exist, that Human Relations training can be incorporated congruently into these, and that the particular contexts should be examined to ascertain whether they may be enhancing or inhibiting the effects of the training.

**Attitude Change Resulting From Human Relations Training**

It is appropriate to look briefly at the question of attitudes and attitude change because there would seem to be a close connection between attitudes and relationships. It may be said that attitudes are some of the
covert components of relationships. Holding this view, it would then follow that the attitudes we have, influence to some extent at least, the type of relating and the relationships we involve ourselves in. Also, if we wish to modify or develop those relationships then seemingly we are also concerned with modifying or developing attitudes. Krech and Crutchfield (1948) define an attitude as "an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual and cognitive processes with respect to some aspects of the individual's world". Thurstone and Chave (1929) advocated a broader definition. They defined an attitude as "the intensity of positive or negative affect for or against a psychological object. A psychological object is any symbol, person, phrase, slogan, or idea toward which people can differ as regards positive or negative affect." Campbell (1950) puts forward the following statement. He says that research on social attitudes has been justly criticized for a lack of common definition and measurement procedures. Campbell goes on to assert that an individual's social attitude is a syndrome of response consistency involving social objects. He thus gives an action connotation to attitude which is evident in his assertion that attitude must be considered a response rather than a set to respond, and that in research we are more concerned with response consistencies rather than isolated responses.
Green (1954) said that attitude measurement involves sampling a behavior universe, and measuring the universe by means of a sample. This means, he says, that the sample of elements must be representative.

Kiesler, Collins and Miller (1969) state that the definition of attitudes should correspond closely with the operational definition used to measure the attitude.

The Carkhuff scales, and their usage, serve to bring together the suggestions and feelings of the above theorists. The attitudes are defined both overall, and at the various levels, and these definitions are then applied to a sample of behavior. The definitions are thus intimately bound up in the measurement scale and the measurement technique.

The literature on measurement techniques in attitudes reveals that the most common measure of attitude is a pencil and paper type giving self-report responses - a measurement technique which does not make direct use of overt behavior. In 1964 Cook and Selltiz distinguished five general categories of attitude measure:

a) Measures in which inferences are drawn from self-reports of beliefs, behaviors, etc.

b) Measures in which inferences are drawn from the observation of on-going behavior in a natural setting.

c) Measures in which inferences are drawn from the individual's reaction to or interpretation
d) Measures in which inferences are drawn from performance of objective tasks.

e) Measures in which inferences are drawn from physiological reactions to the attitudinal object or representations of it.

As the investigation is concerned principally with categories (a) and (b) above, the following comments will concentrate largely on those two issues.

The rating a person gives to himself can be largely influenced by the type of scale. In a situation where there is a six point scale which includes one negative and five positive aspects it could be expected if the particular trait or skill was distributed normally in the population that the negative category would receive a disproportionately higher number of inclusions than each of the other five positive categories. Also, if a scale has a small number of gradations against another that has a large number it may be that the smaller number will mask out some of the differences or discriminations that are possible to obtain with a large number of gradations. Of course, there may be some who are either reluctant or unable to make a fine discrimination and thus are much more comfortable with broader categories. The important point underlying these considerations remains, however, that the attitude scales must give appropriate opportunity for the self-reporting person to locate himself on that scale, and the criteria for setting up, and usage of such
scales may have to change according to the population using those scales. The Carkhuff scales used to measure the degree and direction of attitude change in this study follow the semantic differential approach described by Osgood, Susi and Tannenbaum (1957) and consists of a series of bipolar adjectives, each separated by a number of intervals of equal distance from each other. The subject is asked to indicate where along the continuum between the two pairs of indicators the attitude lies. The usefulness of this approach must be at least partly a factor of the extent to which the meaning of each level on the continuum is clear for the self-reporter. The validity of these self-report measures is related to aspects such as the honesty of the reporter, and the obvious social desirability influence of certain items on the scales as against others. Furthermore, the extent to which the items can be clearly delineated and defined is also important. Reliability, on the other hand, is related to the accuracy and consistency with which the measures are rated. In a repeated measure, self-report situation memory factors of a previous rating could lead to spurious reliability in that a rater recalling what the previous result was may want to give a response on that basis rather than on the required basis of actual level of functioning at a particular time. This aspect will be taken into consideration in this research by using check rater and videoed behavior in Part B of the investigation.
Turning then to the observation of overt behavior there are some problems of availability of observers at the required time, and their skill in rating the behavior. The ratees chosen for this investigation are firstly, the person being rated, and secondly, other members in the same research program.

The problem of availability of others to carry out the observations can be partly overcome by the use of video-taped samples of behavior. The major requirement of the samples is that they are of consistent length and of similar type of interactional situation. Nevertheless, whereas the self raters can span across all interactions in order to accurately rate themselves, the observer-rater has to rely on the sample which has the inherent possibility of not being representative of all behavior. Because of such possibilities it is essential that when results are reported the type of sample is described.

One of the major difficulties with the use of observed behavior for obtaining indexes of attitudes and attitude change is that such interaction information may not be a good method of obtaining data, and thus be of little value in interpreting that data in the terms of the Carkhuff scales. However, the possible unreliability of the task should be lessened by careful and clear delineation of behaviors pertaining to the dimensions and to the level of those dimensions. The instructions
given in the situations to be rated are also important and should be aimed at gaining a natural and representative response.

Another aspect of concern in research in this area is the possible connection between the attitude that one holds and the behavior that he exhibits. Evidence from studies carried out by La Piere (1934) and Minard (1952) suggests that attitudes and behavior do not always correlate, whereas studies carried out by Sherif and Hovland (1961) suggest positive correlations. Kiesler, Collins and Miller (1969) state that there is supportive data for both sides of the question but that typically most falls between the two positions, suggesting that it is possible to predict behavior from attitudes but perhaps without a great deal of certainty. The important question then, may not be whether attitudes and behavior do correlate positively but rather under what conditions are they correlated. This is the viewpoint taken by Lohman and Rietzes (1954) who found differences in attitudes towards blacks largely resulting from the situation under which blacks were rated. Thus in reporting results from research it is necessary to give a full picture of the circumstances under which changes in attitude and/or behavior did or did not occur. Whereas the evidence supports the contention that changes in attitudes can occur as a result of participation in Human Relations programs, the translation
of those changed attitudes into changed behaviors is less certain, and the translation seems to be at least partly dependent upon the environmental circumstances under which the trainee is functioning.
II. REVIEW OF METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

The Purity of the Training Program

In the earlier part of this study reference was made to the somewhat perplexing question of the appropriate type of content or experiences that should be included under the title of Human Relations Training. An aspect of this difficulty is the extent to which leaders should allow participants to determine the direction that the training would take. On the one hand there is the type of freedom permitted by Borton (1970) and Rogers (1969) in which the participants have a large say in content and the leader's role is to facilitate that freedom. On the other hand there is the Carkhuff approach which is far more structured. The Carkhuff (1970) and also the Egan (1975) approaches allow much greater possibility of replication of treatment content, and also greater opportunity to isolate the dependent variables. It is probably largely on account of this latter factor that most of the recent studies on the effects of Human Relations training have followed the Carkhuff approach. Barrett-Lennard (1976) comments on the wide variety of approaches and states that "different data and methods are likely to yield varying results unless the underlying theory is highly developed and extreme care is taken either to
focus exactly on the same elements or to specify differences. However, rigid adherence to the Carkhuff and Egan type approach could lead to a possible contradiction of the aims of the treatment and lessening of value to the consumer. The Carkhuff approach requires the participants to go through a series of controlled exercises that will lead to developing the skill to make a particular "empathic, genuine, honest or confronting response". Particular required responses are sought through conditioning process. The participants are required to learn to make "empathic, honest, genuine and confronting responses, and then be able to implement these at the appropriate times. This training procedure seems to have an inherent difficulty with the two qualities of genuineness and honesty in response. It seems feasible that empathy and confrontation could be developed utilizing the Carkhuff approach, however, honesty and genuineness seem to require the person to be just that and not to make a particular stylized response. The literature does not address this problem. It is the writer's view however, supported by statements from the participants in the training programs that it is the leader's model that is very important in whether the participants are going to respond with honesty and genuineness to the structured exercises. Thus it would seem that while it is possible to set a predetermined training program that carries with it a response expectation, the success of that
training program is least partly related to the qualities of leadership of that program. In speaking then of the purity of the program one cannot discount the degree of structure in that program or effect of leadership on it.

Two research programs which have attempted to overcome the above difficulties are those of Berenson (1971) and Hefele (1971). Interestingly, both researchers have used Carkhuff's structured training approach as well as the Carkhuff scales in their data gathering. Both pieces of research could thus be criticized on account of not examining the honesty and genuineness problem referred to above. What both Berenson and Hefele do, however, is to also use other self-report measuring instruments in which it is not as obvious as in the Carkhuff scales what the required responses may be, and thus what the training is aiming at in the way of end responses. They use self-report instruments, The Communication Index of Interpersonal Functioning - C.I.I.F. (Kratochwil, Carkhuff, and Berenson, 1969), and the Teaching Situation Reaction Test - T.S.R.T. (Duncan and Hough, 1966), in order to obtain alternative measurements which may be related to those obtained from the Carkhuff scales.
The Question of What is to be Measured.  
The Dependent Variables

With the trend towards the measurement of changes in functioning in the core dimension areas two particular focuses have been highlighted. The more usual approach to the measurement has been to gain self reports on the Carkhuff scales on a before and after basis and then note the extent of change. Another way of gaining information is to take video-taped segments of behavior and using the Carkhuff scales carry out a rating of that behavior. In this latter situation it is possible to have check ratings, and also to be able to check behavior against the self-reports. It is interesting to note that in the Carkhuff studies there is rarely a study that covers the entire range of core dimensions. While this has the effect of focussing on a particular aspect of the training program it tends to obscure interrelationship effects between the various dimensions and also does not permit a total effect view, in which all the dimensions are conjointly examined. Exceptions to the restricted area approach are the studies of Bunker (1965), Miles (1965) and Valiquet (1963). Each of these used an approach that encompassed a wide range of dimensions, and required participants and observers to give free responses describing any changes that took place in the participant's behavior during the succeeding
year. Such an approach has value in that it provides both the researcher and the student with the opportunity to delineate changes in areas that may not have been considered, but nevertheless of interest and value to the researcher. On the other hand, it does not guarantee that useful comparative before and after information will be gained. Also, the timing of the assessment opens the possibility that some intervening variables may be more influential in arriving at the final rating than the treatment program itself. In these experimental situations responses were obtained from both a treatment and a control group, and were then compared to determine the kinds of changes on which laboratory participants differed significantly from the control groups. However, it is still possible that the time lapse was so extensive that the time factor was a more potent variable than the treatment variable.

In considering the appropriateness of the Carkhuff "self-report on the core dimensions approach" it is interesting to note that Berenson obtained results indicating the presence of, and level of characteristics similar to those obtained by Carkhuff. Berenson carried out a factor analytic treatment of Human Relations training results that utilized a range of measuring instruments other than the Carkhuff scales, and found relationships across the tests on the core dimensions. If it can be shown conclusively that the two approaches
are measuring substantially the same dimension then the Berenson range of tests would seem to be a desirable alternative to the Carkhuff scales in spite of the longer time required for their administration. There does seem to be a need for the availability of measuring instruments other than the Carkhuff scales in order to provide some check on validity. Berenson used not only a range of self-report measuring devices but also used observer rating scales, and the obtaining of this additional information seems to be a desirable addition to research in this area. Overall what Berenson and Hefele attempted to do was to assess not only attitude change but the extent of translation of that attitude change to behavioral situations. This dual concern is much more in keeping with the current approaches to assessing the effects of Human Relations training in which both discrimination of behaviors and the implementation of these are important, rather than the earlier and more restricted approach in which only discrimination skills were involved. It was with these thoughts in mind that the researcher in this experiment included the Part B section. Through the use of ratings from the video segment, information could be attained which would permit assessment of behaviors as seen by others. The fundamental requirement in all situations is that there is an accurate and comprehensive operationalising of the terms used so that all raters are assessing on the same dimensions.
Control Groups in Human Relations Training Research

The provision of adequate control groups for research in Human Relations training is a recurring methodological problem. The knowledge that the subject is in a control group that is concerned with Human Relations research is likely to influence his self-report appraisal. Also, the training of the control group members in the identification of the core dimension areas carries with it the risk that "social-desirability" elements may intrude into the self-assessment ratings. Related to this difficulty is the problem of bringing together a random group of controlees. Generally it is administratively easier to enlist the assistance of an already assembled group of non-treatment subjects to act as controls but this runs counter to randomness requirements. On the other hand, it is valid to point out that there is usually no randomness in the selection of subjects who will receive the treatment because such people would have volunteered to receive the training and may well be disposed towards improving their functioning in the core dimension areas. It would not be ethical to assign subjects to training groups in order to obtain a neat research design, and with the difficulties of obtaining a control group that on the one hand is uninformed about the research but on the other can validly use the scales, it would seem that to arrange the classical treatment and control groups would not be appropriate in this
research. In this context it is interesting to note the research carried out by Aspy (1969). Aspy did not examine the effects of particular training programs but set out by identifying teachers who were already high and low functioners on the core dimensions and attempted to measure the effects of such functioning on the pupils' behavior, their interrelating skills and their academic progress. It thus does not take into account the effects of particular types of training, but rather identifies in trainees and others, levels of functioning, and then differentially assessing possible effects of this. This research investigation is similar to Aspy's in that it acknowledges that subjects enter situations already possessing certain levels of functioning and attempts to identify what those levels of functioning are. However, it then goes a stage further than Aspy in that it seeks to ascertain the effects of the treatment on the high and low functioners. Thus whereas, in traditional research situations there is a treatment and a control group(s), in this research two groups that are of different entry levels are given the treatment and then compared (Part A) both in a before and after way, and also between each other.

Other Variables: Length of Treatment, Time of Measurement, Stability of Teacher Behavior

A further area that is unsatisfactorily reported in the literature is the length of time of the treatment
time different treatment effects may result when the program is broken up into small training units or concentrated into marathon units. Of course there are also many other intermediate training variations possible, but unless these variations are reported fully the usefulness of the results is greatly restricted and appreciation of training programs impossible. Reports such as the Hefele (1971) and Berenson (1971) programs, and to a less precise extent the O'Banion and O'Connell (1970) program give a clearer picture of the duration and structure of the treatment program and permit some degree of comparison based on the length of the program. A related aspect that receives very little attention in the literature but yet is a pertinent methodological consideration is the time at which the outcomes of the program are measured. Are results significantly different with results taken immediately after the conclusion of the treatment, than after a period of time has elapsed before the measurement takes place? The question is directly related to whether one's concern is to note short term or long term effects or as, in this research, both of these. Of the research reviewed in this study, only the Hefele (1971) program gives details as to when measurement took place in relation to the treatment.

A possible danger in interpreting the results of research in Human Relations training is to regard those results as if they had permanence. The importance of
taking greater account of this aspect is highlighted in a study by Harrison (1956). Harrison collected data at two points following treatment—firstly six weeks after the conclusion of training, and again six months later. The results at the six month stage were in the opposite direction to his predictions. The changes at the six week mark were in a positive direction but did not reach significance at the .05 level, but increased to higher positive and statistically significant levels after six months lapse following treatment. Research was carried out by Schien and Bennis (1965) in which they put forward a three-stage theory of change which was based on a conceptualization by Lewin. They identified a first-stage result from a training program as an "unfreezing" stage. In this stage the individual's self concept is disturbed through the feedback he receives from others. The unfreezing process creates, in a greater or lesser degree, a felt need for change. They then identified a second-stage of development in which the individual carries out new conceptualizations, experiments with new behaviors, and attempts to gather new information about the effectiveness of alternate ways of relating to others. They reported that this second phase covers the period during which behavioral change actually takes place. Finally, there is a refreezing of behavior due to improved adaptation to, and/or defense from forces generated within
the environment. While Schien and Bennis' model lacks adequate empirical demonstration with regard to later research as reported in this paper, it should be conceded that if the model is a sound explanation then the particular stage that a person is in could make a significant difference in the kinds of changes we should expect as treatment outcomes. An obvious precaution that arises from the above considerations is that, at each testing stage the respondent has to be in agreement with the necessity to respond in a way that validly represents his behavioral status at that time. This is probably easier to achieve in a self-report pencil and paper test than in an observation situation in which it is possible that the observed behavior does not provide a representative sample of behavior.

