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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Man's search for self-identity and meaning in his life has been a predominant theme in art, science, literature, philosophy, and theology since recorded time (Buber, 1937; Kurth, 1970; Shakespeare, 1909; van der Poel, 1972). In the process of this search, man has discovered that he is, basically, a relational being, and his quest for meaning has led him to the doorstep of his fellow man. In recent decades, research has convincingly demonstrated that the human person has a fundamental need for entering into deep and significant relationships with others (Mowrer, 1968; Rogers, 1970). Denzin (1970, p.70) refers to such relationships as "relationships of substance which one enters with confidence, feelings of safety, sincerity, and at times intimacy". Sullivan (1953, p.18), who made the study of human relations one of his earliest concerns, suggested that psychiatry be defined as the study of interpersonal relationships since "it is through interpersonal situations that an individual manifests mental health or mental illness".

While the subject of interpersonal relationships has been treated extensively in the literature of the past, only in recent years has a concentrated attempt been made to identify and operationalize the components of the human relationship at its deepest levels, and to develop programs
aimed at improving the interpersonal skills of people in interaction with one another (Golembiewski, 1970; Carkhuff, 1969, c). Since effective relationships are one of man's greatest needs, it seems appropriate that attention be given to the full development of man's relationship potential at all stages of his growth and development, but especially during his formative years.

One of the most difficult periods of this development appears today to occur during the years of adolescence and early adulthood. Teenagers find it frightening to enter fully into a world that Slater (1970) describes as lonely and empty and that Alinsky (1969) reports to be in the state of leaderless chaos. In an effort to ease the fear and insecurity that accompanies the transition to adulthood, many young people have turned to drugs, instant intimacy and societal withdrawal (Carey, 1968). Failing ultimately to find meaning here, they become more discouraged and alienated than ever (Morris, 1971; Tillich, 1952).

It is not surprising, then, that many young people in search of themselves have begun to turn toward others in an effort to find meaning in relationships (Zunin, 1972) rather than in exterior forms of escape. The human relations movement that has been popular in business and organizations (Carkhuff, 1969) has now very much touched our college campuses and in some places has become an integral part of the college environment (Gazda, 1973). Although human relations
training programs have been conducted in a variety of settings and have been adapted to meet the unique needs of many different groups and organizations (Golembiewski, 1970), no study employing human-relations training in combination with encounter group process in a college environment was found in the literature. Human relations literature shows that systematic training in interpersonal skills does effect positive gain in subject's ability to interact in more personally satisfying and meaningful ways (Carkhuff, 1971). Other literature has shown that unstructured encounter group processes have something to offer in terms of interpersonal growth (Egan, 1973). Because of the need today to help college youth develop interpersonally as well as academically, it would seem that methods to facilitate interpersonal growth be an integral part of the college curriculum. In this manner, many young people in college can be given tools that will help them enter more fully into the kinds of personally healthy relationships that will sustain them in life.

The present study attempts to develop, conduct and evaluate a combination human relations training program on a college campus that emphasizes both systematic skills, training and encounter group process. Previous studies which have demonstrated the basic effectiveness of systematic training have suggested that future studies of the method might experiment with expansions or variations of the core theory of systematic training (Ferder, 1973). One of
the suggested variations in the study cited was "adaptation of the method for use in general college curriculums..." (Ferder, 1973, p. 52). This study will attempt the suggested adaptation.

More specifically, the present study will examine the effectiveness of a human relations training course which will utilize both systematic skills training and encounter group process to elicit improvement in measurable communication skills.
A close look at the content of current research in human relations training reveals a vast array of books and articles dealing with human interaction (Anderson, Hummel & Gibson, 1970; Buchanan, 1969; Burke & Bennis, 1961; Carkhuff, 1971; Davies, 1971; Fink, Beak & Taddeo, 1971; Golembiewski & Corrigan, 1970; Ivey, 1971; Knapp, 1972; Meadow & Tillem, 1963; Mehrabian, 1971; Rakstis, 1970; Sebring, 1971; Sikes, 1971; Stearns, 1971; Sutfin, 1971; Watson & Tharp, 1973). While human relations training has a mixed and complex ancestry, two distinct directions emerge from its' background. These two directions might be classified broadly as unsystematic vs. systematic training approaches (Carkhuff, 1969; Egan, 1970). The first approach has its focus on group process and attempts to develop relationship skills in the individual through the medium of spontaneous small group interaction. This type of interaction is classified by a number of different titles and variations including T-group; encounter workshop; sensitivity training; organizational development program or marathon session; but all of these classifications refer to the similar process of developing the individual's communication skill through some form of group interaction (Bennis, 1966; Fordyce & Weil, 1971; Golembiewski & Blumberg, 1970). Such experiences are described as unsystematic in the sense
that they lack a well defined training structure and they focus more on spontaneous experience in relationships than on programmed instruction and practice in relationship skills (Golembiewski, 1970). While unsystematic training does at times provide clearly defined and operationalized goals for a particular experience (Egan, 1970), traditionally, it has often failed to follow through with providing clearly defined and operationalized means for achieving these goals. In the typical group experience, members assemble for some purpose which may be defined as learning to express feelings more appropriately, and they then begin to interact with each other, letting the topic under discussion flow spontaneously from members of the group. Toward the end of the session, members may or may not evaluate the group process that has developed (Golembiewski, 1970; Lakin, 1972). In some groups, various exercises or games may be employed to facilitate interaction (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1969; 1972).

This general form of human relations training has been criticized because it lacks a base of didactic instruction or programmed practice that would ensure members' progress in attaining those skills which enhance social interaction (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). Rather, group members often appear to be turned loose to search for deeper understanding of themselves and others in a hit or miss fashion. Those individuals who are best equipped to start with in the area of interpersonal skills may be able to integrate the experi-
ences they have in an unstructured group and grow as a result, while those who are least equipped interpersonally may be much less able to utilize the experience and may, in fact, deteriorate (Carkhuff, 1971). The same may be said for any laboratory method which fails to spell out the goals of the training or to make the steps toward attaining the goals concrete.

In spite of inherent weaknesses in the unsystematic training approach, there is research demonstrating many positive outcomes that do in fact result in spontaneous small group experiences (Egan, 1973). Members can learn how their behavior affects others; how others affect them; how to try out new behaviors; how to trust more deeply; and how to experience deep psychological involvement often for the first time (Golembiewski, 1970). It does appear then, that some interpersonal gain occurs in unsystematic interaction programs provided the individual is able to utilize the experience and integrate it into his own personality style.

The second, or systematic approach to human relations training is most identified with the work of psychologist Robert R. Carkhuff and his associates (Carkhuff, 1971; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). This approach is distinct because it focuses on systematic didactic and experiential training in the core dimensions of facilitative interpersonal processes (Carkhuff, 1969, b; 1969, c). In other words, systematic training has clearly
defined and operationalized goals, and clearly defined and operationalized means to achieve these goals. The following quotation provides a concise rationale for Carkhuff's strenuous belief in interpersonal skills training that has a systematic base:

We train people in every other aspect of life except how to live with themselves and each other. We teach them how to employ proper grammar and we tutor them on how to dance; indeed, the more affluent, the greater the likelihood of tutoring in every necessary or desirable skill. Yet we do not explore the human and his relations with his fellow humans. We do not train the individual to understand his own behavior and the behavior of others (Carkhuff, 1971, p. 199-200).

Those who use the systematic human relations training approach recognize that all human interaction may have "constructive or retarding or even deteriorative consequences" (Carkhuff, 1971, p. 65). For this reason, it is more desirable to teach people the constructive dimensions of human interaction rather than merely expose them, through uncontrolled laboratory experiences, to the kind of interaction that could go either way with regard to consequences. "In systematic human relations training a trainee is taken, one step at a time, from the simplest form of responsiveness to the most complex communications involving both responsive and initiative behavior" (Carkhuff, 1971, p. 65). In other words, the trainee is given supervised practice in the kind of behavior that is effective in relationships, and at the end of training he has learned
usable skills which are retained after training (Berenson, Carkhuff & Myrus, 1966). Since people generally learn what they are trained to learn (Carkhuff, Piaget, & Pierce, 1967) this approach has been highly effective in training people to interact in ways that have constructive consequences. "There is extensive research to indicate the success of systematic training in the core interpersonal conditions" (Carkhuff, Friel, & Kratochnil, 1969).

A closer look at the systematic approach to training

Because the systematic approach to human relations training is new (Carkhuff, 1969), and because its systematic nature provides a theoretical and experiential core which describes it (Carkhuff, 1971), a more thorough analysis of its basic premise seems warranted here.

Basically, Carkhuff (1969, c) believes that "all effective interpersonal processes share a common core of conditions conducive to facilitative human experiences" (Carkhuff, 1969, c, p.7). These core conditions have been identified (Carkhuff, 1967) as empathy or understanding (E), respect or caring (R), concreteness or being specific (C), genuineness or being real (G), confrontation or telling it like it is (CF), and immediacy or saying what is going on between us (I). Rogers, (1962), who placed special emphasis on empathy and genuineness in interpersonal processes, identifies these conditions as the major qualities associated with human growth and change. Although he was primarily concerned with the
psychotherapeutic relationships (Rogers, 1962) he agrees with Carkhuff's (1969, c) basic assumption that the same dimensions that are effective in the helping process are effective in all other instances of human relations. Thus, any systematic attempt to develop sensitivity and skill in communication will focus on the basic core dimensions of empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, confrontation, and immediacy, regardless of the level or status of the trainee. The communication of these dimensions will lead toward the development of action programs for the second person in the relationship (helpee).

The core dimensions are called the responsive and initiative dimensions of the relationship process (Carkhuff, 1972). The responsive dimensions (empathy, respect, concreteness and genuineness) are those which enable the client, or second person, to feel that the counselor or the first person is really with him and for him. They are the basic ingredients of all constructive relationships and no human growth or self exploration can take place without them (Muehlberg, Drasgow & Pierce, 1969). Concreteness and genuineness are seen more as swing dimensions in the sense that they should permeate the entire communication. The initiative dimensions (confrontation and immediacy), when used with high levels of the responsive dimensions, encourage the client or second person to explore himself at deeper levels (Carkhuff, 1972). When the first person in a relationship confronts
the second person with discrepancies in his behavior, he compels the second person to search for more consistent ways of behaving (Carkhuff, 1972). In like fashion, when the first person openly shares his feelings about what is going on here and now in the relationship, the second person gradually learns to share and disclose himself in a similar manner. He thus learns to communicate the same core conditions that the first person is modeling and he is provided with an opportunity to practice communicating at higher levels in a safe and supportive environment (Carkhuff, 1972). While Carkhuff (1971) describes the core conditions in the manner outlined above, he also makes it clear that the conditions do overlap in the relationship process. For example, high levels of empathetic understanding are really initiating in the sense that the second person can be compelled to act when he feels fully understood. In addition, high levels of accurate empathy and genuineness can be viewed as confrontation because they involve "telling it like it is" and "being real" with another. Often, "telling it like it is" becomes supportive confrontation.

There is extensive research to support the position that the client's or the second person's level of self-exploration and subsequent growth is a function of the levels of empathy, respect, genuineness, concreteness, confrontation and immediacy offered by the counselor or first person throughout the relationship (Cannon & Pierce,
1968; Carkhuff, 1972). Counselors who offer high levels of these core conditions have significantly higher success rates in therapy than do low level counselors (Carkhuff, 1969, b; & Vitalo, 1970). High level counselors or communicators are those who consistently offer high levels of the core conditions (Berenson, Mitchell, & Laney, 1968; Collingwood, Renz, & Carkhuff, 1969). Low level counselors or poor communicators are those who consistently offer low levels of the conditions or who are inconsistent in the level of conditions offered, depending on the circumstances (Friel, Kratochvil, & Carkhuff, 1968). Holder (1968) investigated other differences between high and low functioning communicators and found that high functioning communicators spend significantly more time on topics during discussions and cover fewer topics than do those who function at low levels. It appears that high level individuals become more invested in the communication process and approach deeper levels of interaction than do low level individuals.

Carkhuff (1971) has identified five levels of each of the six core conditions and has operationalized each level to permit step by step training and measurement. Appendix A shows the operational definitions and method of measuring each of these levels.

All effective human communication requires that the persons involved be able to both discriminate and communicate the core conditions (Carkhuff, 1971). Foulds (1969) found,
however, that the two do not necessarily go together. There are many individuals who can discriminate or identify the presence or absence of the core conditions in an interpersonal process but who cannot communicate the conditions themselves. They cannot translate insight into action. On the other hand, studies have shown that those individuals who communicate at high levels also discriminate at high levels (Carkhuff, Collingwood & Renz, 1969). In summary, the ability to discriminate does not necessarily imply the ability to communicate; while the ability to communicate does imply the ability to discriminate. According to Carkhuff (1969,c) good communicators are good discriminators but good discriminators are not necessarily good communicators. Most people can be trained systematically to both communicate and discriminate more effectively (Carkhuff & Berenson, 1968; Carkhuff, 1969), but the training must cover both the areas of discrimination and communication if changes in both areas are desired. Training in discrimination only improves the ability to discriminate. Training in communication is needed to effect improvement in communication (Carkhuff, Kratochvil & Friel, 1968).

Because research shows that programs, regardless of their specific nature, are only as effective as the people who are running them, it is imperative that the most effective people be selected and trained to fill the top positions in all programs which affect the lives of others (Carkhuff, 1971).
For educational, counseling, and other personal development programs, the people running them necessarily become intimately involved in that aspect of human life which is most delicate and most personal - the psycho-spiritual life of man. In this area, therefore, only the person who is himself engaged in a growth process can be the most effective model and agent for another person's growth (Pagell, Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967).

Carkhuff (1971) has repeatedly found that the best index of a person's future level of functioning in a helping role is an index of his present functioning in that role. In present systematic human relations training programs, prospective helpers are cast in a helping role and their functioning in that role is assessed by means of extensively validated communication and discrimination indices (Carkhuff, 1968). The predictive validity of the indices is largely a function of the level of functioning of the raters who employ them, with high level raters typically demonstrating inter-rater reliabilities around or above .85 (Cannon & Carkhuff, 1969). Appendix B shows the communication and discrimination indices that are used to assess levels of functioning in the core conditions, and the scales that are used in scoring the indices.

Substantial research has shown that an individual responds to the index items with the same communication style which he demonstrates in observable behavior (Carkhuff, 1968;
Martin & Carkhuff, 1968). Because direct observational measures, such as tape recorded responses, consistently show high agreement with performance on the indices, Carkhuff (1968; 1971) reports that the communication and discrimination indices validly measure communication and discrimination levels and thus make the use of additional measures or direct observation of performance unnecessary. In other words, the written indices predict, with .85 validity, the level at which an individual will respond in a face to face interaction with another (Carkhuff, 1971). For this reason, the indices alone were chosen as instruments for the present study.

Both the communication and discrimination indices use a 5 point scale to designate the various levels of functioning. When those prospective helpers who are functioning at the highest levels are selected for systematic training in the core conditions, they learn to function from .5 to 2.5 levels higher in the conditions after training (Carkhuff & Griffin, 1971). Training is typically conducted by doctoral level trainers who demonstrate minimally facilitative levels of functioning on the communication and discrimination indices (Carkhuff, Friel, & Kratochvil, 1969). The training program follows the format outlined by Carkhuff (1971), although it is adapted to "approximate as closely as possible the real life conditions for which we are attempting to prepare our candidate" (Carkhuff, 1971, p. 204). Usually the training
period requires about 100 hours of didactic instruction and practice in order to bring both lay personnel and graduate students to levels of interpersonal functioning that is commensurate to those experienced professionals who function at high levels (Berenson & Carkhuff, 1966). However, trainees can learn to improve their communication and discrimination in relatively brief periods of time by practice in writing responses and getting feedback on ratings (Berenson, Carkhuff, Friel & Leitner, 1968).

Carkhuff (1969, c) found no significant differences in ratings on communication and discrimination indices when the client stimuli were presented to the trainees on tape or on written sheets. Since taped or written presentations yield the same scores, it is permissible for the researcher to use whatever method of pretest, posttest presentation that best suits his purposes. However, in order to make the training experience as close to real life conditions as possible, taped stimuli, role playing, and actual contact with a helpee in a helping situation are part of the standard systematic human relations training program.

A full length training program is best carried out in small groups, usually from 6-12 participants, to facilitate supervision and allow the members of the training group facilitative contact with one another (Kratochvil, 1968). Either a control group or a training control group (group which meets for the same period of time for some type of
laboratory experience without systematic training) are used in systematic training research (Martin & Carkhuff, 1968). In some cases both control and training control groups are used to give a more accurate picture of systematic training effects (Carkhuff, 1969, c). Since group composition affects training outcome (Harrison, 1965) and since human relations training selection procedures cannot use enforced random assignment to training (Clark, 1962), giving different training to groups which have comparable communication and discrimination levels at the start of training is one way of handling the randomization problem (Harrison, 1971).

Training non-professionals to help others is not a new practice. Non-professional auxiliary counselors were trained and have functioned successfully as regular staff members of an Australian Counseling Service for several years (Harvey, 1964). Almost twenty years ago, Taft (1955) studied the diagnostic abilities of both lay people and professional counselors and found that lay people could be trained in a very short period of time to make diagnostic judgments about others as accurately as professionals. Housewives have become very stable and productive mental health counselors after brief training in listening skills (Magoon & Golann, 1966). Aspy (1969) trained teachers to offer high levels of empathy, positive regard and congruence and found that these teacher offered conditions were positively related to cognitive growth of students. Stoffer's (1970) research supports
this finding. Other researchers have systematically trained psychiatric patients (Pierce & Drasgow, 1969); nurses in training (Kratochvil, 1969); prison guards (Megathlin & Porter, 1969); pupils and teachers in interracial riot ridden schools (Carkhuff, 1971; Carkhuff & Banks, 1970); and many other lay groups and have consistently demonstrated improved levels of inter-personal functioning and subsequent alleviation of the problems involved (Carkhuff, 1971). With systemic training, "both professional and non-professional persons can be brought to function at high levels of core conditions that effect positive gains in others" (Carkhuff, 1969, c, p.13).

The research on the Carkhuff method of systematic human relations training is now voluminous and has demonstrated high success rates with a wide variety of lay and professional groups (Carkhuff, 1971). The method not only provides an easily duplicated systematic model for the training program, but also boasts of reliable and valid scales for operationally measuring levels of communication and discrimination of the core conditions of facilitative interpersonal processes.

New developments in human relations training

While it has been reported previously that two distinct directions originally emerged in the whole area of human relations training, it appears today that the once separate directions are beginning to fuse. Researchers are realizing that both step by step skills training, and spontaneous
small group interaction make valuable contributions toward total interpersonal growth, and can be combined to provide more effective training (Egan, 1974; Gazda, 1973). Individuals can be given basic skills training according to the systematic method, and can gain proficiency in using these skills through the medium of small group interaction (Brammer, 1973; Dyer, 1972; Lakin, 1972). Such a combined approach emphasizes the importance of both individual skill and interpersonal sharing and risk taking.