Some General Criticisms and Doubts Concerning Human Relations Training

The Human Relations training area comes in for severe criticism from Rosenthal (1971). Rosenthal made a plea for a much greater degree of detailed accurate reporting of research in this area. He suggested that there are several reasons why there has been remarkably little research in the area. Firstly, he states that this may be due to the comparatively short history in the use of Human Relations training with the purpose of effective change in education settings. He also believes that many of the training
aspects and methods appear so striking or novel that formulating appropriate and valid research is both difficult and time-consuming. Furthermore, Rosenthal reports that there has not emerged any conceptual system of magnitude to give direction to the research, or to instigate development of fertile research designs. However, it would seem that this latter statement overlooks the work of people such as Carkhuff, Truax, Berenson and Hefele, the work of the National Training Laboratory personnel in Maine, U.S.A., the studies of numerous groups on the west coast of U.S.A., and more latterly the studies on the English scene reported by Cooper and Mangham (1971), where there has been considerable effort put into the task of defining and delineating the Human Relations area. Cooper and Mangham reported that the English studies have been based on specific content areas and process approaches, which although at times inadequately reported tend to provide result data in a generally consistent way, and for the most part follow the Carkhuff structure and content. Rosenthal's major doubt concerning reasons for the lack of research is his belief that there might be some apprehension, or, at least lack of interest on the part of the adherents or supporters of Human Relations training in determining whether the training experiences have their hoped for effect in heightening sensitivity to the needs of others and in achieving an expansion of humanism in
the everyday world. A negative finding could, he feels, put into question the movement's claimed purpose and validity, and thereby reveal "its own particular manipulative and commercialized use of the materialistic world it is so intent on transforming". At a later point, however, Rosenthal holds that the training, properly handled, can liberate feeling, heighten consciousness and enhance interpersonal relations.

**Ethical Considerations with Interpersonal Relations**

In situations where there is an attempt to change or modify behavior ethical considerations are always important. In the area of interpersonal relationships one is involved with the often ill-defined notions of integrity, freedom of expression, empathy and personal growth. The necessity to develop a code of ethics concerning training issues in these areas has been recognized by the National Association of Social Workers (Profession of Social Work: Code of Ethics, 1971) in which an extensive list of behaviors is set down, but with little exposition of actual behaviors in situations. If this list is to be of significant value then there must be an operationalized identification of those behaviors in the various interpersonal situations. Vaguely defined ethical standards are not only of little value but also tend to provide a false reassurance to professionals and clients. This reassurance comes in the form of assertions that there is agreement of the
sorts of behaviors that should be present in a wide range of diverse interpersonal situations, and this factor tends to obscure differences among helping positions. The emergence of client's rights'groups attests to the fact that there is some unease over the functioning of professionals in the helping professions. Attempts to get to the accurate delineation of desirable helpful behaviors is noted in the U.S. federal governments guidelines for protecting human subjects (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973). One flow-on from these guidelines seems to be the increasing involvement of clients in the planning of treatment and training programs, including the selection of goals and methods. In general it is difficult to estimate the degree to which these guidelines have given rise to greater specificity in the areas of methods and outcomes of helping because there is the information blocking situation that arises because of demands for confidentiality of treatment and the privacy of the client. Thus it is not often that the treatment process and outcome is described in behavioral terms in such a way that a clear exposition of the situation is available and thus so permitting a replication for research purposes. The notion that professionals with their accepted credentials are involved is really not very helpful because such notions tend to hinder investigation of what the professionals
actually do. Traditionally, one does not question a professional's functioning except when blatant errors or unethical practices are observed. The same criticisms, but with perhaps less potency can be levelled at educators. In more recent years, with the public and the education profession starting to address issues of accountability there has been a slowly increasing concern in looking more precisely at what the educationist is or is not achieving. The setting of objectives, the usage of behavior management techniques, and the examination of outcomes now appears with considerable frequency in education research and writings. This movement has led to increased interest in the scientific study of issues. It also makes more likely the controlled examination of the "articles of faith" referred to earlier. With this scientific scrutiny comes greater precision in the type of evidence, and clearer statements of what is actually done in treatment and training situations. These clearer statements are of considerable importance to the person undergoing the treatment or training, as well as to the researcher and his profession. Clear statements of intent and content serve to protect clients and the public from slipshod practice, and although possibly constituting a perceived threat for some professionals, in the long-term should serve to enhance the quality of their functioning.
At the work-face level also, such statements should facilitate the possibility of change and improvement through improved communication to others of the details of those practices that are observed to be effective and also ineffective.

The guidelines mentioned above, with their emphasis on the operationalizing of terms, and the providing of full statements of functioning in behavioral terms are thus central in the push for the sharpening and clarifying of practices of professionals in the helping professions. Education is undoubtedly one of those helping professions. It is the writer's impression that the clearer the objectives are set down in behavioral terms the more successful the treatment program seems to be. The ethical issue in this matter then concerns the need to develop a clear specification for all of what the treatment or training program is going to be, and how the sought improvement or change is going to be tackled. On this latter aspect the behavior management methodology is an approach that permits effective implementation of the treatment program. It is also one that can be communicated and explained to the trainee in terms that are generally easy to understand.

The selection of particular outcomes is an area of concern in any research. These outcomes must be seen to have potential for benefit for the trainee, and thus should not be set up simply for research purposes. The selection
of outcomes in this research is based largely on some evidence that certain teacher interrelationship characteristics seem to be positively correlated with certain levels of gain by their students, and also that those characteristics can be changed, modified and/or developed through certain training programs and procedures. When we embark upon a treatment program to bring about this change it should be apparent to the trainee that a particular end result is being sought and expected, and that this end result is desirable on account of a body of supportive evidence. To some extent the client's or trainee's freedom is being threatened when we predict as trainers that treatment X should result in behavior Y. Any doubts that we have on this matter should likewise be communicated to the trainee. The phrase "let the buyer beware" is not appropriate when we are presenting the trainee with the objectives, content, and past evidence of similar treatment programs. As trainers we must be ready and competent to discuss the offered program with the trainee so that he/she can make decisions as to whether to proceed with the treatment or not. In the context of this research this means the provision of a clearly worded statement of goals and expected outcomes presented to those trainees who have elected to be involved, and the trainees must clearly understand that they can withdraw from the program at any point. (See Appendix A.)
Key factors in the matter of goal selection include the keeping in mind of both immediate and future interests of the client and the society. The program therefore must not be one that provides just useful information for research purposes but must also be defensible in terms of immediate and long term improvements. There could be a danger to the value of the research in that the trainee may know too well what is to be expected as outcomes and how these are to be manifest in behavior. This suggests the possibility of artificiality of response patterns. In Part B in particular the somewhat random sampling of the teacher's functioning with his students should lessen the possibility that this becomes a serious problem in rating the teacher's behaviors. What the researcher must be concerned with is to gain an index of real behavior and real change. The fact that the trainee is given a clear indication of the type of change that the treatment is aiming to facilitate is probably "loading the dice" in favor of that change occurring, unless the trainee actively seeks to rebel or resist the effects of the program. Where volunteers are involved this latter situation is unlikely to occur. Observations of naturalistic behavior are thus highly important in this research situation in order to gain some indication of attitude change that is translated into behavior. In summary, although knowledge of the objectives may be seen to be likely to strongly
influence the results obtained and thus limit the extent to which change results may be directly linked to treatment factors, the desirability of keeping the trainee fully informed about the program is an overriding requirement of considerable ethical importance. If the trainee is unhappy with the objectives, and the possibility and type of change in functioning, he, through the possession of this knowledge, is better placed to make important decisions about continuance in the program.

The question of ethics arises also with regard to the effect of changes which may generalize to many behavioral areas other than the classroom situation. Although the training may have a focus of change in classroom functioning, it is possible that the trainee either sees the desirability of utilizing a changed interpersonal functioning style with "home folk" for instance, or on the other hand may unconsciously function with those others in a changed manner. This situation may result in domestic trauma when, for instance a spouse or parent is not able to readily adjust to a more empathic, honest, confronting, etc. person in the home. This can give rise to unhappy consequences. Recognizing this possibility it is the responsibility of the trainer to so organize the program that any learnings or changes are immediately fed into the domestic scene. Thus in this research the use of homework is important. Homework
exercises that can be shared with a friend or spouse increase the potential for a harmonious reaction by that friend or spouse. This arrangement also has the advantage of providing another reinforcing agent, or on the other hand, providing the trainee with information very quickly and thus reducing the likelihood that any change may produce domestic trauma.

The issue of the evaluation of the program is another important ethical consideration. If both trainer and trainee are to commit themselves to a training program then it is reasonable to expect that they would have an interest in the outcome of that commitment. In this case it may not be essential to have ratings of videoed segments of behavior in order to get evidence of change. Such evidence could be gained by asking the trainee to carry out self-ratings. Where the two forms of rating are gained - that is, self-ratings and ratings by others - there would seem to be a greater likelihood of getting an accurate appraisal of level of functioning. It must be appreciated, however, that the level of functioning and degree of change doesn't necessarily indicate that the treatment is causal with regard to the change. There are many other considerations that must be taken into account on this aspect. Nevertheless, it is appropriate to examine the results from different perspectives to see whether they are supportive of the treatment having an effect. It is
through a full description of the treatment program that a comprehensive analysis of the results that occur becomes more likely. Such a description enhances the possibility of replication of either the segments or of the total program, and thus better enables the researcher to evaluate the potency of the program for creating the effects that are anticipated. The client has the right to the best possible training program. Analysis of results leading to evaluation of the program is an important way to achieve improvement in that program. In this research the writer's involvement in this area of training over the last ten years has provided learnings that have led to modifications in the program and to greater effectiveness. Hopefully, this research will likewise provide further information on the score of effectiveness, and lead to further modifications. In this particular research in describing the treatment or training program the researcher followed the guidelines as set out below:

1. A detailed description of the training plan in behaviorally specific language. (See Appendix A.)

2. A statement of training goals, and the timetable for achieving this phase. (See Appendix A.)

3. An assessment of "entry" behavior, and the directions and magnitude of change possible to expect from the training program. (See Appendix C.)
4. A description of how the training program and the goals interrelate, giving the trainee a clear picture of the total context. (See Appendix A)

5. A statement of how the effects of the program will relate to both the work and non-work environments of the individual. (Done verbally)

6. If there are other trainers involved, why and when they will be involved. (Not applicable)

7. Feedback is to be provided to the trainee at each stage of the program so that the trainee can gauge progress and make decisions about future training.

The only one of the seven points not strictly followed in this research was the final point concerning the assessment of functioning. Whereas self-assessment of functioning was occurring, and the Part B trainees were aware that observer assessment of videoed segments would eventually be made, there was no observer feedback during the currency of either program. In this respect there was summative evaluation of the progress instead of the probably more useful formative type of evaluation. This was done in order to gauge effectiveness of a program where only self-assessment could be made. A further refinement to that type of research would be to give regular observer feedback as well. The researcher
in this study was attempting to present a "naturalistic" training program in which time and finance tend to generally preclude the use of video equipment after each training session to the extent required in carrying out observer ratings. In this research the observer ratings were made retrospectively at the end of the training program. Thus, in terms of the seven requirements listed earlier, the researcher was very concerned that the first five of these, at least, were fully implemented.

In conclusion, the researcher arranged an "after-care" service for the trainees so that should there be unresolved relationship or teaching problems or anxieties, there would be assistance available to help the trainee through these. This acknowledges the possibility that change in functioning with others can create puzzlement and uncertainty in all those others involved, and this in itself may require patience and support for it to be satisfactorily accommodated.
Summary Statement

This review indicates that there is a complex set of factors involved in attempting to determine effects of Human Relations training on the classroom performance of students. The evidence cited in this review is supportive of the view that certain Human Relations factors seem to be present in those situations in which greater academic gains are made by students. These factors have been identified by Carkhuff and Egan in particular as Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Confrontation, Immediacy and Honesty. Some teachers are noted to have high levels of these factors on entering teaching or training situations, while others do not, and this factor does not seem to have been directly addressed by the researchers. Training of the type set down by Egan in his book, "Exercises in Helping Skills: A Training Manual to Accompany the Skilled Helper", seems to be conducive to the development of higher levels of functioning in the areas listed above. The following research program has been formulated and developed after an investigation and consideration of the above factors, and represents an attempt to extend and probe some areas previously unresearched.
III. THE RESEARCH

Introduction

With a background that combines experience as a classroom teacher, as a school psychologist, as a trainer of teachers who are being prepared for positions in Special Education, and as an administrator with responsibilities for designing both total and segments of programs for teachers, the writer has become particularly interested in the delivery of specific training experiences that would enhance the effectiveness of the teacher in his/her work with handicapped and learning disabled students. In 1971 an optional course program was initiated at Melbourne State College in Victoria, Australia based on theoretical propositions of Carkhuff (1969a, 1969b), Rogers (1951), Truax and Carkhuff (1967) in particular, and in a less direct way other writers and researchers with humanistic orientation towards teacher training. The above named researchers identified seven areas of interrelationships - Genuineness, Concreteness, Self-Exploration, Empathy, Respect, Confrontation, and Immediacy - and developed these into scales on which a person could either be rated, or could rate himself (Appendix B). This scale could also be used as a training focus, but it is the writer's
impression that such usage tended to highlight the conditions in such a way that rendered it difficult to obtain a natural and unbiased estimate of the growth of the skill. In other words, the students could display a veneer of the skills without them becoming a genuine part of their behavioral repertoire. Thus, while still believing in the validity of the experience for teacher preparation purposes, the program underwent changes that aimed at introducing the relationship areas in ways, and in situations, that would better facilitate generalization of the skills to situations outside the training context. Another aspect of the program was also changed. In the first years a fairly open free-wheeling approach to the learning situation that approximated Encounter Group technology as described by writers such as Carkhuff and Banks (1967) was used. This approach took its direction largely from the participants, and there was an element of serendipity present in that the focal areas may or may not fortuitously emerge. However, this was not considered by either the writer or the students involved to be sufficiently controlled and ways were sought to tighten that control over the treatment content and direction. The publication of Egan's book (1975) and the accompanying handbook (1975) presented a structure and format which had a distinct behavioral methodology emphasis and permitted the presentation of a series of
exercises that aimed at developing the areas referred to earlier. The approach permitted also the required control over the content aspect of the program. In 1977 this new approach was implemented in the Special Education programs at Melbourne State College, and in the following year, 1978, the research as carried out in this study was commenced involving 28 students.

In order to gauge more closely the effects of this program a two-part research study was organized. These were designated Part A and Part B, and they are seen as two related and complementary studies bearing on the issue of the effects of Human Relations training on teacher effectiveness.

Part A. Beginning in June 1978, 28 teachers completed a series of tests, which comprised a self-rating Carkhuff scale (Appendix A), and the Machiavellian Test, Mach V (Appendix B). These were administered prior to the treatment program. The program was then carried out and at the end of it, five months later, the teachers (students) once again completed the Carkhuff self-rating scale. In March 1980, sixteen months after the completion of a training program, the 28 teachers again completed the Carkhuff self-rating scale. It should be noted that in the final analysis the results of one randomly selected subject were deleted from the study, leaving 27 subjects which were subsequently divided into 3 equal sized groups.
These three groups were gained by taking the scores on the Machiavellian Test, ranking these from Low to High "Machs" and thus ending up with three groups that were designated as Low Machs, Medium Machs and High Machs. Justification for this action is set down in the statement on the Machiavellian Test (p. 84). The three groups were set up in order to permit an assessment as to whether certain types of person as identified by the Machiavellian test were more likely to be affected by the training program than others.