Call for human relations training in our institutions

It is apparent that a new awareness of the necessity of good interpersonal relations in organizations (Bennis, 1966) has stimulated the growth of ongoing development programs in nearly all major organizations around the globe (Fordyce & Weil, 1971). In the words of McCall (1970, p. 25) "...patterns of interaction (among group members) represent the functioning or dysfunctioning of the organization with respect to its own goals, norms, and so on". Smelser & Smelser (1963) also stress the importance of group climate in an organization and note that the development of the personality in any group or organization cannot be left to natural maturation or chance factors. Skilled people who can change social systems to improve the conditions for psychological effectiveness are called for (Reiff, 1966), but before effective procedures for ongoing group development can be planned, it is necessary to first understand what is
going on within the persons in the institution (Smelser, 1963).

The notion that personal development should find its source from within the group or organization dates far back into human history. Mowrer (1968) notes that the members of the earliest Christian communities never took problems outside their intimate circle, but rather provided whatever support, healing, forgiveness or correction that the persons in their own communities needed. This method of corporate problem solving not only healed individuals, but it helped to knit the group together (Mowrer, 1968). Many other groups in earlier times, such as small villages, schools, clubs, and families found so much friendship and availability of others among their own associates that the need to call in outsiders to handle problems of personal development simply did not exist (Schofield, 1963). In our own times, training and development programs in organizations have tended to become separated from the control of the members with the result that certain blocks to effective community spirit have developed. Hobby (1972) states that the following blocks cause the community to become artificial:

1. Lack of the member's commitment to eliminate unhealthy conditions which are uncovered within the community.

2. Dealing with problems only superficially or sporadically.
3. Develop critical attitudes toward authorities in the community for existing problems.

4. Growing relinquishment of responsibility for initiating actions aimed at improving or maintaining the healthy conditions.

(Chapell, 1972, p. 21)

Chapell (1972) encourages organizations of all varieties to regain direct involvement in their development and renewal programs and he reinforces the idea that these programs should never become separated from the community, but should be an ongoing and integral part of the members responsibilities. He adds that the individual within the community who directs development programs should be personally and professionally qualified and should have "... surrounded himself with formalized plans, procedures, and programs, all of which should be approved by people in authority and communicated to those who must support him" (Chappell, 1972, p. 21). Shaw's (1971) research on groups supports the idea that group members are most committed to a project or program when they are directly involved in it, and other contemporary authors have emphasized the necessity of self-responsibility and personal sense of agency in dealing with problems of personal and group development (Fink, 1969; Glasser, 1965).

The Problem Defined

Major organizations around the world have recognized the growing importance of effective interpersonal relation-
ships for carrying out their goals and purposes and they have developed unique human relations training programs to improve the relationship skills of their members (Bennis, 1966).

Educational systems have perhaps an even greater need for effective interpersonal relationships among their members because they have made it a specific goal to direct their energies toward the growth and development of the young. A very important phase of this development lies in the area of interpersonal skill. Young people need opportunities to develop their relationship potential as well as their academic potential, and if our educational system is to stress total personal growth, then direct attention must be given to human relations training as an integral part of the college curriculum.

**Purpose of the study**

The present study attempts to integrate those principles of human relations training which research has shown to be effective (Carkhuff, 1971; Egan, 1973), and to present them within the context of a regular college course, thus developing, conducting and evaluating a creative human relations training program in a college community. The author also proposes, through this study, to introduce the concept of human relations training to faculty members of the college and present it as having potential for further interpersonal growth on campus through ongoing faculty training sessions,
student workshops, and continued coursework. While this latter purpose does not lend itself easily to statistical measurement, an evaluation of faculty response to the study will be presented in the discussion session, as will plans for continued work at the college should they emerge.

Specific hypotheses

1. A sufficient number of college students (at least 16) will volunteer to take a human relations training course, presented as part of the college curriculum, to justify offering the course and conducting the proposed study.

2. Participants in the integrated systematic human relations training program will show significant positive gains in discriminating and communicating the responsive and initiative core dimensions of facilitative interpersonal processes as measured by Carkhuff's (1969, b) Communication and Discrimination Indices.

3. Participants in the integrated program will show significantly greater gains on the indices than the control group.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 62 male and female junior and senior college students enrolled in a small midwestern Christian liberal arts college. The students were from varying majors and none had received any previous formal training in human relations skills. They ranged in age from 19 to 21 years.

The subjects were selected for participation in the study on the basis of their membership in one of two naturally assembled collectives. These collectives were two undergraduate courses in psychology, both of which were offered to all juniors and seniors in the college as psychology electives. The experimental course was entitled Psychology of Human Relations and was described in the college course manual as a course designed to study and explore the skills needed in effective human relationships. A course entitled Psychology of Human Personality was designated as the course to be used for the control group. It was described in the college course manual as a course designed to study the various theories of human personality. The personality course was selected for the control group because its' title and basic focus was similar to that of the experimental course in that both dealt with some aspect of human behavior. In addition, the course was offered as an elective to the same age group of students used in the
experimental course.

The experimental group was composed of 20 female and 11 male students. In this group, 3 students were 19 years of age, 12 were 20 years of age, and 16 were 21 years of age at the time the study began. The control group was composed of 22 female and 9 male students. In this group, 7 were 19 years of age, 8 were 20 years of age, and 16 were 21 years of age when the study began.

**Instruments**

The only measuring instruments used for the study were Carkhuff's (1969, b) extensively validated 16 item communication and 16 item discrimination indices as shown in Appendix B. These indices were used as pretest and posttest instruments for all subjects in the study.

**Materials**

The main course materials used for the experimental group were sixteen 60 minute human relations training lectures taken primarily from Carkhuff's texts (1969, a; 1969 b; 1971); six sets of 10 taped counselee expressions; six sets of 10 taped counselee-counselor response expressions; sixteen small group exercises; and two student text books (Carkhuff, 1972 and Egan, 1973). The titles of the lectures and of the small group exercises are shown in Appendix C.

Audiovisual materials, consisting of transparencies bearing highlight summaries of the lecture material, were made by the experimenter and flashed on an overhead
projector at appropriate times during the experimental lectures.

All of the described materials were used only for subjects in the experimental group. Materials were presented in the context of a classroom situation over a period of time covering one semester. The human relations training lectures and the taped counselee and counselee-counselor response sets were standard materials used in the human relations training sessions described by Carkhuff (1969, b; 1969, c). The text books and the small group exercises were selected by the author in an effort to achieve greater creativity in the training method and make it more appealing to the college population in which the experiment was conducted.

Procedure and data collection

Subjects in both the experimental and control groups were administered the pretest discrimination and communication indices during the first class period of their respective courses. Both groups were told verbally by the instructor that the college was doing some research over the semester aimed at studying the various response styles of students, and that their participation in this study would be appreciated. Students were promised and subsequently given feedback on both the study and their performance in it, and were told that participation would require two hours of their time now, and two hours at the conclusion of the
semester. All students approached agreed to participate. This involved 31 students in the experimental group, and 37 students in the control group at the start of the semester. At the conclusion of the semester no students had dropped the experimental course, while four students had dropped the control group course. One additional student in the control group failed to complete the posttest so was dropped from the study. This left 31 students in each group at the conclusion of the study. Students in both groups believed they were simply taking a psychology elective and did not know that they belonged either to an experimental or control group.

After all subjects had taken the pretest, subjects in the control group studied the regular content of a course in personality theory. Class time was spent in both lecture and group discussion. Subjects did not participate in any small group exercises or any interaction aimed at improving their interpersonal skills. Class time totaled 45 hours spread out over a 16 week period, with the students meeting for the class 3 hours each week.

Subjects in the experimental course spent the same amount of class time in didactic and experiential human relations training. The course was conducted by the experimenter 3 hours each week over a sixteen week period. The first hour of class consisted of didactic instruction in specific human relations topics. During this time, audio-
visual materials were used. The group then spent the second hour of class practicing specific human relations skills in a structured manner. The third hour of class was spent in using the specific skill in actual interpersonal interaction. Small group structured exercises were used for this phase of training. Students were given weekly homework assignments which consisted of reading textbook material; keeping a "feeling" journal; and practicing specific human relations skills in their interactions with others throughout the week. Subjects thus received step by step practice in communicating and discriminating the core conditions of facilitative interpersonal processes (Carkhuff, 1969, b).

At the close of the regular school semester sixteen weeks later, all subjects were retested with the same 16 item communication and 16 item discrimination indices. This was done during the last class period of the course. Prior to taking this posttest, none of the subjects knew that they would be asked to rewrite the test they had taken at the start of the semester as a pretest.

Scoring

Both pretest and posttest discrimination indices were scored according to a standardized answer sheet (Carkhuff, 1969, vol. I). Numerical discrimination scores for each subject were obtained by calculating their deviation from the validated ratings of experts. A pretest and posttest discrimination score was thus assigned to each of the
62 subjects.

Both pretest and posttest communication indices for the two groups were assigned random code numbers and given to two Carkhuff trained counselors for rating. The two raters, both of whom were educated at the bachelors level, worked separately and did not contact each other during the rating period. They did not know which research group the tests came from nor did they know whether the tests they were rating belonged to the pretest or posttest group. Both raters were simply asked by the experimenter to carefully read the subject responses on all the communication pretest and posttest indices and rate them according to the method shown in Appendix B.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Inter-rater reliability for communication index

Mean scores for the two ratings of the communication index is shown in Table I. The inter-rater reliability computed with a Pearson -r program (Hays, 1963), was demonstrated to be .92. An inter-rater reliability of .92 is considered a good agreement between raters according to Carkhuff's (1969, c) research. Carkhuff raters usually obtain an inter-rater reliability at or above .85 (Cannon & Carkhuff, 1969).

In order to obtain a single pretest and a single posttest communication score for each subject, the two ratings on each separate test were averaged and the mean was designated as the score (McNemar, 1949). The final communication means appear in the t-test tables that follow.