**Part B.** Beginning in March 1980 a series of 16 x 2-hour training periods was carried out over two 8 consecutive week periods. As with Part A, a before and after test using the Carkhuff scales was carried out, together with a systematic program of observations of the teachers' classroom functioning in the areas of the Carkhuff scales. Both self and observer ratings were used in this part of the study.

In Part B a different group of teachers to those in Part A were involved. The program was the same in every respect to that delivered in Part A with the exception that it was compressed duration-wise into half the time. This was achieved by having two sessions a week instead of the one a week as in Part A. There was a major difference in the collection of results in that in Part B there was a utilization of a series of video-
changes in the teachers' functioning with their pupils. Whereas in Part A, the emphasis was on seeing whether self-reported changes took place, whether there was any relationship between the magnitude of change and certain types of teacher characteristics, and whether any changes were durable, in Part B the emphasis was more on whether the self-reported changes could actually be observed in classroom functioning following training that highlighted Human Relations aspects as in the Egan approach.
The Approach

The findings cited in the literature with regard to the effects of Human Relations training (see Chapter I of this study) support the contention that Human Relations concerns are significant factors in whether children achieve satisfactorily in the classroom. Overwhelmingly, the researchers report findings that support the inclusion of Human Relations training in teacher preparation programs. Carkhuff (1969a) summarizes the research and emphasizes the following points with regard to the successful implementation of training.

(a) Human Relations training should be systematic, goal directed and action oriented.

(b) The training should emphasize practice in the behavior that we wish to develop.

(c) The approach should leave the trainee with tangible and usable skills.

(d) The approach should be so organized that it promotes longer retention of the skills.

It is interesting to note that eight years later, and after a considerable amount of further research Carkhuff made the following points with regard to teaching and teacher training (1977):

(a) All learning begins with the learner's frame of reference. We need good interpersonal skills in order to enter that frame
(b) All learning culminates in a skills' objective.
(c) All learning is delivered in atomistic steps. Teachers need training in developing skills to organize, stimulate, reinforce and manage learning.
(d) All learning involves the learner in naturalistic processes. Teachers need to be able to involve the learner in experimental exploration, personalized understanding and behavioral action.
(e) All learning is transferable. Teachers need to teach transfer skills in order to ensure everyday living, learning, and working application.

It was with these precepts in mind, and through holding the belief that interpersonal skills were important aspects of education, that lead to the writer offering the training program that is delineated in Appendix A of this research.

The training on the seven core dimensions referred to earlier followed the pattern set down by Egan in the book "The Skilled Helper" (1975). The presentation format is systematic, obvious to the trainee, has clear-cut learning points and homework exercises. It is organized largely along behavior management lines, with reinforcement, generalization, feedback and extinction,
together with the use of different schedules of reinforcement, being prominent aspects of the training program.

The approach in this study was one that could be replicated.

The independent variables in the study were:

(a) Levels of interpersonal functioning on entry as gauged by scores on the Machiavellian Test (Mach V) devised by Christie and Geis (1970) (Parts A & B), and which formed the basis for dividing the group into high, medium and low level functioners.

(b) Time effects derived from two repeated measures taken firstly immediately after the treatment, and secondly 16 months later (Part A). In Part B long-term effects were not investigated.

The dependent variable in Part A is a set of scores gained from the Carkhuff scales on the seven specific core dimensions together with a total measurement. The scores gained immediately after the training were used to ascertain whether the training seemed to have resulted in a change in ratings on the dimensions in the Carkhuff scales. The scores gained 16 months later were used to ascertain whether a retention effect could be noted. The scores were examined across the three groups of teachers as identified by the Machiavellian test scores. Thus the writer was concerned with ascertaining whether any treatment effects could be differentially related to the three
entry levels of functioning. The dependent variable in Part B was an averaged score of the self-ratings on the Carkhuff scales and the observer ratings on these scales. The ratings were taken at both the pretest and posttest stages and at three intermediate points during the treatment program. These were taken in order to gain information as to whether there was any immediate observed effects of the training on the teachers' functioning.

The question of the representativeness of sample was of some concern. The research in Part A was based on a population of nine in each cell, and while this is adequate for statistical treatment purposes it creates some difficulties with regard to the generalizability of the findings. The members of the treatment groups were all from the same education employment authority, undertaking the same program, and seemingly having similar interests in Human Relations training. They volunteered for the training. The students were grouped according to their scores on the Machiavellian test which aims to identify people who are person or humanist oriented, from those who are lesser interested in other people, and to also identify those people in the intermediate category. One concern in this study was that in splitting the population into the three groups it may be that the lower group is not sufficiently lesser interested in the welfare of other people to provide an
adequate contrast group for this study. It was not known whether the two extreme groups were sufficiently different to permit comparison. Reference to Christie and Geis' writings suggest that they should have been. The import of the middle group was largely to provide a buffer group between the groups of high and low functioners.

Research Questions for Parts A and B

(a) Does the training which follows a structured approach and utilizes behaviorist methodology result in changes in self-reported and observed human relations functioning, on all of the seven core dimensions, and on the totality of these dimensions?

1. Immediately following the completion of the training program. (The short term effects). Parts A & B.

2. Immediately following segments of the program in which the various dimensions are highlighted. (The immediate effects). Part B.

3. Sixteen months following the completion of the program. (The long term effects). Part A.

(b) Is there a congruence between the results derived from the Carkhuff scales, and the results or reports given to open ended questions exploring those same dimensions? Note that the teachers were encouraged
to make general comments concerning the effects of the training as well as completing the ratings on the Carkhuff scales. Parts A & B.

(c) Are the effects of the training, as derived by the ratings on the Carkhuff scales, the same for all teachers who enter the training program but yet are shown to have different levels of interpersonal functioning as determined by the scores on the Mach test. Part A.

Method of Carrying Out The Research

1. Part A.

(a) Subjects: The subjects were all registered teachers undertaking a graduate course in Special Education at Melbourne State College in Victoria, Australia. They had all completed an initial teacher training course in either elementary or secondary education. They had also completed at least three years of classroom teaching. From a large number of elective studies available to them they had all selected the "Teacher and Human Relations" course, as one of seven elective studies that they were required to take to complete the program. Twenty-eight teachers undertook the study. The results of one teacher was randomly deleted from the research so that three groups of nine teachers could be more easily analyzed in the statistical process.
(b) The Program: The program for this part was carried out at Melbourne State College over a period of sixteen study weeks broken at the mid-point by a mid-term break of four weeks. Each weekly session was of two hours duration.

(c) Materials used: The program closely followed the sequence of studies as set down in Egan's book, "The Skilled Helper", supplemented by the companion workbook, "Exercises in Helping Skills", also by Egan. The workbook was used mainly as a homework text. For details of the program and materials see Appendix A.

(d) Data collection: The data was collected at three points,


(e) Reliability of self-ratings: Each person in Part A was required to check their self-rating with another person who knew them very well. As well as providing a check in the accuracy of the self-rating
this procedure also provided the ratee with another person with whom he could share his learnings, and thus tending to enhance generalizability of learning and/or behavior to the outside world.

(f) Procedure: The procedure has been set down in the data collection section above with the addition that the treatment for Part A took place between June 1978 and December 1978 at which times the before and after tests were administered.

2. Part B.

(a) Subjects: The four subjects were all teachers undertaking a study program in Special Education at Melbourne State College. They had completed an initial course of teacher training in either elementary or secondary education, and had voluntarily enrolled in the elective subject "The Teacher and Human Relations" in the 1980 program.

(b) Setting and program: As each teacher taught at the same school they were invited to work together as one group with the researcher who had also been the leader of the study for the Part A subjects. This Part B group had agreed to be video-taped with their classes of mentally handicapped children, and to be rated on the dimensions in situations in which they interrelated with those children. Each teacher was thus video-taped immediately before the training commenced and later at
the conclusion of the training program, and also at three intermediate stages during the program. The purpose of the intermediate tapings was to gain a sample of behavior immediately following specific training sessions so as to determine whether particular training aspects seemed to have any direct effect on functioning. The details of the program and the timing of the taping sessions are set down on Appendix A.

(c) Materials used: As in Part A the program closely followed the sequence set down in Egan's book, "The Skilled Helper", (1975) supplemented by the accompanying workbook, "Exercises in Helping", also by Egan (1975). The workbook was used largely as a homework text. The homework exercises were seen as very important in helping the trainee validate his feelings and functioning with a close friend.

(d) Data collection: There were five ten-minute video-taped sessions for each of the four participants, each of which were rated at the conclusion of the training program by the trainees and the leader collectively leading to an average rating figure being arrived at. The trainee was video-taped in the same type of teaching situation on each occasion, so as to maintain constancy in the teaching content. Another aspect of the data collection was that the first rating was made before training program, giving
a base score. Throughout all the ratings the Carkhuff scales are used.

(e) Procedure: The training program followed the sequence and timing as set down in Appendix A. During each training session the concepts (the seven core dimensions) were discussed and exercises pertaining to those concepts were undertaken. There was a concentration on the core dimensions of the Carkhuff rating scales.

Machiavellian Test

The development of the Machiavellian test is reported fully in Chapter 1 of the book, Studies in Machievallianism by Christie & Geis (1970). Also reported are the assumptions and principles on which it was based. Basically, the Machiavellian test was derived following a process of item analysis of statements about situations described in Machiavelli's "The Prince" and "The Discourses". Initially a 20-item Mach IV test was designed. This was followed by a Mach V test which purported to have no significant correlation with external measures of social desirability. A scoring system was designed to differentiate respondents in levels of Machiavellianism and arguments advanced to indicate Encounter Prone and Encounter Blind respondents.

The question of the validity of using this test for estimating encounter proneness or encounter blindness is an important one for this research. It is important
because of the writer's attempt to gain some evidence concerning the extent to which the effects of the program can be related to, and influenced by the entering attitudes of the student.

In Chapter XIV of the Christie and Geis book (1970), James F. Durkin speaks of the process of encountering as related to the information gained from the Mach tests. Durkin sees High Machs as being predominantly concerned with implementing cognitive strategies designed to ensure task outcomes. It is the outcome which is important. On the other hand, he sees Low Machs as getting distracted from task goals by empathic involvements with others; and he proposes that Lows have a personal orientation to others as compared to an impersonal instrumental approach among Highs. Durkin carried out a number of pieces of research that were designed to show that Low Machs are more than just incapable of Machiavellianism, but are individuals who become engrossed in their own characteristic mode of interpersonal functioning. Thus while High Machs are concerned with outcomes, Low Machs are principally concerned with process. Durkin calls this process encountering and describes it using concepts as empathy, spontaneity and treating others personally.

He says that encountering is a process by which we change through direct contact with one another, and it takes place when we open up to one another. By this he
means when we lay aside the layers of cognitive insulation that isolate us within separate frames of reference. As encountering happens, we move together with reference to each other rather than with reference to ourselves, and spontaneously interact, often in directions irrelevant to any previous intentions. Such behavior which arises spontaneously continues for its own sake rather than being managed as a means to some predetermined end. With a tendency to act, which is directly triggered by another's act, without cognitive mediation, it is readily appreciated how Low Machs can get distracted from task goals.

Durkin sums up the characteristics of the Low Machs (or Encounter Prone) personality:

a) They make personal responses that are particular responses.
b) The responses are based on behavioral contact rather than cognitive information.
c) The responses demonstrate a tendency to receive rather than to give influence.
d) The responses are based on participation with others rather than through an objective perspective of them.
e) The behavioral experience influences subsequent attitudes but is not determined by previous attitudes.
Durkin supports these propositions with results from experimental situations in which High and Low Machs were systematically paired with other High and Low Machs and the extent of Encountering was assessed. These results from these experiments supported the contention that Low Machs respond to others far more personally and reciprocally than do High Machs who tend to maintain their individual orientation in interactory situations. Durkin gives an explanation for the differences between the High Mach reciprocal cognitive control of behavior and the Low Mach mutual feedback control. He says:

"High Machs have been described as maintaining an instrumental cognitive attitude toward others and a convergent orientation of the task at hand. They are cognitively sensitive to the definitional characteristics of others and of the situation, and are relatively impervious to irrelevant distractions. These characteristics are typical of the cognitive control process. Cognitive control operates through informed decisions made by a cognizing subject about the meaning of a given object with respect to a set of alternatives already represented within his memory system. Effective cognitive exchange with another depends upon the development within each individual of reasonably accurate cognitions about the other's cognitions. Common language and cultural norms facilitate such inferences. It is essential, however, that the actual work of processing these cognitions remain isolated within each cognizer and not be confounded with either the objects to be represented or the independent cognizing process of the other individual. The cognitive frame must remain as a fixed reference against which cognitions about the other can be compared."
Later on he says:

"The efficiency of cognitive control is amply demonstrated by our ability to process information and to generate useful decisions based on it in coordination with others. However, there are certain situations which even the most powerful cognitive systems cannot in principle handle. These are situations generating dynamic interactions in which the objects of cognition are changing so rapidly that informed decisions become obsolete before they can be enacted and because the cognitive process itself changes the object of cognition. Encounters are essentially dynamic interactions: here mutual feedback control is more appropriate."

It is these latter statements that have led the writer in this research to consider whether the treatment is likely to have any effect on those group of teachers who are in "the High Mach" category.

The term "feedback" is used extensively by Durkin. Traditionally, the term "feedback" has been equated with knowledge of results or more generally, with reinforcement. On the other hand, Durkin tends to use the term more as a process in which the important issue is the attempt to clarify or reflect the thoughts and feelings back into the interactory system - a mechanism of "feeding back" the content for further investigation. This mechanism is directly akin to the mechanisms described by Egan and Carkhuff for establishing empathy. Durkin's "feedback" is a mechanism or perhaps better described as a skill in which no particular goal is sought except the clarification and the enhancement of the interactory situation. Thus
the "Low Machs" with their propensity for "feedback behavior" differ markedly from "High Machs" who attempt to achieve a particular form of cognitive control. Durkin "feedback" has a strong element of spontaneity in the sense that it operates on a moment-to-moment (c.f. Carkhuff's Immediacy) basis in the present without regard to past or future.

Durkin goes on to describe the "encounter configuration" as:

"Two open and responsive individuals come into contact with one another. As individuals, each has learned to maintain the integrity of his own control system while moving to satisfy his goals in the face of environmental obstacles. Cognitive functions such as learning are particularly useful in dealing with nonresponsive objects, which "hold still" long enough for cognitions to do their work. High Machs have learned to succeed by transforming responsive other persons into cognitive objects. Low Machs let holes open up in their cognitive insulation and fall into dynamic interactions with others."

Thus whereas for High Machs the issues at hand have "object" qualities and need to be worked on, to be controlled, to be put into the controller's cognitive structure, the situation for Low Machs is that the issues at hand are principally the interacting processes that allows one to more fully appreciate the frame of reference of the other. Translating these actions into an education or teaching context then it would be expected that High Machs would operate largely as controllers of instruction
and the instruction process - they would get on with the task - they may alter the task if the child doesn't respond in the required way - but the goal is always clearly defined and pursued. On the other hand, the Low Machs would be greatly concerned about the feelings and the relationships involved in getting the task done - what success or failure means to the relationship - how the learner feels about exploring his successes or failures - whether the learner will seek to clarify and move "with" the thoughts of the teacher. These are the areas referred to earlier that have been researched by Aspy (1969), Carkhuff (1971), Egan (1977) and Hefele (1971). The findings of these researchers support the contention that the Low Machs seem likely to possess the human relations characteristics with the greater potential for achievement by learners in schools.