Analysis of pretest data

In order to determine whether or not the groups differed significantly at the start of the experiment, t-tests of mean differences between the experimental and control groups on the variables under study were run. Results of the t-test between the experimental and control groups on the communication pretest are presented in Table 2. It was demonstrated that the subjects in the control group had a significantly higher communication mean than subjects in the experimental group. While subjects in both groups were functioning below
TABLE I

INTER-RATER COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS FOR PRETEST AND POSTTEST COMMUNICATION INDICES (N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td>Rater 11</td>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td>Rater 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>t Score</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Comparison (df=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the level of communication considered to be minimally facilitative, subjects in the control group did start out one half level higher in communication ability than subjects in the experimental group. On the discrimination variable, however, there was no significant difference in performance between groups at the start of the experiment. Subjects were functioning at about the same discrimination ability on the pretest. The t-test results of the pretest discrimination data are presented in Table 3.

**Analysis of pretest-posttest data within groups**

In order to evaluate the amount of change occurring within the two groups between the pretest and posttest periods, the communication and discrimination scores of subjects in the groups were compared, again by means of a t-test. In the control group, a t-test of mean differences between the pretest and posttest communication data showed that no significant change occurred between testings. While subjects in this group started out at a significantly higher level in communication ability than subjects in the experimental group, their superior communication ability was not developed and therefore did not improve. This data is shown in Table 4. On the discrimination variable, a similar picture is observed in the control group. No significant change was demonstrated when pretest and posttest scores for this group were subjected to the t-test. The t-test results for the pretest-posttest discrimination data in the control group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t Score</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Comparison (df=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8513</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>t Score</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (N=31)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest (N=31)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Comparison (df=58)</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

**t-Test of Mean Differences Between the Pretest and Posttest Discrimination Scores in the Control Group (N=62)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-Score</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (N=31)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest (N=31)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Comparison (df=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5399</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are presented in Table 5 and are shown to be not significant. Subjects in the control group did not change their discrimination levels between testings.

When t-tests were run on the pretest-posttest communication and discrimination scores for subjects in the experimental group, a significant change was observed for both variables under study. The t-test of mean difference probability between the pretest and posttest communication scores in the experimental group was significant at the .001 level indicating a significant improvement on the posttest. Table 6 shows these results. A significant change was also observed for the discrimination variable between pretest and posttest in this group. A significance level of .01 was reached as shown in Table 7. The discrimination and communication data thus shows that subjects in the experimental group obtained a significant improvement in their ability to both discriminate and communicate the core facilitative conditions between the pretest and posttest periods.

Analysis of pretest-posttest data between groups

Finally, t-tests were run in order to compare the difference between groups on the posttest. Table 8 shows the test of mean difference for the posttest communication data. The experimental group differed significantly from the control group in the direction of improvement. While the control group started out with greater communication ability, no gain was shown in communication ability for this group. On the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-Score</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (N=31)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest (N=31)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Comparison (df=58)</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>t Score</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (N=31)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest (N=31)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Comparison (df=58)</td>
<td>6.279</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

**t-TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON THE COMMUNICATION POSTTEST (N=62)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t Score</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Comparison (df=58)</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other hand, subjects in the experimental group gained significantly after training, and showed posttest communication scores that were significantly higher than the posttest communication score of subjects in the control group. All subjects in the experimental group reached a level of communication considered to be minimally facilitative in interpersonal interaction. As Table 8 shows, a significance probability level of .01 was reached when subjects in the experimental and control groups were compared for overall gain in communication ability. In order to evaluate the discrimination data between these two groups on the posttest, a final t-test was run. Again, results showed that subjects in the experimental group had a greater gain over subjects in the control group in discrimination ability. The difference was statistically significant at the .01 level as shown in Table 9.

Summary of results

T-tests performed on the communication and discrimination pretest and posttest scores for subjects in the study showed that a significant improvement in ability to both communicate and discriminate the core conditions occurred in the experimental subjects as a result of their participation in the experimental treatment. Improvements in the communication and discrimination variables were not observed in the control group. Thus, the hypotheses for the study were confirmed as follows:
### TABLE 9

**t-TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON THE DISCRIMINATION POSTTEST (N=62)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t Score</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Comparison (df=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.146</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(I) Participants in a systematic human relations training course showed a significant increase in their ability to both communicate (.001) and discriminate (.01) the core facilitative dimensions of interpersonal processes.

(2) Participants in the experimental group changed significantly more in their ability to both communicate (.01) and discriminate (.01) these conditions than did subjects in the control group.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The overall results of this study lend support to the hypothesis that a combined program of systematic basic skills training and encounter group process does effect positive gain in subjects' ability to interact in more facilitative ways. Mean communication scores in Table 2 show that subjects in both groups were functioning below minimally facilitative levels in communication ability prior to training. Even though the means for the two groups differ significantly before training, indicating that the two groups were drawn from different populations with respect to the communication variable under study, the actual communication level for both groups falls below that level considered effective in interpersonal interaction. While the control group did communicate significantly better than the experimental group prior to training, members of the control group still are not able to communicate well enough to be considered minimally effective communicators. In this sense, both groups initially fell in the same population of people - namely, those who communicate below minimally facilitative levels. In addition, a close examination of the raw data for communication scores reveals three subjects in the control group who obtained very high scores on the pretest. In contrast, no subjects in the experimental group obtained such high scores. This suggests that the high scores of a
few subjects in the control group raised the overall mean for the group significantly. This was likely made possible because of the small size of the sample. When a t-test was run, omitting the three high subjects from the control group, the two groups did not differ significantly on the communication pretest.

Behaviorally, subjects in the two groups at the start of the study would be likely to give advice to those who came to them for help and would often fail to communicate real understanding and responsiveness to those with whom they interacted.

Posttest means in Table 8 show that this communication pattern does not change for the control group, while the posttest mean for the experimental group increases more than one full level. Behaviorally, this means that the control group subjects maintained the same non-facilitative communication style, while the experimental subjects learned to communicate the core conditions at minimally facilitative levels. They would, at this new level, be less likely to offer advice or to miss the feeling cues given by others. Rather, they would be more likely to respond accurately to the surface feelings of others in their interactions with them, and to offer a level of understanding that would encourage further depth sharing. The fact that subjects in the control group did not improve their communication style even though they appeared to have a better facility in this
area at the start of the study than the experimental subjects, supports the basic Carkhuff premise that people do not improve their communication ability apart from specific training in communication skills. Mere ability does not ensure growth in the art of communication.

The discrimination index detects the accuracy with which subjects can identify the various levels of the core conditions being offered in sample statements. Discrimination scores show how much the ratings of the subject differ from the ratings of trained experts. For the present study, pretest discrimination means for the two groups in Table 3 show that there was no significant difference in discrimination ability between the groups. Subjects in both groups fall within the same discrimination cluster (Carkhuff, 1969, b). According to Carkhuff research, this means that subjects in both groups had mean discrimination scores that clustered between the mean discrimination scores of undergraduate students and untrained lay personnel in counseling (1969,b). Thus, they scored at the level of discrimination typically found in persons of their status and training. Posttest discrimination means in Table 9 show that subjects in the control group did not change their discrimination level, but rather remained in the same cluster characteristic of those without training. Subjects in the experimental group, on the other hand, changed clusters in the direction of expected improvement. Following training, subjects in this
group discriminated as well as beginning psychology graduate students and experienced counselors (Carkhuff, 1969, b).

All of this suggests that both didactic instruction and related practice in desired skills in combination with group interaction are necessary components of learning more effective ways of communicating with others. Subjects who are encouraged to pay direct attention to the levels of empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, immediacy and confrontation that they offer during the training period, appear better able to offer facilitative levels of these conditions to others after training. On the other hand, subjects who do not pay direct attention to these conditions, do not appear to improve their skill in offering them.

Because the author's primary interest in conducting this study was to develop a human relations training program for use in a college curriculum and to introduce the training concept to college faculty, no attempt was made to study the different effects of the combined training program with training programs that use either one method or the other alone. In other words, the study does not attempt to evaluate whether the use of systematic training in combination with encounter group process (or unsystematic training) is more or less effective than systematic training alone, or unsystematic training alone. The study simply shows that significant improvements in both communication and discrimination of the core conditions are achieved in a combined
program. From this specific study, it is known that encounter group exercises do not prevent subjects from significantly improving their interpersonal skills through systematic training, but it is not known whether or not the addition of encounter group exercises facilitates training. It is this author's opinion that the use of encounter group interaction provides subjects with an opportunity to spontaneously try out the new skills learned following systematic training. Experimenting with newly learned behavior should help familiarize and personalize it, thus making it more apt to be retained. Future studies, of a longitudinal nature, might explore this theory further.

Since the instruments used in the study are those identified with systematic theory, namely the Carkhuff Communication and Discrimination Indices (1969, b), a discussion of these tests appears in order. A criticism of the systematic method has been that the tests used to measure improvement in communication and discrimination abilities are constructed to pick up skills that are directly taught during training. In other words, subjects are taught to take the test. Since subjects who don't take the systematic training don't learn how to take the test, they naturally fail to show improvement on the posttest.

In one sense this is true. Subjects in systematic training receive direct practice in the skills measured by the test and subjects who do not receive systematic training
do not receive this practice. Carkhuff (1969, b; 1969 c), however, has repeatedly demonstrated that the skills (or lack of skills) measured by the communication and discrimination tests actually are observable in subjects' real interactions with helpees. These skill themselves define operationally what is meant by high level interaction. Subjects who score high on the test, also score high when their taped interactions with helpees are rated. Subjects who score low on the tests, also score low when their taped interactions with helpees are rated. In other words, the communication and discrimination indices do appear to validly measure skills that are transferred to real life situations as a result of training. Since the ideal test measures what is taught (Carkhuff, 1971; McNemar, 1969), Carkhuff's communication and discrimination tests appear justified in the sense that they validly measure skills that are taught. They thus provide a valid index of the effectiveness of training.

Another problem with instrumentation is scoring. The rating method is used to score the communication index, and this method of scoring lacks the precision that is most desirable in research (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Responses are scored according to the judgment of raters and thus are subject to the error variance inherent in this method of scoring. Carkhuff (1969, c) and his researchers have attempted to minimize rating error for the communication
index by finely operationalizing the various communication levels in behavioral terminology and assigning numerical scores to each level. Raters can thus identify a particular behavior, such as "advice giving", and assign the numerical score appropriate for advice giving responses. According to Campbell and Stanley (1963), operationally defining the behaviors to be rated increases the accuracy of the rating method of scoring. The inter-rater reliability data for this study, presented in Table 1, demonstrates the effectiveness of Carkhuff's (1969, b) operationally defined rating guide, in that the raters show a good agreement, or high inter-rater reliability, in the scores they assigned to the communication indices. Even though the inter-rater reliability is high, the raw reliability data in Appendix D shows the small discrepancies in ratings typically found in scores obtained through ratings. It can be observed that one of the raters very often rated responses a fraction of a level lower than the other rater. No explanation for this tendency is offered by the author, since both raters were trained at the same time, in the same training program, with the same instructor, and the same amount of exposure to the Carkhuff indices at the time the ratings were done. No doubt, pre-experimental response biases in the raters, such as general tendencies to mark high or low, could account for the small differences shown (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).

Moving beyond theoretical and statistical findings of
the study, a discussion of the circumstances of the training process seems important. It was hypothesized that a sufficient number of college students to warrant the study would register for the experimental course, and this hypothesis was confirmed. It might be noted that at least 40 additional students at the college attempted to register for the human relations training course but could not work it into their class schedules. This finding suggests that college students are attracted to a course which is aimed at helping them improve their relationship potential. Since they did not know any of the details of the course prior to registration, including the course requirements or who the instructor would be, it can be postulated that they chose the course on the basis of its appeal as a subject, rather than on any of the extraneous variables that can and often do influence course selection.

During the actual semester when the course was conducted, students indicated verbally to this author and to other faculty members at the college that they found the course helpful. There were several other indications that human relations training provides a welcomed and sought after addition to the college curriculum. These include the following:

1. requests from other students in the college that the course be offered again (these requests were from students who had not taken the course but
heard about it from those who had);

2. requests from faculty members in the college for "human relations talks" for various other classes;

3. a request from the college administration that a human relations training program be conducted for R.A.'s (resident assistants) in the college dormitories in order to better equip them for their work with the students;

4. a request for a human relations laboratory for interested faculty to be conducted in workshop style during the course of the next year;

5. a suggestion given to the college Director of Nursing that a human relations course be required for nursing majors (This suggestion came from four nursing students who had taken the experimental course).

The implications of these follow-up results of the study are important. Human relations training appears to be more than just another elective one adds to his list of academic achievements. The evidence is strong that students and faculty alike have a desire to grow in more than academic ways. They are concerned about their emotional ties and relationships as well as their intellects. They recognize that they are, above all, relational beings who need to improve their skill in fashioning warm and satisfying relationships with their fellows. When presented with an opportunity
to grow interpersonally, they will welcome it.

When the results of this study are viewed within the context of the numerous other studies of the systematic and unsystematic methods (Carkhuff, 1971; Golembiewski, 1970), it appears that the movement to help individuals and groups improve their interpersonal skills has been both effective and popular. Present studies attest both to the basic effectiveness of systematic skills training and to the possibility of refining and enlarging training methods for use in a variety of populations. Hopefully, future studies of this kind will serve to make human relations training more available to individuals and groups in all parts of the world who seek to grow, to share and to find greater meaning in human relationships.
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SCALE 1

EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES: A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the first person either do not attend to or detract significantly from the verbal and behavioral expressions of the second person(s) in that they communicate significantly less of the second person's feelings than the second person has communicated himself.

EXAMPLES: The first person communicates no awareness of even the most obvious, expressed surface feelings of the second person. The first person may be bored or uninterested or simply operating from a pre-conceived frame of reference which totally excludes that of the other person(s).

In summary, the first person does everything but express that he is listening, understanding, or being sensitive to even the feelings of the other person in such a way to detract significantly from the communications of the second person.

Level 2

While the first person responds to the expressed feelings of the second person(s), he does so in such a way that he subtracts noticeable affect from the communications of the second person.

EXAMPLES: The first person may communicate some awareness of obvious surface feelings of the second person, but his communications drain off a level of the affect and distort the level of meaning. The first person may communicate his own ideas of what may be going on, but these are not congruent with the expressions of the second person.

In summary, the first person tends to respond to other than what the second person is expressing or indicating.

Level 3

The expressions of the first person in response to the expressed feelings of the second person(s) are essentially interchangeable with those of the second person in that they
express essentially the same affect and meaning.

EXAMPLE: The first person responds with accurate understand­
ing of the surface feelings of the second person but may not respond to or may misinterpret the deeper feelings.

In summary, the first person is responding so as to neither subtract from nor add to the expressions of the second person; but he does not respond accurately to how that person really feels beneath the surface feelings. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative inter­personal functioning.

Level 4

The responses of the first person add noticeably to the expressions of the second person(s) in such a way as to express feelings a level deeper than the second person was able to express himself.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator communicates his understanding of the expressions of the second person at a level deeper than they were expressed, and thus enables the second person to experience and/or express feelings he was unable to express previously.

In summary, the facilitator's responses add deeper feeling and meaning to the expressions of the second person.

Level 5

The first person's responses add significantly to the feeling and meaning of the expressions of the second person(s) in such a way as to (1) accurately express feelings levels below what the person himself was able to express or (2) in the event of on going deep self­exploration on the second person's part, to be fully with him in his deepest moments.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator responds with accuracy to all of the person's deeper as well as surface feelings. He is "together" with the second person or "tuned in" on his wave length. The facilitator and the other person might proceed together to explore previously unexplored areas of human existence.

In summary, the facilitator is responding with a full awareness of who the other person is and a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of his deepest feelings.
THE COMMUNICATION OF RESPECT IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES: A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the first person communicate a clear lack of respect (or negative regard) for the second person(s).

EXAMPLE: The first person communicates to the second person that the second person's feelings and experiences are not worthy of consideration or that the second person is not capable of acting constructively. The first person may become the sole focus of evaluation.

In summary, in many ways the first person communicates a total lack of respect for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

Level 2

The first person responds to the second person in such a way as to communicate little respect for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

EXAMPLE: The first person may respond mechanically or passively or ignore many of the feelings of the second person.

In summary, in many ways the first person displays a lack of respect or concern for the second person's feelings, experiences, and potentials.

Level 3

The first person communicates a positive respect and concern for the second person's feelings, experiences, and potentials.

EXAMPLE: The first person communicates respect and concern for the second person's ability to express himself and to deal constructively with his life situation.

In summary, in many ways the first person communicates that who the second person is and what he does matter to the first person. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.
Level 4

The facilitator clearly communicates a very deep respect and concern for the second person.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator's responses enable the second person to feel free to be himself and to experience being valued as an individual.

In summary, the facilitator communicates a very deep caring for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

Level 5

The facilitator communicates the very deepest respect for the second person's worth as a person and his potentials as a free individual.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator cares very deeply for the human potentials of the second person.

In summary, the facilitator is committed to the value of the other person as a human being.

SCALE 3

FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES: A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The first person's verbalizations are clearly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment, or his only genuine responses are negative in regard to the second person(s) and appear to have a totally destructive effect upon the second person.

EXAMPLE: The first person may be defensive in his interaction with the second person(s) and this defensiveness may be demonstrated in the content of his words or his voice quality. Where he is defensive he does not employ his reaction as a basis for potentially valuable inquiry into the relationship.

In summary, there is evidence of a considerable discrepancy between the inner experiencing of the first person(s) and his current verbalizations. Where there is no discrepancy, the first person's reactions are employed solely in a destructive fashion.
Level 2

The first person's verbalizations are slightly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment, or when his responses are genuine they are negative in regard to the second person; the first person does not appear to know how to employ his negative reactions constructively as a basis for inquiry into the relationship.

EXAMPLE: The first person may respond to the second person(s) in a "professional" manner that has a rehearsed quality or a quality concerning the way a helper "should" respond in that situation.

In summary, the first person is usually responding according to his prescribed role rather than expressing what he personally feels or means. When he is genuine his responses are negative and he is unable to employ them as a basis for further inquiry.

Level 3

The first person provides no "negative" cues between what he says and what he feels, but he provides no positive cues to indicate a really genuine response to the second person(s).

EXAMPLE: The first person may listen and follow the second person(s) but commits nothing more of himself.

In summary, the first person appears to make appropriate responses that do not seem insincere but that do not reflect any real involvement either. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The facilitator presents some positive cues indicating a genuine response (whether positive or negative) in a non-destructive manner to the second person(s).

EXAMPLE: The facilitator's expressions are congruent with his feelings, although he may be somewhat hesitant about expressing them fully.

In summary, the facilitator responds with many of his own feelings, and there is no doubt as to whether he really means what he says. He is able to employ his responses, whatever their emotional content, as a basis for further inquiry into the relationship.
Level 5

The facilitator is freely and deeply himself in a non-exploitative relationship with the second person(s).

EXAMPLE: The facilitator is completely spontaneous in his interaction and open to experiences of all types, both pleasant and hurtful. In the event of hurtful responses the facilitator's comments are employed constructively to open a further area of inquiry for both the facilitator and the second person.

In summary, the facilitator is clearly being himself and yet employing his own genuine responses constructively.