Durkin's research postulates the notions that Low Machs are "Encounter Prone" whereas High Machs are "Encounter Blind". This research then should give some evidence to either support the postulate or not. All the subjects in Part A were given the Mach V test and the results were obtained and grouped as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 - Low Machs</td>
<td>64 - 77</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 - Middle Machs</td>
<td>78 - 84</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 - High Machs</td>
<td>85 - 116</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From these results it could be expected that the Low Machs would be "Encounter Prone" and thus susceptible to change as a result of the Human Relations Training, and that the High Machs would be "Encounter Blind" and thus less susceptible to change as a result of the training. Being already "Encounter Prone" the Low Machs' "proneness" to levels of Human Relations functioning should be enhanced by the training because the training would be aiming at developing, supporting, and reinforcing behavior and attitudes already present in the person's life style. On the other hand the High Machs could be expected to be largely resistant to the training because it is seeking to develop response and interrelationship styles that are seen as being antagonistic to those persons' life style. This could be represented for the groups in the following way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Expected Effect of H.R. Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Machs</td>
<td>To increase levels of functioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Machs</td>
<td>The possibility of some increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Machs</td>
<td>Little likelihood of increase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, another difficulty in this research is the entry level of functioning on the Carkhuff scales in that persons already functioning at high levels on those scales, such as may be the case with Low Machs would have "restricted room" to show improvement as a possible
result of the treatment. Furthermore, it may be postulated that High Machs are considered by Durkin to be "Encounter Blind" and thus resistant to the treatment or training, or perhaps even antagonistic, may have "restricted room" to show lowered levels of functioning on the Carkhuff scales. Thus, whereas the Carkhuff measuring scales may have limitations in terms of showing movement in either direction at the extremes they do permit the gaining of an index of functioning levels at different times which can be meaningfully examined. It would be reasonable to assert that any significant movement noticed with the Low's to higher levels of functioning or noticed with the Highs to lower levels of functioning would be a conservative estimate of a possible true movement because the subjects were already close to the ceiling extremes.

Nevertheless, the Group means will still be useful data as indicators of any movement in the direction of the scores, and these can be supplemented by subjective reports made by the persons in the program (both Part A and Part B) at the conclusion of the testing for all participants.

Summary

In conclusion then, the Mach V test has the following important functions:

a) To identify levels of entry behavior.
b) To permit classification of participants into categories of Low Machs, Middle Machs, and High Machs.

c) To permit examination of treatment effects over time, and between groups, for each of the three groups.

The Mach V Test's usage is justified on the basis of research results obtained largely by Durkin and reported in Christie and Geis' book (1971) entitled, "Studies in Machiavellianism" in which levels of performance on the test are related to certain interpersonal functioning characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Machs</th>
<th>Low Machs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistant to social influence</td>
<td>Susceptibility to social influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to cognition</td>
<td>Orientation to persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating and controlling structure</td>
<td>Accepting and following structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter blind</td>
<td>Encounter prone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects in this research fall rather neatly into the categories of High and Low Machs. Middle Machs as a term is not used by Christie and Geis but has been invented for usage in this experiment in order to provide a buffer group between the two discrete High and Low Mach groups. Middle Machs may thus incorporate some of both High and Low Machs, but as a group their main value lies in having a separation function.
IV. THE TREATMENT PROGRAM

The Program

A. Introduction

In Appendix B there is a schedule of dates and activities representing the timing and content of the program, or sometimes called the treatment. It is a program based on the model and principles set down in Gerard Egan's book "The Skilled Helper" 1975.

The model as presented by Egan is described as developmental and is based on three interrelated sources.

1. The work of Carkhuff and other systematic skills training systems

Commencing with the writings of Truax and Carkhuff (1967) and elaborated upon over succeeding years (Carkhuff, 1969a, b, 1971, 1972a, b, c, d, 1973, 1977), there has been a detailed spelling out of the demands of the three stages of this developmental model and a delineation of the skills needed by a helper, be he teacher or social worker or any other person operating in a helping capacity, in order to function effectively in that helping role. Carkhuff not only identifies and delineates the skills - Empathy, Concreteness, Genuineness, Respect, Confrontation, Immediacy, and Self-Exploration - but sets out procedures for training both the helper and helpee to develop the skills for more effective living.
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Egan has organized his training approach along similar lines and has presented through his publications (1975a, b, 1977) a general teaching strategy that follows a sequential progression of lesson beginning with a didactic presentation of concepts leading to exercises in interpersonal relating. This approach is systematic and emphasizes skills-training methodology. It is significant that Egan is very concerned with (1975) "the goallessness and ambiguity that have characterized so much of the human-relations training movement." Throughout his writings he reiterates the desirability of integrating systematic skills training into human relations program.

2. Social-influence theory

It is Egan's belief that all human interaction can be conceptualized to a large extent from the viewpoint of a social-influence process. He takes the position that as soon as he involves himself with his fellow human beings he becomes one who both influences and one who is influenced. He says (1975):

"I influence others both by acting (for example, when I show care for others, they are influenced to like me, respect me, and co-operate with me; when I am cynical, others are influenced to avoid and fear me) and by not acting (my silence at a meeting influences other members to think of me as impotent or unconcerned or to feel a need to 'deal with' my silence). We live in a society charged with social-influence attempts, overtly or covertly, knowingly or unwittingly."

In the developmental model utilized in this program the helper establishes in Stage 1 a power base or influence
base with the helpee through perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness, and in Stage II uses this influence to help the client change both his attitudes and behavior to more constructive patterns. Egan sees Carkhuff's approach of the communication of respect, genuineness and accurate empathy as being behavioral ways of establishing the expertness and the trustworthiness of the helper.

Social-influence theory coheres with a skills-training approach in that social influence stresses the notion of getting the client to do something, and this "something" is the training in skills that lead to more effective living and self-determination. Egan brings up an interesting point concerning the possibility of ethical problems with modern behavior control technology in that it implies a threat to personal responsibility and decision making. However, he goes on to state (1975) that it is impossible completely to avoid social-influence processes in helping and that helpers should stress overt social influence, basing primarily on caring, understanding and collaboration, and directed towards helping clients learn the skills of effective interpersonal living. Otherwise, he says, helpers and helpees alike become the victims of helping as a covert social influence process based primarily on the helper's need to control and the helpee's disorganization, suggestibility and dependency.
3. Learning theory and the principles underlying the maintenance and change of behavior

The developmental model accepts the importance of learning theory, principles and practice as being an essential component of the approach. Egan (1975) states that the approach:

"... is directed toward helping a client (1) maintain growthful transactions with himself and his environment, especially his interpersonal environment, (2) change those behaviors that are self- and other-destructive, and (3) acquire skills that will enable the client to live more effectively, ..." 

Thus Egan firmly indicates that a helper must have a thorough practical grasp of the basic principles underlying learning, unlearning and relearning. In the training situation therefore, the trainee is encouraged to develop a repertory of problem-solving and behavior-modification skills based on learning principles.

In summary then, the developmental model set down by Egan and followed in the treatment part of this research is one that attempts to integrate the three major influences cited above and emphasizes skills training at all stages.

B. Overview of Developmental Model

The developmental model is called "developmental" because is composed of progressive interdependent stages. In this research it has as its direction the achievement of improved behavioral functioning in the seven core dimension areas as set down by Carkhuff and others - Genuineness,
Self-Exploration, Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Confrontation and Immediacy. The model has a pre-helping phase that stresses the importance of attending and listening in each of the three dimensional stages. The details are as follows (Egan, 1975):

Pre-helping or pre-communication phase. Attending. Helper's goal: Attending. To attend to the other, both physically and psychologically; to give himself entirely to "being with" the other, to work with the other.

Stage I: Responding/self-exploration. Helper's goal: Responding. To respond to the helpee and what he has to say with respect and empathy; to establish rapport, an effective collaborative working relationship with the helpee; to facilitate the helpee's self-exploration. Helpee's goal: Self-exploration. To explore his experiences, behavior, and feelings relevant to the problematic in his life; to explore the ways in which he is living ineffectively.

Stage II: Integrative understanding/dynamic self-understanding. Helper's goal: Integrative understanding. The helper begins to piece together the data produced by the helpee in the self-exploration phase. He sees and helps the other identify behavioral themes or patterns. He helps the other see the "larger picture." He teaches the helpee the skill of going about this integrative process. Helpee's goal: Dynamic self-understanding.
Developing self-understanding that sees the need for change, for action; learning from the helper the skill of putting together the larger picture for himself; identifying resources, especially unused resources.

Stage III: Facilitating action/acting.

Helper's goal: Facilitating action. Collaborating with the helpee in working out specific action programs; helping the helpee to act on his new understanding of himself; exploring with the helpee a wide variety of means for engaging in constructive behavioral change; giving support and direction to action programs.

Helpee's goal: Acting. Living more effectively, learning the skills needed to live more effectively and handle the social-emotional dimensions of life; changing self-destructive and other-destructive patterns of living; developing new resources.

The above developmental model aims to provide the helpee with the skills he needs to help himself and to provide a helper to others. In the context of this research we are referring to the skills that a teacher would need to help (or teach) his pupils, to help those students who are experiencing difficulties in learning. The model also provides for the helper (or teacher) being a source of reinforcement, and motivation, for the pupils. Flexibility has been built into the model in that it provides a repertory of skills to be used as needed.
rather than a rigid plan. For the model to be successful, the program needs good modelling from a high level trainer and provision for supervised practice. The trainer used throughout this research has had ten years of experience in conducting training programs in Human Relations for teachers. He is a registered psychologist with the Australian Psychological Society having completed also a Graduate Diploma in Psychology at Honours level. He has also been a member of the Australian Institute of Human Relations, and has conducted training programs for helpers in education and other areas.

The developmental model is seen as an excellent way to identify one's repertory of helping skills and to learn those skills in which one is deficient. It is also seen as a way of learning a training methodology.

In the program the first two sessions will concentrate on the pre-helping and the Stage I aspects - Attending to and Responding to the helpee. The helper or teacher attends to what the other person is saying or doing. The helper attends to the helpee's responses - both verbal and non-verbal and has to keep asking himself: What is the person trying to communicate? What is he saying about his feelings? What is he saying about his behavior? Attending is a pre-requisite skill leading to Stage I behavior. Having attended to what the other person is
saying, the helper is then required to respond in a way that helps the other person to explore his behavior (his feelings, his attitudes, what he does, what he fails to do, what is constructive in his life, what is destructive). The skills that the helper needs in order to facilitate the other person's self-exploration are accurate empathy, respect, genuineness, and concreteness. These are defined in the glossary section (page 160). The acquisition of the above skills is crucial because if the helper does not have them he will not be able to utilize the skills required for Stages II and III. The aim in the relationship at this first stage is for the helpers to see the helper as an expert; to develop trust within the helpee for the helper; and to develop respect that is mutual.

The remaining sessions (Nos. 3 - 15) present a combined approach to Stage II - Integrative understanding/dynamic self-understanding; and Stage III - Facilitating action. As the helpee explores the various problem areas in his functioning, he produces a great deal of data that is useful, generally speaking, only to the degree that it can be pieced together to reveal behavioral themes. The helper helps the other person to integrate this data, particularly as it is manifested in his relationships in the teaching situation. The helper's skills that are highlighted at these stages are Empathy, in which the helper must communicate to the helpee an understanding
not only of what the helpee actually says but also of what he implies, what he hints at, and what he communicates non verbally - **Self Disclosure**, in which the helper is willing to share his own experience with the helpee if sharing it will actually help the helpee understand himself better - **Immediacy**, in which the helper is willing to explore the here-and-now of interactions in order that the helpee can achieve a better understanding of himself and of his functioning - **Confrontation**, in which the helper challenges the discrepancies and distortions of the helpee's functioning in order to assist the helpee to bring about constructive behavioral change.

As Stage II learnings emerge the helpee sees more clearly the necessity for action on his part. Some helpees can recognize the need for change but become very anxious about allowing it to occur or doubt whether they have the capacity to make it occur. This is when the action program of Stage III becomes important. The total training program continues on the proposition that while understanding of the dynamics and the effects of relationships is important, it is not in itself adequate for the implementation of a "change" program and that training in that skill area is also required. Thus Stage III emphasizes the notion that the helpee must "act" on the understanding if he is to function more adequately.
The helper's role is to collaborate with the helpee in the elaboration of action program. Aspects of this will include problem-solving techniques, decision-making processes, behavior-modification programs, carrying out "homework" tasks, and training in interpersonal functioning. As the helpee becomes involved in the action programs the helper provides support in the form of reinforcing the helpee's successes and helping him through problem situations. Stage III is thus the culmination of the developmental model—bringing the learnings to the point of developing a skill. It requires the usage of the characteristics of Genuineness, Honesty and Concreteness.

Throughout this training program, the trainer adopted a teaching technique that continually interfaced teaching—and trying out. Concepts would be introduced and then tried out in simulated situations. Trainees were paired for practice sessions, however, on occasions larger groupings were used. Homework exercises were employed so that the learnings and skills which were developed in the training program did not become too situation-specific, and thus could be generalized to off-campus situations. This, of course, was the main intention.
Method of Analysis of Data

Part A

The data was subject to multivariate analysis of variance, based on a "between" and "within" subject design. There are three levels of the "between" aspect, and three measurings of the "within" aspect. This analysis provided information relevant to the extent of change occurring between groups of subjects operating at the three levels on the Machiavellianism scale. It also provided information relevant to the extent of change and retention occurring at the three time points, and finally, provided information of the extent of interaction between levels of Machiavellianism and levels of change and retention.

Part B

Each of the four teachers were video-taped on the five ten-minute segments of their usual classroom functioning and were requested to teach in the same subject area during the video-taped sessions. They were given a handout indicating the sequence and content of the training sessions, and the times for the videotaping. In this section of the experiment, the dimension of self-exploration was omitted as it was felt (by the researcher) that it was not possible to accurately
describe this behavior in operational terms that would permit observers to rate the dimension.

The video-taping and their purposes were as follows:

(a) Feb. 25th. Baseline data on concreteness, empathy, genuineness, respect, confrontation, and immediacy.

(b) Mar. 18th. After sessions on concreteness. Measurements on the six dimensions above.

(c) Mar. 27th. After sessions on concreteness and empathy. Measurements on the six dimensions above.

(d) April 10th. After sessions on concreteness, empathy, genuineness and respect. Measurements on the six dimensions above.

(e) April 26th. After sessions on concreteness, empathy, genuineness, respect, confrontation and immediacy. Measurements on the six dimensions above.

The data were subject to statistical analysis utilizing the Relative-Frequency procedure (Jayaratne, 1978).
V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Analysis of Results

Part A

With a dearth of research studies in the area of analysis of efforts of Human Relations Training one is not able to refer to earlier studies for guidance in the most appropriate way to analyze the data. Certain decisions were thus made on the basis of what seemed to be the logic of the situation. The researcher divided his population into three groups on the basis of scores on Machiavellian test, and was able to align the two extreme groups with Machiavellian categories of Encounter Prone (Low Machs) and Encounter Blind (High Machs). The other third of the population obtained scores in the "between" area and were included in the analysis largely to separate off the Lows from the Highs. The results of the Middle group were compiled but because of the buffer function of the Middle group in this research, those results have received minimal attention in this investigation. Nevertheless, their inclusion in the computation increases the power of the analysis in that it incorporates the error effect attendant to the results of the three groups.
Figures 1 to 8 indicate the results in graphical form for the grouped subjects across the occasions on each of the seven core dimensions and the total score. The graphs indicate a variety of movement magnitudes and directions. The literature would suggest that Group A should score higher than Group B which in turn scores higher than Group C at all stages of measurement. It would also suggest that treatment effects in an increase of score direction should occur for Group A, probably also for Group B, and possibly for Group C. None of the results fit this picture exactly although some of them approximate it. This is the case with Concreteness and Respect when all the dimensions are combined in a total figure. In general, it would appear that Group B and C at Occasion A provide the results that are discrepant with expectations.