SCALE 4
FACILITATIVE SELF-DISCLOSURE IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:
SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The first person actively attempts to remain detached from the second person(s) and discloses nothing about his own feelings or personality to the second person(s), or if he does disclose himself, he does so in a way that is not tuned to the second person's general progress.

EXAMPLE: The first person may attempt whether awkwardly or skillfully, to divert the second person's attention from focusing upon personal questions concerning the first person, or his self-disclosures may be ego shattering for the second person(s) and may ultimately cause him to lose faith in the first person.

In summary, the first person actively attempts to remain ambiguous and an unknown quantity to the second person(s), or if he is self-disclosing, he does so solely out of his own needs and is oblivious to the needs of the second person(s).

Level 2

The first person, while not always appearing actively to avoid self-disclosures, never volunteers personal information about himself.

EXAMPLE: The first person may respond briefly to direct questions from the client about himself; however, he does so hesitantly and never provides more
information about himself than the second person(s) specifically requests.

In summary, the second person(s) either does not ask about the personality of the first person, or, if he does, the barest minimum of brief, vague, and superficial responses are offered by the first person.

Level 3

The first person volunteers personal information about himself which may be in keeping with the second person's interests, but this information is often vague and indicates little about the unique character of the first person.

EXAMPLE: While the first person volunteers personal information and never gives the impression that he does not wish to disclose more about himself, nevertheless, the content of his verbalizations is generally centered upon his reactions to the second person(s) and his ideas concerning their interaction.

In summary, the first person may introduce more abstract, personal ideas in accord with the second person's interests, but these ideas do not stamp him as a unique person. Level 3 constitutes the minimum level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The facilitator freely volunteers information about his personal ideas, attitudes, and experiences in accord with the second person's interests and concerns.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator may discuss personal ideas in both depth and detail, and his expressions reveal him to be a unique individual.

In summary, the facilitator is free and spontaneous in volunteering personal information about himself, and in so doing may reveal in a constructive fashion quite intimate material about his own feelings, and beliefs.

Level 5

The facilitator volunteers very intimate and often detailed material about his own personality, and in keeping with the second person's needs may express information that might be extremely embarrassing under different circumstances or if revealed by the second person to an outsider.
EXAMPLE: The facilitator gives the impression of holding nothing back and of disclosing his feelings and ideas fully and completely to the second person(s). If some of his feelings are negative concerning the second person(s), the facilitator employs them constructively as a basis for an open-ended inquiry.

In summary, the facilitator is operating in a constructive fashion at the most intimate levels of self-disclosure.

SCALE 5
PERSONALLY RELEVANT CONCRETENESS OR SPECIFICITY
OF EXPRESSION IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The first person leads or allows all discussion with the second person(s) to deal only with vague and anonymous generalities.

EXAMPLE: The first person and the second person discuss everything on strictly an abstract and highly intellectual level.

In summary, the first person makes no attempt to lead the discussion into the realm of personally relevant specific situations and feelings.

Level 2

The first person frequently leads or allows even discussions of material personally relevant to the second person(s) to be dealt with on a vague and abstract level.

EXAMPLE: The first person and the second person may discuss the "real" feelings but they do so at an abstract, intellectualized level.

In summary, the first person does not elicit discussion of most personally relevant feelings and experiences in specific and concrete terms.

Level 3

The first person at times enables the second person(s) to discuss personally relevant material in specific and concrete terminology.
EXAMPLE: The first person will make it possible for the discussion with the second person(s) to center directly around most things that are personally important to the second person(s), although there will continue to be areas not dealt with concretely and areas in which the second person does not develop fully in specificity.

In summary, the first person sometimes guides the discussions into consideration of personally relevant specific and concrete instances, but these are not always fully developed. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative functioning.

Level 4

The facilitator is frequently helpful in enabling the second person(s) to fully develop in concrete and specific terms almost all instances of concern.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator is able on many occasions to guide the discussion to specific feelings and experiences of personally meaningful material.

In summary, the facilitator is very helpful in enabling the discussion to center around specific and concrete instances of most important and personally relevant feelings and experiences.

Level 5

The facilitator is always helpful in guiding the discussion, so that the second person(s) may discuss fluently, directly, and completely specific feelings and experiences.

EXAMPLE: The first person involves the second person in discussion of specific feelings, situations, and events, regardless of their emotional content.

In summary, the facilitator facilitates a direct expression of all personally relevant feelings and experiences in concrete and specific terms.
SCALE 6
CONFRONTATION IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper disregard the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior (ideal versus real self, insight versus action, helper versus helpee's experiences).

EXAMPLE: The helper may simply ignore all helpee discrepancies by passively accepting them.

In summary, the helper simply disregards all of those discrepancies in the helpee's behavior that might be fruitful areas for consideration.

Level 2

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper disregard the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

EXAMPLE: The helper, although not explicitly accepting these discrepancies, may simply remain silent concerning most of them.

In summary, the helper disregards the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior, and, thus, potentially important areas of inquiry.

Level 3

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper, while open to discrepancies in the helpee's behavior, do not relate directly and specifically to these discrepancies.

EXAMPLE: The helper may simply raise questions without pointing up the diverging directions of the possible answers.

In summary, while the helper does not disregard discrepancies in the helpee's behavior, he does not point up the directions of these discrepancies. Level 3 constitutes the minimum level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper attend directly and specifically to the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.
EXAMPLE: The helper confronts the helpee directly and explicitly with discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

In summary, the helper specifically addresses himself to discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

Level 5

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper are keenly and continually attuned to the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

EXAMPLE: The helper confronts the helpee with helpee discrepancies in a sensitive and perceptive manner whenever they appear.

In summary, the helper does not neglect any potentially fruitful inquiry into the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

SCALE 7
IMMEDIACY OF RELATIONSHIP IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES: A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper disregard the content and affect of the helpee's expressions that have the potential for relating to the helper.

EXAMPLE: The helper may simply ignore all helpee communications, whether direct or indirect, that deal with the helper-helpee relationship.

In summary, the helper simply disregards all of those helpee messages that are related to the helper.

Level 2

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper disregard most of the helpee expressions that have the potential for relating to the helper.

EXAMPLE: Even if the helpee is talking about helping personnel in general, the helper may, in general, remain silent or just not relate the content to himself.

In summary, the helper appears to choose to disregard most of those helpee messages that are related to the helper.
Level 3

The verbal and behavior expressions of the helper, while open to interpretations of immediacy, do not relate what the helpee is saying to what is going on between the helper and the helpee in the immediate moment.

EXAMPLE: The helper may make literal responses to or reflections on the helpee's expressions or otherwise open-minded responses that refer to no one specifically but that might refer to the helper.

In summary, while the helper does not extend the helpee's expressions to immediacy, he is not closed to such interpretations. Level 3 constitutes the minimum level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper appear cautiously to relate the helpee's expressions directly to the helper-helpee relationship.

EXAMPLE: The helper attempts to relate the helpee's responses to himself, but he does so in a tentative manner.

In summary, the helper relates the helpee's responses to himself in an open, cautious manner.

Level 5

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper relate the helpee's expressions directly to the helper-helpee relationship.

EXAMPLE: The helper in a direct and explicit manner relates the helpee's expressions to himself.

In summary, the helper is not hesitant in making explicit interpretations of the helper-helpee relationship.

SCALE 8
HELPEE SELF-EXPLORATION IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The second person does not discuss personally relevant material, either because he has had no opportunity to do such
or because he is actively evading the discussion even when it is introduced by the first person.

EXAMPLE: The second person avoids any self-descriptions or self-exploration or direct expression of feelings that would lead him to reveal himself to the first person.

In summary, for a variety of possible reasons, the second person does not give any evidence of self-exploration.

Level 2

The second person responds with discussion to the introduction of personally relevant material by the first person but does so in a mechanical manner and without the demonstration of emotional feelings.

EXAMPLE: The second person simply discusses the material without exploring the significance or the meaning of the material or attempting further exploration of that feeling in an effort to uncover related feelings or material.

In summary, the second person responds mechanically and remotely to the introduction of personally relevant material by the first person.

Level 3

The second person voluntarily introduces discussions of personally relevant material but does so in a mechanical manner and without the demonstration of emotional feeling.

EXAMPLE: The emotional remoteness and mechanical manner of the discussion give the discussion a quality of being rehearsed.

In summary, the second person introduces personally relevant material but does so without spontaneity or emotional proximity and without an inward probing to discover new feelings and experiences.

Level 4

The second person voluntarily introduces discussions of personally relevant material with both spontaneity and emotional proximity.
EXAMPLE: The voice quality and other characteristics of the second person are very much "with" the feelings and other personal materials that are being verbalized.

In summary, the second person introduces personally relevant discussions with spontaneity and emotional proximity but without a distinct tendency toward inward probing to discover new feelings and experiences.

Level 5

The second person actively and spontaneously engages in an inward probing to discover new feelings and experiences about himself and his world.

EXAMPLE: The second person is searching to discover new feelings concerning himself and his world even though at the moment he may perhaps be doing so fearfully and tentatively.

In summary, the second person is fully and actively focusing upon himself and exploring himself and his world.
INSTRUCTIONS: The following excerpts represent 16 helpee stimulus expressions; that is, expressions by a helpee of feeling and content in different problem areas. In this case the same helpee is involved in all instances.

You may conceive of this helpee not necessarily as a formal client but simply as a person who has come to you in a time of need. Please respond as you would if someone came to you seeking assistance in a time of distress.

In formulating your responses keep in mind those that the helpee can use effectively in his own life.

Excerpt 1

HELPEE: I don't know if I am right or wrong feeling the way I do. But I find myself withdrawing from people. I don't seem to socialize and play their stupid little games any more. I get upset and come home depressed and have headaches. It seems all so superficial. There was a time when I used to get along with everybody. Everybody said, "Isn't she wonderful. She gets along with everybody. Everybody likes her." I used to think that was something to be really proud of, but that was who I was at that time. I had no depth. I was what the crowd wanted me to be -- the particular group I was with.

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 2

HELPEE: I love my children and my husband and I like doing most household things. They get boring at times but on the whole I think it can be a very rewarding thing at times. I don't miss working, going to the office every day. Most women complain of being just a housewife and just a mother. But then, again, I wonder if there is more for me. Others say there has to be. I really don't know.
Excerpt 3

HELPEE: Sometimes I question my adequacy of raising three boys, especially the baby. I call him the baby -- well, he is the last. I can't have any more. So I know I kept him a baby longer than the others. He won't let anyone else do things for him. If someone else opens the door he says he wants Mommy to do it. If he closes the door, I have to open it. I encourage this. I do it. I don't know if this is right or wrong. He insists on sleeping with me every night and I allow it. And he says when he grows up he won't do it any more. Right now he is my baby and I don't discourage this much. I don't know if this comes out of my needs or if I'm making too much out of the situation or if this will handicap him when he goes to school -- breaking away from Mamma. Is it going to be a traumatic experience for him? Is it something I'm creating for him? I do worry more about my children than I think most mothers so.

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 4

HELPEE: It's not an easy thing to talk about. I guess the heart of the problem is sort of a sexual problem. I never thought I would have this sort of problem. But I find myself not getting the fulfillment I used to. It's not as enjoyable -- for my husband either, although we don't discuss it. I used to enjoy and look forward to making love. I used to
have an orgasm but I don't any more. I can't remember the last time I was satisfied. I find myself being attracted to other men and wondering what it would be like to go to bed with them. I don't know what this means. Is this symptomatic of our whole relationship as a marriage? Is something wrong with me or us?

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 5

HELPEE: Gee, those people! Who do they think they are? I just can't stand interacting with them any more. Just a bunch of phonies. They leave me so frustrated. They make me so anxious, I get angry at myself. I don't even want to be bothered with them any more. I just wish I could be honest with them and tell them all to go to hell! But I guess I just can't do it.

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 6

HELPEE: They wave that degree up like it's a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. I used to think that, too, until I tried it. I'm happy being a housewife; I don't care to get a degree. But the people I associate with, the first thing they ask is where did you get your degree. I answer, "I don't have a degree." Christ, they look at you like you are some sort of a freak, some backwoodsman your husband picked up along the way. They actually believe that people with degrees are better. In fact, I think
they are worse. I've found a lot of people without degrees that are a hell of a lot smarter than these people. They think that just because they have degrees they are something special. These poor kids that think they have to go to college or they are ruined. It seems that we are trying to perpetrate a fraud on these kids. If no degree, they think they will end up digging ditches the rest of their lives. They are looked down upon. That makes me sick.

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 7

HELPED: I get so frustrated and furious with my daughter. I just don't know what to do with her. She is bright and sensitive, but damn, she has some characteristics that make me so on edge. I can't handle it sometimes. She just -- I feel myself getting more and more angry! She won't do what you tell her to. She tests limits like mad. I scream and yell and lose control and think there is something wrong with me -- I'm not an understanding mother or something. Damn! What potential! What she could do with what she has. There are times she doesn't need what she's got. She gets by too cheaply. I just don't know what to do with her. Then she can be so nice and then, boy, she can be as onery as she can be. And then I scream and yell and I'm about ready to slam her across the room. I don't like to feel this way. I don't know what to do with it.

RESPONSE:
Excerpt 8

HELPEE: He is ridiculous! Everything has to be done when he wants to do it. The way he wants it done. It's as if nobody else exists. It's everything he wants to do. There is a range of things I have to do. Not just be a housewife and take care of the kids. Oh no, I have to do his typing for him, errands for him. If I don't do it right away, I'm stupid—I'm not a good wife or something stupid like that. I have an identity of my own and I'm not going to have it wrapped up in him. It makes me--it infuriates me! I want to punch him right in the mouth. What am I going to do? Who does he think he is anyway?

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 9

HELPEE: I finally found somebody I can really get along with. There is no pretentiousness about them at all. They are real and they understand me. I can be myself with them. I don't have to worry about what I say and that they might take me wrong, because I do sometimes say things that don't come out the way that I want them to. I don't have to worry that they are going to criticize me. They are just marvelous people! I just can't wait to be with them. For once I actually enjoy going out and interacting. I didn't think I could ever find people like this again. I can really be myself. It's such a wonderful feeling not to have people criticizing you for everything you say that doesn't agree with them. They are warm and understanding and I just love them! It's just marvelous.

RESPONSE:
Excerpt 10

HELPEE: I'm really excited! We are going to California. I'm going to have a second lease on life. I found a marvelous job. It's great! It's so great, I can't believe it's true -- it's so great! I have a secretarial job. I can be a mother and can have a part time job which I enjoy very much. I can be home when the kids get home from school. It's too good to be true. It's so exciting. New horizons are unfolding. I just can't wait to get started. It's great!

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 11

HELPEE: I'm so pleased with the kids. They are doing just marvelously. They have done so well at school and at home; they get along together. It's amazing. I never thought they would. They seem a little older. They play together better and they enjoy each other and I enjoy them. Life has become so much easier. It's really a joy to raise three boys. I didn't think it would be. I'm just so pleased and hopeful for the future. For them and for us. It's just great! I can't believe it. It's marvelous.

RESPONSE:
Excerpt 12
HELPEE: I'm really excited the way things are going at home with my husband. It's just amazing. We get along great together now. Sexually, I didn't know we could be that happy. I didn't know anyone could be that happy. It's just marvelous! I'm just so pleased, I don't know what else to say.

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 13
HELPEE: I am so thrilled to have found a counselor like you. I didn't know any existed. You seem to understand me so well. It's just great! I feel like I'm coming alive again. I have not felt like this in so long.

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 14
HELPEE: Silence (Moving about in chair)

RESPONSE:
Excerpt 15

HELPEE: Gee, I'm so disappointed. I thought we could get along together and you could help me. We don't seem to be getting anywhere. You don't understand me. You don't know I'm here. I don't even think you care for me. You don't hear me when I talk. You seem to be somewhere else. Your responses are independent of anything I have to say. I don't know where to turn. I'm just so -- doggone it -- I don't know what I'm going to do, but I know you can't help me. There just is no hope.

RESPONSE:

Excerpt 16

HELPEE: Who do you think you are? You call yourself a therapist! Damn, here I am spilling my guts out and all you do is look at the clock. You don't hear what I say. Your responses are not attuned to what I'm saying. I never heard of such therapy. You are supposed to be helping me. You are so wrapped up in your world you don't hear a thing I'm saying. You don't give me the time. The minute the hour is up you push me out the door whether I have something important to say or not. I -- ah -- it makes me so God damn mad!

RESPONSE:
INSTRUCTIONS: The following excerpts involve a number of helpee stimulus expressions and in turn a number of helper responses. There are 16 expressions by helpees of problems, and in response to each expression there are four possible helper responses.

These helpees can be considered to be helpees in very early contacts. They may not be formal helpees. They may simply be people who sought the help of another person in a time of need. In this example the same helpee and the same helper are involved.

You may rate these responses, keeping in mind that those helper responses which the helpee can employ most effectively are rated the highest. Rate the responses 1, 2, 3 and 4 with 1 being the poorest response and 4 being the best response.

Excerpt 1

HELPEE: I don't know if I am right or wrong feeling the way I do. But I find myself withdrawing from people. I don't seem to socialize and play their stupid little games any more. I get upset and come home depressed and have headaches. It all seems so superficial. There was a time when I used to get along with everybody. Everybody said, "Isn't she wonderful. She gets along with everybody. Everybody likes her." I used to think that was something to be really proud of, but that was who I was at that time. I had no depth. I was what the crowd wanted me to be -- the particular group I was with.

HELPER RESPONSES:

_____ You know you have changed a lot. There are a lot of things you want to do but no longer can.

_____ You are damned sure who you can't be any longer but you are not sure who you are. Still hesitant as to who you are yet.

_____ Who are these people that make you so angry? Why don't you tell them where to get off! They can't control your existence. You have to be your own person.

_____ So you have a social problem involving interpersonal difficulties with others.
Excerpt 2

HELPEE: I love my children and my husband and I like doing most household things. They get boring at times but on the whole I think it can be a very rewarding thing at times. I don't miss working, going to the office every day. Most women complain of being just a housewife and just a mother. But then, again, I wonder if there is more for me. Others say there has to be. I really don't know.

HELPER RESPONSES:

— Hmm. Who are these other people?
— So you find yourself raising a lot of questions about yourself — educationally, vocationally.
— Why are you dominated by what others see for you? If you are comfortable and enjoy being a housewife, then continue in this job. The role of mother, homemaker can be a full-time, self-satisfying job.
— While others raise these questions, these questions are real for you. You don't know if there is more out there for you. You don't know if you can find more fulfillment than you have.

Excerpt 3

HELPEE: Sometimes I question my adequacy of raising three boys, especially the baby. I call him the baby — well, he is the last. I can't have any more. So I know I kept him a baby longer than the others. He won't let anyone else do things for him. If someone else opens the door, he says he wants Mommy to do it. If he closes the door, I have to open it. I encourage this. I do it. I don't know if this is right or wrong. He insists on sleeping with me every night and I allow it. And he says when he grows up he won't do it any more. Right now he is my baby and I don't discourage this much. I don't know if this comes out of my needs or if I'm making too much out of the situation or if this will handicap him when he goes to school — breaking away from Momma. Is it going to be a traumatic experience for him? Is it something I'm creating for him? I do worry more about my children than I think most mothers do.