Table 4.1 indicates the same results in tabular form.
Figure 1: Mean scores for Groups A, B & C on Occasions 1, 2 & 3 on Genuineness Dimension.
Figure 2. Mean scores for Groups A, B & C on Occasions 1, 2 & 3 on Concreteness dimension.
Figure 3. Mean scores for Groups A, B & C on Occasions 1, 2 & 3 on Self-Exploration dimension.
Figure 4. Mean scores for Groups A, B & C on Occasions 1, 2 & 3 on Empathy dimension.
Figure 5. Mean scores for Groups A, B & C on Occasions 1, 2 & 3 on Respect dimension.
Figure 6. Mean scores for Groups A, B, & C on Occasions 1, 2 & 3 on Concreteness dimension.
Figure 7. Mean scores for Groups A, B & C on Occasions 1, 2 & 3 on Immediacy dimension.
Figure 8. Mean scores for Groups A, B & C on Occasions 1, 2 & 3 on Total Treatment Area.
Table 4.1 shows upwards movements in the totals for Groups A and C across the Occasions but for Group B the upward movement did not continue on Occasion 3. Comparing total Group results, Group A's results were consistently higher than both Group B and Group C, however, Group B's were not always higher than Group C. Investigation of various dimension areas reveals for Group A five of the seven areas had an upward trend, for Group B five of the seven areas had an upward trend, and for Group C four of the seven areas had the upward trend. Those few downward trends in the results occurred with equal frequency on Occasions 2 and 3. On the dimensions of Concreteness, Respect and Confrontation the upward movement was apparent for each group on each occasion. The results seem to indicate a positive treatment effect for Groups A and C across the Occasions and a maintenance of the differences in levels of functioning between Groups A and C on Occasions 1 and 2. Comparing the Groups on Occasion 3 there was a slight increase in the degree of improvement for Group A. The results were then subject to a multivariate analysis of variance in order to ascertain the significance of these trends and movements. Throughout the study the level of significance was set at .05. The results of these analyses are set down in Tables 4.2 to 4.9.
Table 4.1
Mean Scores for Groups on Occasions on Total and all Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Occasion 1</th>
<th>Occasion 2</th>
<th>Occasion 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C'</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Exploration</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediacy</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2
ANOVA of Occasion of Measurement by Group
on Dimension of Genuineness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Occasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.96</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups x Occasions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>158.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05

Table 4.3
ANOVA of Occasion of Measurement by Group
on Dimension of Concreteness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>9.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Occasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups x Occasions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>121.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4
ANOVA of Occasion of Measurement by Group on Dimension of Self-Exploration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Occasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups x Occasions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 4.5
ANOVA of Occasion of Measurement by Group on Dimension of Empathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Occasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.63</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups x Occasions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>116.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6  
ANOVA of Occasion of Measurement by Group  
on Dimension of Respect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Occasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89.26</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups x Occasions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54.52</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>148.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05

Table 4.7  
ANOVA of Occasion of Measurement by Group  
on Dimension of Confrontation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>10.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Occasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>107.48</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups x Occasions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79.19</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>239.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8
ANOVA of Occasion of Measurement by Group on Dimension of Immediacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Occasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups x Occasions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75.85</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>159.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05

Table 4.9
ANOVA of Occasion of Measurement by Group on the Total of all Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>685.56</td>
<td>341.78</td>
<td>5.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>401.40</td>
<td>200.70</td>
<td>3.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Occasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>296.60</td>
<td>74.15</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1612.00</td>
<td>67.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S's within Groups x Occasions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2460.67</td>
<td>51.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5454.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These tables indicate a significant Group effect on the Total only, a significant Occasion effect on the dimensions of Concreteness, Self-Exploration, Respect, Confrontation and for the Total; and a significant Group-Occasion interactory effect on the Genuineness dimension.

The Tukey Test was then applied to the results in order to ascertain which specific differences between Groups A and C (the Low and High Machs), and the Occasions 1, 2 and 3 reached significance. Table 4.10 indicates levels of significance findings between Groups A and C on the Total and the specific dimensions. The mean square used in the calculations was the one obtained for the subjects within Groups by Occasions.

Table 4.10
Tukey Test of Significance between Group A and C Results at Occasions 1, 2 and 3 on Dimensions and Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Occasion 1</th>
<th>Occasion 2</th>
<th>Occasion 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Exploration</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediacy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = Not significant at .05.
S = Significant at .05.
Taking Group A's results separately (Table 4.11), the raw scores illustrate a strong upward trend over the three occasions across all dimensions and the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upwards</th>
<th>Static</th>
<th>Downwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasions 1 and 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasions 1 and 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasions 2 and 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With Group C (Table 4.12) the upward trend of the raw scores was also strong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upwards</th>
<th>Static</th>
<th>Downwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasions 1 and 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasions 1 and 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasions 2 and 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 4.13 and 4.14 give the results of the Tukey Test for significance across Occasions 1, 2 and 3 (before, short term, long term) for Groups A and C, respectively on the seven dimensions and the total. For Group A significance was gained on the Confrontation dimension between Occasions 1 and 3 and Occasions 2 and 3.

**Table 4.13**

**Tukey Test of Significance Across Occasions 1, 2 and 3 for Group A on Dimensions and Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Occasions 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Occasions 1 &amp; 3</th>
<th>Occasions 2 &amp; 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Exploration</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediacy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = Not significant at .05.  
S = Significant at .05.
For Group C the only significance emerging was on the Concreteness dimensions between Occasions 1 and 3.

Table 4.14
Tukey Test of Significance Across Occasions 1, 2 and 3 for Group C on Dimensions and Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Occasions 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Occasions 1 &amp; 3</th>
<th>Occasions 2 &amp; 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Exploration</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = Not significant at .05.  
S = Significant at .05.

Whereas there is no doubt that there is a general upward trend in the raw scores, and the A.N.O.V.A. procedures have identified some significant results at the .05 level, when the Tukey Test is applied the number of specific differences achieving significance at the .05 level is very small. This finding is consistent with the understanding that the Tukey Test puts a strong
control on the amount of alpha error that may be present in a series of comparisons, and in doing so tends to make it more difficult for significant differences to emerge. This can be a problem in this research where the amount of variation or change that is possible in the scores is rather limited.

There was an attempt to analyze the open-ended impressions given by the subjects sixteen months after the completion of the treatment. The subjects were invited to fill in the Carkhuff scales and also to append comments if possible. Whereas all the subjects complied with filling in the scales, only 13 of the 27 appended comments and it was not possible to relate these in a systematic way to the rating scales. Possibly the main impression for these written responses was that 12 of the 13 said commendatory things about the experience and one other commented that it was of minimal value. These comments are listed in Appendix E.

Part B

In this section of the investigation, the Carkhuff scales were also used with the following modifications:

a) Self Exploration dimensions was omitted. It was felt that this area could not be observed and rated from a viewing of the video tapes.

b) Ratings were carried out individually and then averaged. (Four participants and the leader.) These
following a viewing of the video segments.

Tables 4.14, 4.15, 4.16 and 4.17 indicate the scores for the four subjects on the six dimensions and over the five occasions. The averaged scores for Teacher A indicate an improved trend for all dimensions across the five occasions.

The averaged scores for Teacher B shows quite a strong upward trend on all six dimensions across the five occasions. The averaged scores for Teacher C shows an upward trend on three of the dimensions (Concreteness, Respect, Confrontation), a static result on one dimension (Immediacy), and a fluctuating trend on the other two dimensions (Genuineness, Empathy), across the five occasions. The averaged scores for Teacher D shows an upward trend on all dimensions across the five occasions.

The rating sessions were organized with the segments being in scrambled sequence and the ratees were unable to ascertain which segment in the sequence they were rating on any one occasion.

The results of the four subjects were then brought together, averaged, and a single index of performance for the group of four was derived. This permitted a statistical analysis approach whereby a single subject design with time-series data could be utilized. The
data was subject to a test of auto-correlation (Jayaratne, 1978) in order to determine the degree of independence of the data. This procedure resulted in a finding that the results for the dimensions were not auto-correlated. An examination of the results was then made using Bloom's relative-frequency procedure as set out in the article above by Jayaratne. The results for the dimensions of Genuineness, Concreteness, Empathy, Confrontation and Immediacy all moved into the desired behavior at the .05 level of significance. Only the dimension of Respect did not achieve that level of significance.

The results were graphed for each of the six dimensions on Figure 9. Results for Genuineness indicated a rise in scores up to fifth occasion when the results dropped slightly. On Concreteness, Genuineness, Empathy, Confrontation and Immediacy, the results showed an upward trend across the five occasions. Figure 4.1 also indicates the timing of the five video-taping sessions (a, b, c, d, and e), and provides an indication of possible relationship between the results and the treatment program. This figure indicates a pattern of results that suggests that the treatment in totality may have been contributing to the upward trend in the scores but the particular timing of the segments of the treatment did not seem to have a strong impact.
Table 4.15

Scores of Teacher A on the 6 Dimensions on the 5 Rating Occasions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
<th>Rater 3</th>
<th>Rater 4</th>
<th>Rater 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emp</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Res</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.16
Scores of Teacher B on the 6 Dimensions on the 5 Rating Occasions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conc</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emp</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Res</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conf</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imm</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av.</strong></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

a) Teacher A is the same person as Rater A, etc.
b) Rater E is the Leader of the group.
Table 4.17

Scores of Teacher C on the 6 Dimensions on the 5 Rating Occasions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3 5 6 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5 5 6 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5 5 6 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4 5 5 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>4.8 5.4 6 6.4 5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 5 5 7 7 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7 7 8 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3 5 6 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5 5 6 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6 6 7 7 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>5.2 5.6 6.8 6.8 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) Teacher A is the same person as Rater A, etc.

b) Rater E is the Leader of the group.
Table 4.18
Scores of Teacher D on the 6 Dimensions on the 5 Rating Occasions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) Teacher A is the same person as Rater A, etc.

b) Rater E is the Leader of the group.
Summary table for all 4 Teachers on all 6 Scales at the Five Rating Occasions with Treatment Intervention time indicated.

Note: Dotted line indicates training on that dimension.
Discussion of Results

The research was conducted in two parts - Part A was carried out to ascertain whether change, as measured by self report, could be attributed to the training program, and Part B was carried out to ascertain whether change, as rated by observers, could be noted with regard to actual classroom functioning and related to the training program.

In Part A, a "before" and "two-after" (short-term and long-term) design was used in an attempt to estimate extent of change over the period of the program, and at the stage long after the completion of the program. As indicated on Tables 4.11 and 4.12 the results are suggestive of change having taken place in the expected direction on most of the dimensions. Whereas a researcher can take some encouragement from results moving in the expected direction, change results can be illusory as indicators of effects. In Group A, for instance, between Occasions 1 and 2 all of the dimensions showed raised levels with the exception of the dimensions of Empathy and Immediacy. However, in both of these two areas the downwards trend reverted to an increase when comparisons were made between the "before" test and the "long-term" test. In examining further the movement picture for Group A, the upward trend was in evidence on all
dimensions excepting Self Exploration when Short Term and Long Term (Occasions 2 and 3) comparisons were made, and in the instance of Self Exploration the downward trend only went as far as the baseline level. It should be noted that on the Self Exploration dimension the scores on all three occasions were very high and almost as high as the rating scale would allow, suggesting some difficulty in this dimension to maintain high level functioning.

When these upward trends in the scores were subjected to statistical analysis using the ANOVA procedures, significance at .05 level was gained on the changes in the dimensions of Concreteness, Self Exploration, Respect, Confrontation, and not surprisingly, the Total score for all dimensions. The discrepancy noted between the seeming lack of change for Self Exploration for Groups A and C and the reaching of significance for that dimension can be explained by the fact that the ANOVA was applied to the data for all groups and Group B (Middle Machs) did show a strong upward movement in scores. With Group A (Low Machs - Encounter Prone) the upward trend was strongly evident between the "before" and the "long-term" scores. The only exceptions to this upward picture occurred in the areas of Empathy and Immediacy between Occasions 1 and 2 (the "before" and the "short-term" after tests). Group C's results paralleled
Group A's with a slight downward movement between Occasion 2 and 3 (the "short-term" after and the "long-term" after) in the area of self exploration and this could probably be best explained in the same way as for Group A by stating when scores reach almost the ultimate level there is a greater likelihood that differences will show up in a movement back towards the mean.

Comparing the results for Groups A and C on the rating scales they suggest that the respondents felt that there had been general improvement on their functioning both at the short-term and the long-term stages. There were only three instances out of a possible twenty four comparisons (3 occasions by 8 dimensions - this includes the total figure) showing a downward trend in results. These self-rating results were consistent with written statements of those subjects who supplied them at the conclusion of the research program - that is, at the "long-term" stage. Unfortunately, not all subjects provided written statements concerning the impact of the training on them. Because the researcher considers it unlikely that the subjects would have remembered the earlier ratings it is postulated that those written statements gave an interesting confirmation of the trends showing up in the self rating results (Appendix E).
Although the ANOVA application supported the possibility of significant change on the four dimensions of Concreteness, Self Exploration, Respect and Confrontation, and also on the Total score, when the Tukey test was applied in order to ascertain which of the particular change results were significant the only comparisons that reached the .05 level were for Group A on the dimension of Confrontation between Occasions 1 and 3, and on the same dimension between Occasions 2 and 3. With Group C the only result reaching the .05 significance level on the Tukey Test was on the dimension of Concreteness between Occasions 1 and 3. It is not surprising that the Tukey test was only able to indicate significance on so few comparison as it is regarded by Maxwell (1980) as being a conservative test, in which extent of control of alpha error tends to be magnified. The situation in which Concreteness and Confrontation were the only two dimensions on the Tukey test to reach significance is not surprising in that these two dimensions appear to be easier to objectify, and thus to train, and it is the writer's impression that with an orientation towards training that emphasizes behavioral methodology, dimensions such as Concreteness and Confrontation are more susceptible to identifiable movement than the dimensions of Empathy, Genuineness and Respect for instance, which are more likely to be developed through traditional Encounter methodology.
On the other hand, it is interesting to note that the dimension of Empathy was recently the focus of training in research carried out by Wilson (1981). Wilson found that it was possible to train children in the dimension of Empathy. It is the writer's belief that the training program in this research would need to revise its methodology concerning the dimensions of Empathy, Genuineness and Respect as the Egan approach as used in this research could well utilize further structure and control. Probably the most difficult aspect for a leader in these three dimensions is the question of how far can he go in controlling the training without intruding into the subjects' realm of independence. A leader should always respect the subject's right not to be changed. Thus, in this study the researcher was careful to ensure, as far as possible, that the subjects were volunteers, that they were aware of the type of expected outcomes, that their right to reject or withdraw from the training program was protected, and that they were reassured that group rather than individual results would be reported. Nevertheless, it was the researcher's impression that he could have adopted reinforcement and feedback arrangements that could have been more potent in achieving change. Of course, a further consideration would be the extent
to which a more vigorous application of the training program would have led to a reaction by participants both to the program methodology and its aims. In this program there were no drop-outs along the way nor was there any resistance to undertaking the tests at the three points.

Another aspect of the results in the areas of Concreteness and Confrontation is that these two dimensions received the lowest ratings of all scales at the pretest stage (Occasion 1). Thus it may be that change was more likely to occur because there was more room for improvement on the dimension. An examination of the raw scores at the three occasions on the other dimensions shows a rating uniformly higher than midpoint. It is interesting to note that at the pretest ratings the overall average score was 6.6, at the short-term test 7.0, and at the long-term test 7.2. This brings up the possibility that the subjects who were all teachers in Special Education were a group who not only entered with above average functioning levels but were predisposed towards improvement in these areas given the training opportunity. It also brings up the consideration that perhaps even the supposedly "Encounter Blind" subjects were either more "Encounter Prone" than the Mach V tests indicated or that the training served firstly to confirm
and reinforce the Encounter Prone subjects' characteristics, and was successful in overcoming any resistance that might have been present with the Encounter Blind subjects. Perhaps what is really important is not so much that Groups A and C did not differ greatly in the extent of their improvement but rather that each group did improve both at the short-term and the long-term measuring on most dimensions. Another interpretation of the movement of the Group C (Encounter Blind) subjects is that if they were prepared to undertake the program it could be that they were, in spite of their "Encounter Blindness", receptive to the training program's proposed outcomes. As the researcher did not know until after the training program had concluded which subjects were Encounter Prone or Encounter Blind, he was not able to make any subjective judgments as to whether the subjects were either receptive or resistant to the training, prior to the commencement of the training or during the training.

One of the very important issues involved in this research is concerned with how appropriate it was to use the rating scales which have been developed from psychotherapeutic research models (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) or from a general helping relationship model (Carkhuff, 1969, 1971) in a teacher training context. It could be said that the Carkhuff scales as set down
Appendix B are in general global, with adjectives and descriptions of behavior hypothesized to be reflected at various points on a continuum. The scales were developed with a 5 point grading and in presenting these scales to the subjects in the first session the researcher attempted to develop a consensual understanding of the meaning of each level, and of possible positions of uncertainty between each level. In order to accommodate the uncertainty a 9 point scale emerged. This enlarged scale is listed as Appendix B.

During the program the researcher and subjects endeavoured to obtain behavior-anchored statements to describe the levels on the scale, and to determine behaviors indicative of how these levels were manifested in the classroom situation. Certainly during the training for Part A subjects the classroom application of these was always of central concern. However, during this time although the subjects discussed the application of the training for classroom and related relationship situations there was no attempt by the researcher to monitor actual classroom interaction. This aspect came in Part B. The rating of behavior for Part A was simply a self report of how the subject rated his level of classroom functioning on the seven dimensions. During the training program he was repeatedly told to share his self perceptions with pupils, colleagues, or
close friends in order to try to get a validation of the levels of functioning. This form of checking with others of whether his self perceptions were in line with the way others saw him served also to lead to a refining of the criteria for the various levels and thus was felt to lead to increased reliability. Therefore, for each self rater there was a strong attempt to gain reliability through precision in defining the concepts and through the "checking with others" procedure. At each stage the subjects were pushed to be precise in their communication and to "check out" misunderstanding and lack of understanding. The procedure of giving "feedback", being honest and genuine, empathic to the needs of others and being concrete in communication, all of which were objectives of the training program moved during the course of the program from a training exercise situation to a naturally occurring situation. The consistent approach for each session of specifying the objectives, training to develop these objectives, trying them out in relationships, getting feedback, shaping and refining them, and generalizing their usage from the training situation to the classroom situation carried with it a built-in mechanism of repeated practice, and the potential for reinforcement of improved levels of functioning. Likewise, these were the opportunities
in a safe but vigilant training environment for extinction of low-level or ineffective functioning.

What is very interesting is not only the improved levels of functioning at the short-term stage but also the continued "holding-on" of the improvement level at the sixteen months later stage. It would seem that the high level of functioning present immediately after the training program ceased was generating its own reinforcement system and thus permitting a maintenance of level of functioning on the dimensions as assessed on the self-report scales. If one were to be skeptical about the validity of the long-term measure it may be on account of the possibility that the subjects were reluctant to show that "fall-off" or inferior functioning was taking place after having gone through the training. However, the consistency of the upward trend across subjects and the "holding on" of functioning levels tends to suggest that the final self rating did represent a reasonably valid self rating, and that the training program did have lasting impact.

Part B section of the research attempted to gain some indication of the extent to which the training program may have had an effect on classroom relationships between the teacher and her pupils. The same training program and the same rating scales as used in Part A were used.
Different subjects were involved in Part B section but like their Part A counterparts they were Special Education teachers undertaking the same graduate program. It is perhaps incorrect to say it was the same program because even though the objectives, the methods, the training situations, and the leader were the same, the sessions occasionally took different directions and had different emphases. The leader introduced the pretest self rating scale at the beginning of the program but did not require the participants to rate themselves. Nevertheless, the dimensions were fully discussed particularly as they relate to classroom functioning. The purpose was to note any changes that may occur and whether these changes seem to occur following specific training occasions. Observer rating was used throughout, but the rating given to each participant at each point, was the averaged rating of the five observers (the four participants and the leader) of videoed segments of the classroom interaction. All the video tapes were rated at the conclusion of the training program and were rated in scrambled order so as to prevent the possibility that the raters would be able to sequentially compare the levels of functioning. Furthermore, rating the segments in this way enabled the raters to get into a rating frame of mind that didn't have to be reinstituted on a number of separate occasions. These
procedures were adopted in order to increase both the validity and reliability of the ratings. The ratings actually took place on two consecutive days. The ratings showed an improvement trend for each of the four subjects, however, there does not seem to be any noticeable relationship between the timing of segments of the treatment and resultant movement on particular dimensions on the rating scale. Whereas each dimension improved slightly after the treatment, no dramatic improvements were noted. Thus it would seem reasonable to suggest that although the focus of the treatment may have been on Genuineness, for example, at a particular stage, through a modelling by the leader or through a sensitivity to the dimension gained at the beginning discussion of the dimension, or on account of some other unknown factor, the actual effect of the treatment seemed to serve little more than to reinforce what was already there in the person's functioning. The possibility throws into question the effect of the treatment except perhaps to reinforce or strengthen pre-existing skills and behaviors. This nevertheless may still be a valid use of a training program if it is argued that the person may have been on a "plateau" in her relationships or even dropping to lower levels.
The Part B subjects showed general patterns of agreement with the Part A subjects in movement of scores, and the research does suggest that the training can both influence an upward movement of scores on dimensions, as reported on self-report devices, and can also influence the actual interactory behavior between teacher and pupil, as revealed from an analysis of video-taped segments. One of the questions that remains obscure however, is whether the upward movement in scores reflects the content and approach of the training program, the modelling effect of the leader, the motivation of the subjects or some other unidentified influence. Probably the important points that should be made here are that the scores in both parts of the research indicate improvement in functioning by the subjects, and the final levels were very much at the levels thought to be necessary for enhancing the learning of the students of those teacher-subjects.

There are other positive aspects to this study. The study sets out clearly in Appendix A what is involved in this particular approach to Human Relations training and it is the writer's contention that the training program carried out in this instance is directly reflective of the description set down by Blank, Gottsegen and Gottsegen (1971). It concentrates on the "hearing, feeling, responding and articulating" aspects described by
O'Banion (1970) as leading to "a greater check on the accuracy of perceptions". An important aspect is that the program is clearly delineated, and thus provides a reasonable opportunity for replication with other groups in other circumstances. In this respect it is a pivotal study and will enable others to usefully explore and develop its directions. While acknowledging that the study has its own uniqueness it is in accordance with the Seashore prescriptions as set on page 8 of this study. Each participant was aware of his responsibility for his own learning. The leader structured the learning situation and direction, and facilitated the learning process within the sessions through a modelling of, and a teaching of objectives utilizing behavioral technology. The group climate that was sought was the one built on the Carkhuff dimensions and subjects were aware of these aims. The objectives were the improvement of functioning in human relations skill areas, and there were constant attempts to operationalize those skills, and at designated times, attempts were made to assess the extent of development in those skills.

Perhaps the most surprising aspect of the results was the way in which the Part B subjects seemed to globally lift their levels on the dimensions even prior to the specific training in those areas. This finding suggests that the initial careful and full delineation of the dimension areas, together with the knowledge that the
objectives of the training were to lift functioning levels in those areas, seems to have been equally as potent in effecting improvement as the actual training itself. It may then be suggested that the training served to maintain the improvement direction as the graphed results reveal continued improvement. It was the researcher's impression that the subjects enjoyed the exercises during the program and were keen to improve their functioning levels on the dimension areas. Nevertheless, in spite of the findings of significance of movement towards the desired areas the difficulty of relating movement of the dimensions to specific aspects of the training program remains a concern.

The Carkhuff approach of including not only "discrimination" but "communication" aspects in training programs is felt to have been an improvement in training in this area. Not only did the program seek to develop the skills of identifying Genuineness, Respect, etc., but it also set out to train the subjects in the communication of these dimensions. Part B sought to probe this area by having the teaching sessions videoed and then rated. Thus what was happening in this aspect was the identification of the seven core dimensions in action rather than the self report of the degree of presence of those dimensions in one's functioning.
In general then what was attempted in this study was to explore some of the important attitudinal and preparation aspects of a teacher's functioning and relate these to the classroom performance of children. The work of Berenson (1971), Borton (1970), Hefele (1971) and Truax and Tatum (1966), all suggested a relationship between some human relations factors and pupil performance. Others such as Blank, Gottsegen and Gottsegen (1971) purported to show that the human relations aspects could be trained. This research tried to bridge the gap.

The attempt to relate the effects of the training to different entry levels of functioning on the core dimensions gave some interesting findings and suggested that some types of relationship qualities are more likely to benefit from this training program than others. Such a finding could have significance for teacher trainers.
in that if appropriate human relations qualities can be gained through training, and if the training can be effective even with seemingly resistant persons then there would seem to be a strong argument for the inclusion of human relations training in all teacher training programs. This research suggests that training of the type carried out in this program may be useful with teachers whether they be disposed towards improvements in the core dimension areas or not, and as already referred to earlier there is some indication that following the training program there was observed improvement in the core dimension areas in the classroom interactions.

This research was also concerned with the aspect of the durability of change and the results achieved in Part A of this study seem to indicate that over a 16 months period the effects of the training program may be continuing at least. Not only were the levels obtained at the short-term post test maintained 16 months later but for most dimensions there were even slight increases. One interpretation of this could be that the improved levels achieved from the training program generate their own reinforcements which tend to sustain those levels. Of course, it must be acknowledged that the 16 months later rating was a self rating, and although it is unlikely that the teachers would remember their earlier ratings they would be aware of what levels are desirable for a
teacher. What is really needed with these long-term results is to have the self report checked by observer ratings in a similar way as was done with Part B, and thus giving a check on the reliability of their self report. A less cautious way of interpreting the improved long-term functioning would be to suggest that the training had an impact on the teachers and that it was a "durable" one.

The question of the effects of the Humanistic context is one that should be looked at. There is no doubt that the prevailing atmosphere within the faculty at Melbourne State College is one of caring, concern, respect, openness and indeed there is a rather strong modelling of the Carkhuff dimensions. This attitude does not preclude the use of behavioral technology in the instructional aspect of the programs. The teachers who undertake the program at Melbourne State College have no other viable alternatives in Special Education studies within that geographical region. Therefore, if they wish to study Special Education, regardless of the extent of their humanistic orientation and functioning, they have to "buy" what is offered. There could be a biased selection process operating by which some non-Humanist teachers opt not to undertake the studies, and thus the persons undertaking the Special Education studies may be largely Humanist in orientation. Even more specifically, the persons who take the non-compulsory Human
Relations segment were self selected and also possibly a biased sample. On the other hand the Mach Test seemed to suggest that the Group C subjects were of the "Encounter Blind" group and thus allowing a satisfactory spread of subject types as far as this research is concerned.

One point that still stands out clearly with research in this area is the difficulty of concluding that a particular treatment is causative with relation to certain outcomes. The training program utilized techniques thought to be conducive of change (Garvin, 1981), and thus gave greater confidence in proposing that changes could be viewed in a cause-effect way. For example, it met Garvin's suggestions for a progression from the practicing of certain interactory skills in a one-to-one interaction, through to group practice, and thence to practice in an outside environment. The treatment program incorporated features such as the identification of goals, training in the attainment of change on the core dimensions, assessment of levels of attainment, and maintenance of levels of training outside the training situation. The first session was a direct attempt to heighten understanding of the areas of focus - the core dimensions. Clarification of those dimensions across students, and the identification of appropriate behaviors to describe the dimensions, was felt to be an important technique in gaining validity and reliability in the ratings. Other
aspects mentioned by Garvin included the importance of the leader's modelling of high levels of functioning, and thus a reinforcement of the stated principles. It was necessary for the leader to demonstrate the concepts in action. The regular meetings between the trainer and the trainees provided the desired opportunities for practice, feedback, modification, shaping and reinforcement in the movement towards improvement in the core dimension behaviors.

Another writer who likewise reports that the above factors are important in a training program is Rose (1977). Rose also says a training should give a trainee confidence to try our new behaviors and be less fearful of mistakes and derision.

Turning to the question of the method of evaluating the results one of the important issues considered was to employ behavioral indices that would be both valid in terms of the research area and easy to utilize. There were some difficulties in identifying behaviors that were discrete and results from Part B in particular tend to throw some doubt as to how discrete the core areas were. Improvement on the core dimensions seemed to occur on all dimensions in similar degrees and at similar times and not be identifiable with specific training episodes.

The hammering out of the types of behaviors illustrative of the dimensions did not always result in a quick or totally agreed consensus, however, for the purpose of
the ratings discrepant opinions were submerged and agreement was finally obtained on behavioral descriptions. Another consideration always present was the possibility, arising both from the findings of Aspy (1967) mentioned earlier, and the subject's own convictions that low functioning on the dimensions was suggestive of ineffective teaching. Thus there may be motivation to improve on the dimensions, and indeed a motivation to attain the desired levels of functioning, and the results that were achieved may be indicative of causative factors other than those aspects of the treatment program considered to be logically related to possible effects.

The measurement of change was a crucial aspect of this research and required the establishment of baseline information against which direction and magnitude of change could be noted. The measurement in Part A in particular had the additional advantage of being directly related to the setting up of treatment goals. The subjects could note their levels on the core dimensions and could either privately or in collaboration with others establish their own goals. The program was presented to all the subjects as one that would allow each subject the opportunity to develop skills that would lead to higher levels of functioning on the core dimensions. Although evidence was put forward concerning the relationship between the
higher levels and improved pupil classroom performance
this point was not pushed very strongly and the leader's
position was rather one of allowing the program, the related
literature, and its improvement goals to speak for themselves.
In Part A there was no intermediate checks on progress, and
any such private checks that did occur would have done so
without encouragement, direction and comment from the
leader. Thus formal evaluation, at the "short term" after
the program was the only contrived and expected evaluation.
The fact that there was to be an evaluation sixteen months
later only became known to the subject when he/she was
contacted at that latter period. Therefore, it could
not be suggested that the subjects had in mind the neces­
sity to keep their skills at a high level on account of
an expected later evaluation situation. Similarly, the
lack of knowledge of further evaluation would tend to
erase the memory of particular performance levels at
the short-term evaluation situation. In Part A group
results of Groups A and C were used rather than individual,
however, reference to Appendix C illustrates a consistent
pattern for individuals within each group. There seemed
to be an evenness in effect across individuals in the
groups rather than spectacular rises and falls. The
approach to the evaluation was thus a combined qualitative
(showing general trends) and quantitative (showing extent
of individual movement), however, Appendix C information does permit examination of individual performance, and that information was available to the leader/trainer so as to permit remediation and/or further practice in developing the required skills. This aspect of the training program, which was after all principally concerned with developing skill to be implemented in real-life situations rather than going through a treatment program just for research purposes, probably contributed significantly to the maintenance of high levels of functioning at the long-term stage. The possession and utilization of the core dimension skills promised, according to the literature, pay-offs in terms of the children's performance, and this factor probably carried with it a sustaining motivational impact that had an influence of the maintenance of the high levels.

In Part B of the research there was also a baseline measurement taken prior to the first training session and this no doubt sensitized the trainees to the total range of dimensions. No further intermediate evaluation was formally carried out until the end of the program when the randomized video-tapes were rated by the leader and the group. A long-term after the treatment evaluation has not been carried out, however, this is proposed as a later piece of investigation.
One important aspect of the self ratings on the core dimensions in Part A was that the ratings were able to be private. In order to achieve this, each student was given a number that only he knew and used this number on all the self rating forms. In actuality, however, the "private" aspect of the rating seemed to be rarely sought and most trainees discussed their ratings with fellow trainees. It is felt that these discussions tended to increase the reliability of the ratings. The Part B ratings were likewise private, although discussion was permitted at the time of rating, and as the behavior to be rated was being viewed and rated by all the participants.

In summarizing the two parts of the research, together the results are suggestive that training does have a stimulating effect on pre-existing skills, both in terms of self reported behavior, and also classroom functioning that has been videoed. There is also some evidence to suggest that some dimensions are more susceptible to movement than others. In Part B of the research the more susceptible dimensions seemed to be Genuineness and Confrontation, whereas the Part A section seemed to indicate greater susceptibility for Respect, Concreteness and Confrontation.

In concluding this section mention will be made of some of the limitations of this research and the possibilities for future research. There exists a major
problem in delineating goals of the training in terms of behavioral characteristics. The area of interrelationships involves at least two persons and a context, and while we can attempt to specify certain behaviors related to levels of functioning on a dimension the accurate measurement of these at a particular point in time is difficult. Therefore, there is value in rating segments of naturalistic behavior, providing they are representative of the total functioning area under consideration. The requirement was met in Part B whereas in Part A the rating was not confined to a specific time or event. In research in this area the timing of the rating and the specificity of it with regard to particular segments of behavior is important, and should be directly linked to the goals.

At the beginning of this research the statement was made that the field is one which has as its research basis predominantly "articles faith rather than fact". This particular piece of research has done a little to erode at that limitation but much more needs to be done. It is this researcher's intention to investigate some of the following areas:

i) The effect of training on teachers who are not Special Educators.
ii) An investigation of the effects of a greater number of evaluation (self-ratings) at various stages during the program, and in particular the effects of trying to lift functioning levels in those areas not achieving the desired high levels.

iii) The transferability of the training skills to areas other than in education settings.

iv) An investigation of the academic performance of the pupils of the trainees undergoing this program.

Investigation of these aspects should provide a further nibbling away at the lack of knowledge in the area of the effects of Human Relations Training on teachers and gradually edge the "article of faith" more towards a situation in which we can say "the evidence seems to suggest".
GLOSSARY

CORE DIMENSION - An area of behavior, involving the interaction of at least two persons, which can be identified as discrete from other areas of behavior. Carkhuff identified seven core dimensions - Empathy, Respect, Concreteness, Genuineness, Confrontation, Immediacy, Self Disclosure.

EMPATHY - An interactory response in which the first person's feelings and meanings are responded to by another in such a way that it indicates an accurate assessment and communication of the first person's feelings and meanings.

RESPECT - The communication by the first person of a concern for the second person's feelings, meanings and experiences.

CONCRETENESS - The aspect of how specific a particular message is.

GENUINENESS - The extent to which there is a congruency between what a person verbalizes and what other cues indicate that he is feeling or meaning.
CONFRONTATION - An act, initiated by the first person in which the first person challenges the discrepancies within and across the second person's thoughts and feelings, with the aim of achieving a unity and congruence within the second person's life style.

IMMEDIACY - The ability to understand and communicate the range of feelings and experiences that are going on between you and another person.

SELF-EXPLORATION - The voluntary introduction by the second person of personally relevant material - the material may or may not be communicated to the first person.
### Timetable for Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video No.</th>
<th>Session No.</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Homework</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 1</td>
<td>Session No. 1</td>
<td>Introduction &amp; Setting Objectives</td>
<td>Ex 1</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 1</td>
<td>Session No. 2</td>
<td>Attending to Response</td>
<td>Ex 2-4</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 1</td>
<td>Session No. 3</td>
<td>Verbal &amp; Non-verbal Communication</td>
<td>Ex 5-7</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 1</td>
<td>Session No. 4</td>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>Ex 8-9</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 1</td>
<td>Session No. 5</td>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>Ex 10-11</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 1</td>
<td>Session No. 6</td>
<td>Experiencing the Language of Emotion</td>
<td>Ex 12-13</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 2</td>
<td>Session No. 7</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Ex 14-17</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 2</td>
<td>Session No. 8</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Ex 18-21</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 2</td>
<td>Session No. 9</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Ex 22-24</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 3</td>
<td>Session No. 10</td>
<td>Genuineness &amp; Respect</td>
<td>Ex 25-26</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 3</td>
<td>Session No. 11</td>
<td>Practical Session</td>
<td>Ex 27-28</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 3</td>
<td>Session No. 12</td>
<td>Advanced Accurate Empathy</td>
<td>Ex 29-31</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 4</td>
<td>Session No. 13</td>
<td>Self-disclosure &amp; Confrontation</td>
<td>Ex 32-34</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 4</td>
<td>Session No. 14</td>
<td>Immediacy</td>
<td>Ex 35-36</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video No. 5</td>
<td>Session No. 15</td>
<td>Putting It All Together</td>
<td></td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of Sessions - Both Parts A & B

Note: L indicates Lecturer, S indicates Subjects.

Session 1

Aims:

1) To delineate and explain the details of the program.
2) To explain Carkhuff's 7 core dimensions.
3) To carry out testing of entry behaviors.

Part A only.

Approach:

L hands out copies of program and discusses this work with S. Clarification of uncertainties, doubts, obscurities concerning the involvements, the content, the method of approach and the requirements takes place. S are informed that they will be required to work on the development of some skills - the Carkhuff core dimensions. These dimensions are presented in handout form and class works on gaining consensual understanding of those dimensions in action. Behaviors are listed that relate to classroom interaction. S are informed that a before and after test is to be carried out to see what movements, if any occur on the dimensions. S are then requested to fill out (self-rate) the Carkhuff scales, and are given one week to discuss, amend or validate their ratings. The forms are to be returned to L at the beginning of Session 2 and will not be referred to by L during the
training program. Part A subjects are also requested to fill out the Mach Test. They are told that the results of this test will be used for research purposes only. They are not given the results of the test - nor is reference made to the rationale behind, or the purpose for using the test.

S are informed of the "exercise" approach to the development of skills, and that the purpose of the exercise will be to help the S begin to translate into practice those skills of relationships set down by Carkhuff. They are introduced to a workbook "Exercises in Helping Skills" by Egan and informed that the workbook will be used to assist the development of the skills - and to keep significant next-of-kin in touch with the program. It was explained that the L did not want the skills to be situation-specific to the College but transferable to other situations, and in particular, the classroom situation.

The exercise book was largely to provide a behavioral link between a theoretical understanding of the skills and their actual implementation.

The model of functioning within each session is also described. The S will be both helper and helpee, and the content will centre around the human relationship situations of the classroom. It will thus not only be
problem centered but will also highlight those relationships that are facilitating and productive in classroom performance.

Homework:

The task is for the S to list those relationship attributes which are or have been characterizing classroom functioning. Emphasis will be on gaining an accurate description of the behaviors involved.

Note: At the end of each session S are required to examine whether aims have been met, what further work needs to be done, and what were the gains in the session.

Session 2

Aims:

1) To study "attention to self and others".
2) To appreciate the negativeness of non-attempting.
3) To develop skills in attending to verbal communication.

Approach:

The activities of this session and the next were seen as precursors to the core dimension area studies. Attention was seen as requiring five elements:

1) Face the other person squarely.
2) Adopt an open posture.
3) Leaning toward the other.
4) Keeping good eye contact.
5) Trying to be "at home" or relatively relaxed in this position.
S were required to work in pairs, and adopt, in turn, both an attending and a non-attending position. They were then required to work in threes or fours in which as well as the helper and helpee, there would also be at least one observer who would supplement the feedback and discussion sessions. During this session the L will move the subjects from pairs into larger groupings, and in this way try to extend the generalizability of the skills.

Homework:

The S will try out the behaviors with "back-home" or "at-work" others, and either take tape recordings, video-recordings, or written notes of the interactions. These will be discussed during Session 3.

Session 3

Aims:

1) To study degrees of attending in a group situation, e.g. the training class and/or the classroom.
2) An examination of, and noting of non-verbal and/or paralinguistic cues.
3) Ensuring that S get the message straight. Exercises in parroting.

Approach:

Homework exercises from the previous week are checked out and a group exercise is conducted to note progress in
the different feelings and response levels by respondents who adopt non-attending, minimal and intense attending positions.

Non-verbal messages are studied, particularly with the way they confirm, punctuate, emphasize, moderate or modify the verbal messages of the speaker. Non-verbal is sometimes referred to as body language.

Paralinguistic cues are studied. Here the focus is on tone of voice, loudness, pitch, pacing of words, stumbling over words, grunts and sighs.

Non-verbal and paralinguistic cues are seen as important information components related to the discrimination and communication of messages in relationships.

The aspect of parroting is a training device that aims at ensuring that the receiver has received the message accurately. Verbal messages of differing complexities are parroted.

Homework:

S are required to practice the skill of observing the non-verbal messages and listening to the paralinguistic cues, and thus to gain additional information concerning the messages that are communicated during relationships.
Session 4

Aim:

To develop the skill of speaking concretely - about experience and behaviors.

Approach:

L assists the development of the skill of speaking concretely by comparing vague statements with concrete ones. S are given practice in converting vague to concrete statements. In the first instance practice is centered on experience areas - or events that have happened in the classroom functioning of S. The context then moves to behavioral areas or things that the S does or has done. In both those areas the progression is from working in pairs through to larger groupings.

Homework:

Practice the skill of making statements as concrete as possible. S are also asked to note examples of both vague and concrete statements - to seek clarification of the vague and to react favorably to concrete statements. At this point the focus is on experience and behavioral situations.

Session 5

Aims:

1) To develop the skill of speaking concretely about feelings.
2) To develop the skills of speaking concretely about complex situations involving combinations of experience, behavior and feelings.

Approach:

Skills of speaking concretely about experience and behavior are checked out. S are encouraged to speak more concretely in interactions within training sessions. Training in the area of feelings is then undertaken, and finally complex statements involving experience, behaviors and feelings are practiced. Once again, practice moves from small to larger groupings.

Homework:

Practice in the skill of making feeling statements as concrete as possible is undertaken. S are asked to note examples of both vague and concrete statements - to seek clarification of the vague and to react favourably to concrete statements. At this stage, the focus is on feeling and complex statements and situations.

Session 6

Aims:

1) Expanding of skill in expressing feelings and emotions.

2) To get a clearer picture of S own feelings and emotion and how they may affect relationships.
Approach:

The importance of concreteness is emphasized in assisting oneself and others to get into close touch with their own emotions. The language of emotion is explored - joy, anger, anxiety, shame, embarrassment, defeat, confusion, guilt, regret, rejection, depression, love, peace, pressure, capability, competence, low self-esteem, satisfaction, abused, distress, constraint, boredom, and hope.

Feelings and emotions can be expressed in a variety of ways - by single words, phrases and through the implications of experiential and behavioral statements. These aspects are explored and practiced. S are given the opportunity to respond verbally to cue "emotion" words. S are then invited to picture themselves in the situations and to seek ways of further clarifying the feelings.

Homework:

S are required to give written responses in terms of single word, phrase, experiential and behavioral statements to a number of cue words. They are also required to pay particular attention to feeling statements by others.
Session 7

Aims:

1) To be able to accurately identify the feelings of others.
2) To develop the skill of interpreting feelings from content.

Approach:

The importance of both accurate discrimination and communication in giving and receiving messages is stressed leading to practice exercises in which the S attempts to accurately identify speakers' feelings in statements - both written and verbal. Getting the message accurately is seen as a necessary precursor to helpful communication. There is a revision of the aspects of attending, non-verbal information and paralinguistic cues. At this point there is increased use of video equipment as a further way in which the S can check his skills and analyze these with other S.

Homework:

The S is required to check out his responses to exercises 14-17 from Egan's "Exercises in Helping Skills" with a "back-home" or "at-work" person.
Session 8

Aim:

To develop the skill of communicating one's thoughts and feelings to another person as accurately as possible.

Approach:

Through a graded series of exercises involving communicating with the others the S has to take the role of helper and work with another S - the helpee. First person conversation is used: The language used must be direct and concrete. Where possible the content should arise from mathematics classroom interacting situations, however, a number of prepared statements are on hand in order to give adequate training. The point is made that empathy involves not only accurate discrimination of messages but the communication of a response. Thus empathy is seen as an interacting situation.

Homework:

The completion in written form of the homework exercises for sections 18-21 in Egan's "Exercises in Helping Skills".
Session 9

Aim:

To develop further the skill of communicating one's thoughts and feelings to another person on matters of complex feeling and content.

Approach:

Whereas in Session 8 the training centered on discrimination and communication involving one feeling or content item in this session there will be progression to a more complex interacting situation. The response must thus include an understanding of both feeling and content, and be cast in language that is natural for the helper yet understandable for the helpee.

Homework:

The completion in written form of the homework exercises for sessions 22-23 in Egan's "Exercises in Helping Skills". As with previous exercises the S is requested to discuss his responses with another person.

Session 10

Aim:

To examine and practice the notions of genuineness and respect from the point of view of both the helper and the helpee.
Approach:

Genuineness is an aspect that requires considerable honest interaction with other persons. Attempts will be made to firstly identify genuine attitudes and behaviors present in interaction situations. Subjects are required to give each feedback on the quality of genuineness that they communicate. In order to give concrete feedback the trainees will need to have clearly in mind the behaviors that constitute the communication of genuineness. A checklist of genuine and non-genuine behaviors is developed. The same process is adopted with regard to respect and a checklist is also developed for this area.

Homework:

S are required to note persons and situations that illustrate various levels of genuineness and respect, and also to seek opportunities to discuss these aspects with colleagues and pupils.

Session 11

Aim:

To consolidate and practice the skills of empathy, genuineness and respect.
Approach:

Whereas in earlier sessions the emphasis was on the development of skills in areas such as empathy, genuineness, and respect in this session, there will be a consideration of what behaviors to avoid in relationships and how to go about this. Ss are required to role-play examples of both desired and undesired qualities. They are also required to identify from both written and videoed segments examples of both desired and undesired qualities. Following this, Ss are required to carry out a videoed consulting situation with another S, and the segment is to be appraised by whole class. Segments are usually only 3-5 minutes in duration.

Homework:

Ss are required to complete exercise 27 of Egan's "Exercises in Helping Skills" and also to undertake the assignment as set down for chapter 28 of Egan's book. The assignment will be discussed in class for session 12.

Session 12
Aim:

To develop skills that will allow others to understand themselves and their problems in a way that enables them to see the need for action and behavioral change.
Approach:

The L assists the S to gain an understanding of "Advanced Accurate Empathy". Attention is paid to helping the helpee see what he expresses indirectly or implies but does not express directly, helping the helpee to see some of the logical conclusions of what he is saying, helping the helpee to see what he may be overlooking, helping the helpee to identify themes, and helping the helpee over his only partially owned feelings and behaviors. The point is made that advanced accurate empathy must not take away the helpee's responsibility for making decisions. By this stage role playing interactions between class members are with random groupings rather than normal pairings.

Homework:

S are required to complete exercise 31 of Egan's "Exercises in Helping Skills".

Session 13

Aims:

1) To study the importance of self disclosure in relationships and to practice appropriate self disclosure.

2) To study the technique of confrontation and to practice the effective use of the skill.
Approach:

There is a study of the value of appropriate use of self disclosure. The importance of a good relationship both to facilitate and to receive self disclosure is emphasized. Inappropriate disclosure is also examined. Self disclosure is seen as being involved with feelings, experiences and behavior. S are encouraged to practice this skill firstly in pairs, then small groups, and finally the large group.

Confrontation is discussed from the aspect of constructive and destructive relationships. Inept confrontation is destructive. Appropriate confrontation can clarify, facilitate and strengthen good relationships. Such confrontations are usually in the form of invitations to explore one's behavior and the discrepancies in one's life. They are also invitations to employ unused strengths and resources rather than the unmasking of inadequacies.

Homework:

S complete exercise 33 of Egan's "Exercises in Helping Skills" in which they are required to confront themselves both irrationally and responsibly on some aspects of their classroom functioning.
Session 14

Aim:

To investigate the notion of immediacy and to give practice in developing the skill.

Approach:

The session centers on exploring those issues that would enable the person in a relationship, particularly the teaching situation, to involve themselves with each other more creatively. Immediacy requires the meeting of a challenge to deal with issues, usually of an inability nature that prevent the effective growth of relationships. The need to approach immediacy tentatively is highlighted; as premature or spontaneous immediacy can be difficult for some persons to cope with.

Homework:

S are to list those situations occurring during the week between classes in which immediacy was either present in the relationship or should have been.

Session 15

Aim:

To integrate the skills in the areas of concreteness, empathy, genuineness, respect, self disclosure, confrontation and immediacy during the training session.
Approach:

Through a number of simulated, role playing and real-life situations the S is given the opportunity to use the skills in the way that is believed to enhance relationships. Practice, followed by feedback, the refining of the skills support and praise from fellow subjects are the main activities during this session.

Homework:

This is in the form of a rating, using the Carkhuff scales of a teacher and selected children in a classroom situation. S are to work in pairs and discuss their observations and ratings.

Session 16

Aim:

To do a self rating on the seven core dimensions.

Approach:

The homework exercise results are discussed and compared with the L's ratings. Particular attention is paid to areas of discrepancy in the ratings. S are then required to rate themselves, as they did in session 1. Because of the research aspect of this situation they were not allowed to compare their ratings with the session 1 rating, and they were not aware at that stage that a further rating 16 months later (for Part A) would be undertaken. The final
ratings were discussed particularly with reference to how successful the training had been, and which areas needed further development by the various individuals.

Text Books

### Carkhuff Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core dimensions and levels</th>
<th>Empathy (Understanding)</th>
<th>Respect (Caring)</th>
<th>Concreteness (Being specific)</th>
<th>Genuineness (Being real)</th>
<th>Confrontation (Telling it like it is)</th>
<th>Immediacy (What goes on between us)</th>
<th>Self-exploration (Looking at my situation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Really understanding (adding much)</td>
<td>Really caring (positive regard)</td>
<td>Very specific and precise</td>
<td>Being completely real and honest</td>
<td>Really telling what's going on between us</td>
<td>Really saying what's going on between us</td>
<td>Really looking at one's own problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Understanding (adding some)</td>
<td>Some caring fairly specific (positive regard)</td>
<td>Being mostly real and honest</td>
<td>Somewhat telling it like it is</td>
<td>Saying some of what's going on between us</td>
<td>Usually looking at one's own problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interchangeable expressions</td>
<td>Open to caring</td>
<td>Open to being specific</td>
<td>Open to realness</td>
<td>Open to telling it like it is</td>
<td>Open to saying what's going on between us</td>
<td>Open to looking at one's own problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not understanding (Some confusion)</td>
<td>Not caring (negative specific regard)</td>
<td>Not being specific (abstract)</td>
<td>Not usually real (Rather phony)</td>
<td>Not generally telling it like it is</td>
<td>Mostly avoiding saying what is going on between us</td>
<td>Rarely looking at one's own problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Really not understanding (total confusion)</td>
<td>Total lack of respect (Completely negative)</td>
<td>Very vague (Completely abstract)</td>
<td>Totally non-real (Completely phony)</td>
<td>Always avoiding telling it like it is</td>
<td>Completely avoiding saying what's going on etc.</td>
<td>Never looking at one's own problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

Originally in the scales (Carkhuff & Truax, 1967) there were only five rating points on each dimension. Experience with usage of the scales has led the writer to expand the scales to a nine point scale with behavior anchored statements for levels 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9. Where the subject felt that his position was somewhere between the statements he was able to use the intervening number. Although the numbers of "even" ratings amounted to only 4.7% of the total number of ratings it did permit a little more precision for those subjects who desired it.
Machiavellian Scores for Groups A, B and C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Mach Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Mach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Raw Scores for Group B Subjects on the Seven Core Dimensions and Total, on the Three Occasions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Mach</th>
<th>Genuine-ness</th>
<th>Concrete-ness</th>
<th>Self-Expl.</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Confrontation</th>
<th>Immediacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7 9 5</td>
<td>5 7 5</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>5 7 5</td>
<td>7 9 7</td>
<td>7 9 5</td>
<td>5 7 5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7 9 7</td>
<td>5 7 7</td>
<td>7 9 9</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>9 9 9</td>
<td>3 5 7</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7 9 7</td>
<td>5 7 7</td>
<td>9 9 9</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>7 5 9</td>
<td>3 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9 9 9</td>
<td>3 5 5</td>
<td>9 9 7</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>5 7 9</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 7 5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 7</td>
<td>9 9 9</td>
<td>9 5 5</td>
<td>9 7 5</td>
<td>3 5 5</td>
<td>7 5 5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 7 5</td>
<td>9 9 9</td>
<td>7 7 9</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>9 7 7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7 8 5</td>
<td>6 6 7</td>
<td>6 9 9</td>
<td>6 8 9</td>
<td>7 9 9</td>
<td>6 7 9</td>
<td>7 6 9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7 7 5</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>7 9 9</td>
<td>7 7 7</td>
<td>7 7 5</td>
<td>7 5 7</td>
<td>5 7 5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5 7 5</td>
<td>7 5 9</td>
<td>5 9 9</td>
<td>5 9 9</td>
<td>5 9 9</td>
<td>7 9 7</td>
<td>6 7 7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Raw Scores for Group C Subjects on the Seven Core Dimensions and Total, on the Three Occasions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Mach</th>
<th>Genuine-ness 1</th>
<th>Genuine-ness 2</th>
<th>Genuine-ness 3</th>
<th>Concreteness 1</th>
<th>Concreteness 2</th>
<th>Concreteness 3</th>
<th>Self-Expl. 1</th>
<th>Self-Expl. 2</th>
<th>Self-Expl. 3</th>
<th>Empathy 1</th>
<th>Empathy 2</th>
<th>Empathy 3</th>
<th>Respect 1</th>
<th>Respect 2</th>
<th>Respect 3</th>
<th>Confrontation 1</th>
<th>Confrontation 2</th>
<th>Confrontation 3</th>
<th>Immediacy 1</th>
<th>Immediacy 2</th>
<th>Immediacy 3</th>
<th>Total 1</th>
<th>Total 2</th>
<th>Total 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D
Appendix E

Comments by Subjects in Group A Written at the Long-Term Rating Stage

Subject A3
"Minimal value."

Subject A4
"Fifteen months after the completion of the course I don't think I have immediate recall of the details of the sessions. I believe I have positive memories, particular with all the participants during the time. Whilst I have had little or no contact with the others, I am sure there is greater empathy potentially with them than with the fellow participants of other electives. I find it difficult to rationally assess on my growth but would probably conclude that the experience added considerably to my understanding of human relations - relationships. My professional setting is exactly the same this year as it was 3 years ago (same school and similar classes), but with the normal staff changes encountered in a technical school. I enjoyed most sessions, felt pressure in some, but considered them worthwhile."

Subject A5
"The value I can see is in relationships with people I met now. I understand what I am saying as I perceive the 'zones' I am relating on. I also can better
understand how the other person is feeling by the level he/she begins talking on."

Subject A6
"I apologize for handing in the sheet late but I have only just received it. I was absent from school on leave. I cannot write any comments on the Carkhuff scales as I have not yet seen any of the former results."

Subject A7
"I feel experience is a great factor in our lives and that we learn a great deal from it. Having undertaken the "Teacher and Human Relations" subject I feel I have gained a valuable asset. The value of the subject to me personally has enabled me to be more aware of myself and others. Basic things that I might normally overlook are now part of my awareness of myself and others. It's starting to sound clumsy but what I am trying to say is that it has opened my eyes a little more and made more aware. When one starts delving into one's inner feelings and thoughts - which some of Egan's questions make you do, you start to realize things and confront the good and sometimes distasteful things about yourself. I'm not too sure what you mean by part (b) but I will answer this way (if the above hasn't done so). The value to me has been an important one but to minimise its value I feel
I need a refresher or a continuing of what we are doing. It's so easy to slip back to what was "before", therefore a continuance of refresher would be advantageous to me. This could have been done by myself but you know what it's like once you put those books down. I wonder how the same group (1978) would respond to each other now? Interesting?"

Subject A8

"On completion of 1978 I transferred to Kew Cottages and have worked there since. The situation there is difficult and staff constantly question the value of the work they do. Also, it demands patience, efforts and understanding - not just of the children's needs, but also those of the staff. Personally, the Human Relations course has helped me to come to terms with my own feelings, philosophies and aims and this in turn has enabled me to empathise more greatly with my colleagues. I feel I have a greater awareness and understanding of their problems and I'm no longer afraid to face a problem. Many of the staff share their problems with me, both in relation to work and those at home, thus showing me that I have developed in:

1) understanding,
2) listening,
3) getting to the root of the problem, and
4) offering feasible, appropriate advice for its solution.
Prior to the Human Relations Course, I tended to be "the listening ear" to people's problems, but I was never confident, nor strong and secure enough in myself to forget about myself; thus constantly relating the problem only to myself. Whilst this method may, at times be helpful, it is essential to be open to the person and to consider the problem from their viewpoint. The course helped me to realise this."

Subject A9

"The following comments show the value of Human Relations course to me 15 months after its completion.

1) The study has helped me to confront now rather than shy away from people that I found difficult to cope with in the past, in particular with people senior to me or those with different life styles.

2) I am more aware that some people may take advantage of me and so I cope with situations better and before they get out of hand.

3) As a consultant teacher in an S.E.U., I am using the skills developed during the course and can lead interviews with peers, senior staff and parents through the stages studied and thus the interviews are more successful than perhaps they were in the past."
4) I can 'feel' for the other person or persons to a
greater extent now having experienced both sides of
the interview situation when we carried out the audio
visual tapes at College."

Subject B1
"I believe the study in 'Teacher and Human Relations' has
been of value in my professional functioning, in as much
as it has heightened my awareness of the counselling
situation, and knowledge of 'techniques' employed to gain
maximum benefit for both client and helper. However, my
interviews have been less formal, and while some 'skills'
may have emerged during the interaction, I wasn't aware
of really structuring them. I think this would need a
lot of practice - and appropriate opportunities. But I
feel I have a greater understanding of the language used,
and the role played, by people whose function is to be a
'skilled helper'. Greatest gains have been made in the
area of self-exploration - getting closer to my thoughts
and feelings - now I'm working on how to handle them!
(before, when I was ignorant I didn't have to!)."

Subject B3
"The 'Teacher and Human Relations' study was of immense
value to me both professionally and personally.
Within my current professional setting I am continually
in a position of counselling parents and teachers.
I often refer back to Egan and have found that the skills I learnt are not only continually being used but also are developing more. I now find it far easier to relate with other professionals and no longer seem to find situations threatening. On a personal level, I still find it a little difficult to confront people but professionally this is not so - I guess that it is when it affects me personally I still shrink a little, but slowly I have made certain gains and aim to continue to do so. As a result of the course I am hoping to continue in the field of counselling and am in the middle of my second unit at A.N.U. and hoping to transfer to the C.C.A.S. next year to complete a degree in Counselling."

Subject B5

"One has been more aware of one's differing functioning especially in the new situations. One also tends to be more discerning in forming new relationships. Whilst understanding the need to confront on some issues one tends generally to take a more passive or self-directed approach to solving problems. One is more aware also that one is forced to adopt or change one's previously held objectives for a class given the restrictions within the setting."
Subject B6

"Whilst doing Human Relations I must admit to being skeptical to the value of some of its aspects. After a year of being a "classroom consultant" and utilizing all of the covered areas, I frequently think that those skills were helped develop by some of our discussions."

Subject B7

"As a mental exercise it was interesting to re-examine the scale and to the dimensions posed. Although I have not given the exercise much thought since first responding, I would be interested from my own point of view to compare this response with the original and also the comparison of the others involved. The only value that I am aware of is that it has made me re-examine my professional functioning in terms of the dimensions described - which in itself may be worthwhile. As part of my B.Ed. course at LaTrobe I am currently doing a unit called 'Humanistic Education' which is similar in nature to the Human Relations course that you run. I'm sure that the interest created by your course helped me decide to take this elective."

Subject B9

"I feel the value of the study to me personally has been very positive. I have become a much more 'aware' of myself and others, especially the mothers of clients we have at this centre. I did not realize how much damage
could be done with people in a crisis until I spoke to
the mothers of children attending this centre, e.g. G.P.
told mother 'Your child is retarded, why don't you face
the facts'. Most of the parents we see are very distressed
initially, because of the lack of empathy they have received
from previous agencies or persons. Also teachers display
very negative attitudes towards some of the children, by
telling parents 'the truth'. 'Your child is a real problem
and he shows all the signs of autism.' They leave the
parents with that sort of statement and never tell the
parents any positive or good behaviors. Summing up, your
study has been of great value, and has given me confidence
to handle counselling situations in a more effective manner."

Subject C2
"Value of study - 15 months after completion:

1) Firstly, I'd just like to say I see the distinct need
for this type of unit to be included in Teacher Education
courses (and in any related field where individuals
must work co-operatively together.) Doing the course
has reinforced this for me. I see it as a vitally
significant aspect of one's functioning in a work
oriented environment (as indeed elsewhere!) and should
be seen as an integral part of one's overall func-
tioning in that environment."
2) Find I am often looking at your functioning and relating it to aspects of Egan's framework: Example - empathy
(a) am I really 'feeling' what it is like? (b) am I letting this come across to the other person/people? - appropriate self disclosure. I am more aware of this and where this can be of value for mutual understanding of a particular problem/situation.

3) I have come to see more clearly (through the course and related readings) the distinction between acting on the understanding and merely understanding and for me this tenet is a very important one, as I know I can and have tended to put off acting after I feel I have understood the implicit demands of the situation.

4) I have kept up my readings and often pick up Egan's book to read - when something has jogged my mind - or just for a 'read' at night with the milo.

5) When I am working (with children, associates, multi-disciplinary staff, etc. thoughts re the study often creep up - and am very aware of this. Have several times got out exercises in book and looked at my response, etc. - then and now.

6) I hadn't looked at the 'write-up' of the interview we undertook in the course, until I received your letter, but did so after and still remember it as being worthwhile and a follow-up would have been interesting.
If you need any more information, etc. please let me know; I am most interested to receive results of the study."

Subject C3
"In retrospect I would have to say that the study was very valuable, both professionally and personally. I could summarize in areas:

1) The study helped me to recognize and analyze, for mutual advantage, mine and other people's feelings in professional exchanges during 1979 where my position as Vice-Principal in 'Pressure Situations' was to be one of support and guidance.

2) Has made me more aware of my personal limitations and abilities and, therefore, able to perhaps improve the former and also be happy with 'what I am'.

3) Introduced me to a form of 'group dynamics', the features of which are often found in the classroom, the staff room, circle of friends, etc."

Subject C4
"Comments on the value of study 15 months after its completion are that previously held opinions have been strengthened and in some instances, opinions have been challenged. Practising various techniques mentioned in 'Teacher and Human Relations' can manifest themselves
in teacher/pupil and/or other human relationships, very often, that one feels some caution is required in communicating - perhaps this is growth?"

**Subject C5**

"Because I have not referred back to the notes of this subject, I feel I have lost touch with the philosophy. I attend Alanon meetings which keep these qualities in mind and Effective Training (Dr. Theo Gordon) experiences also encourage development of these skills. One main difference I noted and one that I haven't developed is the technique of going further than listening empathy - towards problem solving when others have the problems. I tend to listen in such a way that they can hear their problem well enough to begin to solve their own problems. I "problem-solve" when I have the problem."

**Subject C7**

"Please find enclosed the scale that you wished me to complete. Thank you for your interest in following up the original ratings, I'm sure that the results will be both interesting and enlightening. No doubt whilst in America you must have seen many new and interesting innovations both in the mainstream and in Special Education. Both myself and Barry Schmidt would be most interested to
meet with you if possible to discuss some of those experiences and to relate to you some of our own since completing the course. Once again, thank you for your interest in following up the work from 1978."
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