HELPER RESPONSES:

— So you find yourself raising a lot of questions as to if what you are doing is right for your child.
HELPER RESPONSES Continued:

______ Is it perhaps possible for you to have the child become involved in a situation such as some experiences in a public park where the child could play and perhaps at a distance you could supervise—where the child can gain some independence?

______ Could you tell me-- have you talked to your husband about this?

______ While you are raising a lot of questions for yourself about yourself in relation to your youngest child, you are raising some more basic questions about yourself in relation to you. In lots of ways you're not certain where you are going—not sure who you are.

Excerpt 4

HELPEE: It's not an easy thing to talk about. I guess the heart of the problem is sort of a sexual problem. I never thought I would have this sort of problem. But I find myself not getting the fulfillment I used to. It's not as enjoyable—for my husband either, although we don't discuss it. I used to enjoy and look forward to making love. I used to have an orgasm but I don't anymore. I can't remember the last time I was satisfied. I find myself being attracted to other men and wondering what it would be like to go to bed with them. I don't know what this means. Is this symptomatic of our whole relationship as a marriage? Is something wrong with me or us?

HELPER RESPONSES:

______ Perhaps you feel your marriage and role of mother is holding you back and preventing you from being something else you want to be. Your resentment here against your husband is manifested in your frigidity. Perhaps it is your way of paying him back for keeping you down in this role, for confining you, for restricting you.

______ What about your relationship with your husband, his role as father and companion?

______ You don't quite know what to make of all this but you know something is dreadfully wrong and you are determined to find out for yourself, for your marriage.

______ What's happened between you and your husband has raised a lot of questions about you, about him, about your marriage.
Excerpt 5

HELPEE: Gee, those people! Who do they think they are? I just can't stand interacting with them anymore. Just a bunch of phonies. They leave me so frustrated. They make me so anxious. I get angry at myself. I don't even want to be bothered with them anymore. I just wish I could be honest with them and tell them all to go to hell! But I guess I just can't do it.

HELPER RESPONSES:

_____ They really make you very angry. You wish you could handle them more effectively than you do.
_____ Damn, they make you furious! But it's just not them. It's with yourself, too, because you don't act on how you feel.
_____ Why do you feel these people are phony? What do they say to you?
_____ Maybe society itself is at fault here—making you feel inadequate, giving you this negative view of yourself, leading you to be unable to successfully interact with others.

Excerpt 6

HELPEE: They wave that degree up like it's a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. I used to think that, too, until I tried it. I'm happy being a housewife; I don't care to get a degree. But the people I associate with the first thing they ask is, "Where did you get your degree?" I answer, "I don't have a degree." Christ, they look at you like you are some sort of a freak, some backwoodsman your husband picked up along the way. They actually believe that people with degrees are better. In fact, I think they are worse. I've found a lot of people without degrees that are a hell of a lot smarter than these people. They think that just because they have degrees they are something special. These poor kids that think they have to go to college or they are ruined. It seems that we are trying to perpetrate a fraud on these kids. If no degree, they think they will end up digging ditches the rest of their lives. They are looked down upon. That makes me sick.
HELPER RESPONSES:

---
You really resent having to meet the goals other people set for you.
What do you mean by "it makes me sick?"
---
Do you honestly feel a degree makes a person worse or better? And not having a degree makes you better? Do you realize society perpetrates many frauds and sets many prerequisites such as a degree. You must realize how many doors are closed unless you have a degree, while the ditches are certainly open.
---
A lot of these expectations make you furious. Yet, they do tap in on something in yourself you are not sure of—something about yourself in relation to these other people.

Excerpt 7

HELPEE: I get so frustrated and furious with my daughter. I just don't know what to do with her. She is bright and sensitive, but damn, she has some characteristics that make me so on edge. I can't handle it sometimes. She just—I feel myself getting more and more angry! She won't do what you tell her to. She tests limits like mad. I scream and yell and lose control and think there is something wrong with me—I'm not an understanding mother or something. Damn! What potential! What she could do with what she has. There are times she doesn't use what she's got. She gets by too cheaply. I just don't know what to do with her. Then she can be so nice and then, boy she can be as onery as she can be. And then I scream and yell and I'm about ready to slam her across the room. I don't like to feel this way. I don't know what to do with it.

HELPER RESPONSES:

---
So you find yourself screaming and yelling at your daughter more frequently during the past three months.
---
Why don't you try giving your daughter some very precise limitations. Tell her what you expect from her and what you don't expect from her. No excuses.
---
While she frustrates the hell out of you, what you are really asking is, "How can I help her? How can I help myself, particularly in relation to this kid?"
---
While she makes you very angry, you really care what happens to her.
**Excerpt 8**

HELPEE: He is ridiculous! Everything has to be done when he wants to do it, the way he wants it done. It's as if nobody else exists. It's everything he wants to do. There is a range of things I have to do -- not just be a housewife and take care of the kids. Oh no, I have to do his typing for him, errands for him. If I don't do it right away, I'm stupid -- I'm not a good wife or something stupid like that. I have an identity of my own, and I'm not going to have it wrapped up in him. It makes me -- it infuriates me! I want to punch him right in the mouth. What am I going to do? Who does he think he is anyway?

HELPER RESPONSES:

It really angers you when you realize in how many ways he has taken advantage of you.

Tell me, what is your concept of a good marriage?

Your husband makes you feel inferior in your own eyes. You feel incompetent. In many ways you make him sound like a very cruel and destructive man.

It makes you furious when you think of the one-sidedness of this relationship. He imposes upon you everywhere, particularly in your own struggle for your own identity. And you don't know where this relationship is going.

**Excerpt 9**

HELPEE: I finally found somebody I can really get along with. There is no pretentiousness about them at all. They are real and they understand me. I can be myself with them. I don't have to worry about what I say and that they might take me wrong, because I do sometimes say things that don't come out the way I want them to. I don't have to worry that they are going to criticize me. They are just marvelous people! I just can't wait to be with them! For once I actually enjoy going out and interacting. I didn't think I could ever find people like this again. I can really be myself. It's such a wonderful feeling not to have people criticizing you for everything you say that doesn't agree with them. They are warm and understanding, and I just love them! It's just marvelous!
HELPER RESPONSES:

_____ Sounds like you found someone who really matters to you.
_____ Why do these kind of people accept you?
_____ That's a real good feeling to have someone to trust and share with. "Finally, I can be myself."
_____ Now that you have found these people who enjoy you and whom you enjoy, spend your time with these people. Forget about the other types who make you anxious. Spend your time with the people who can understand and be warm with you.

Excerpt 10

HELPEE: I'm really excited! We are going to California. I'm going to have a second lease on life. I found a marvelous job! It's so great I can't believe it's true -- it's so great! I have a secretarial job. I can be a mother and can have a part-time job which I think I will enjoy very much. I can be home when the kids get home from school. It's too good to be true. It's so exciting. New horizons are unfolding. I just can't wait to get started. It's great!

HELPER RESPONSES:

_____ Don't you think you are biting off a little bit more than you can chew? Don't you think that working and taking care of the children will be a little bit too much? How does your husband feel about this?
_____ Hey, that's a mighty good feeling. You are on your way now. Even though there are some things you don't know along the way, it's just exciting to be gone.
_____ Let me caution you to be cautious in your judgment. Don't be too hasty. Try to get settled first.
_____ It's a good feeling to contemplate doing these things.

Excerpt 11

HELPEE: I'm so pleased with the kids. They are doing just marvelously. They have done so well at school and at home; they get along together. It's amazing. I never thought they would. They seem a little older. They play together better and they enjoy each other, and I enjoy them. Life has become so much easier. It's really a joy to raise three boys. I didn't think it would be. I'm just so pleased
and hopeful for the future. For them and for us. It's just great! I can't believe it. It's marvelous!

HELPER RESPONSES:

____ It's a good feeling to have your kids settled once again.
____ Is it possible your kids were happy before but you never noticed it before? You mentioned your boys. How about your husband? Is he happy?
____ Do you feel this is a permanent change?
____ Hey, that's great! Whatever the problem, and you know there will be problems, it's great to have experienced the positive side of it.

Excerpt 12

HELPEE: I am really excited the way things are going at home with my husband. It's just amazing! We get along great together now. Sexually, I didn't know we could be that happy. I didn't know anyone could be that happy. It's just marvelous! I'm just so pleased. I don't know what else to say.

HELPER RESPONSES:

____ It's a wonderful feeling when things are going well maritally.
____ It's really exciting to be alive again, to feel your body again, to be in love again.
____ Is your husband aware of these changes?
____ Now don't go overboard on this right now. There will be problems that lie ahead and during these periods that you have these problems I want you to remember well the bliss you experienced in this moment in time.

Excerpt 13

HELPEE: I'm so thrilled to have found a counselor like you. I didn't know any existed. You seem to understand me so well. It's just great! I feel like I'm coming alive again. I have not felt like this in so long.

HELPER RESPONSES:

____ Gratitude is a natural emotion.
This is quite nice but remember, unless extreme caution is exercised, you may find yourself moving in the other direction.

That's a good feeling.

Hey, I'm as thrilled to hear you talk this way as you are! I'm pleased that I have been helpful. I do think we still have some work to do yet, though.

Excerpt 14

HELPEE: No response (Moving about in a chair.)

HELPER RESPONSES:

You can't really say all that you feel at this moment.

A penny for your thoughts.

Are you nervous? Maybe you haven't made the progress here we hoped for.

You just don't know what to say at this moment.

Excerpt 15

HELPEE: Gee, I'm so disappointed. I thought we could get along together and you could help me. We don't seem to be getting anywhere. You don't understand me. You don't know I'm here. I don't even think you care for me. You don't hear me when I talk. You seem to be somewhere else. Your responses are independent of anything I have to say. I don't know where to turn. I'm just so -- doggone it -- I don't know what I'm going to do, but I know you can't help me. There is just no hope.

HELPER RESPONSES:

I have no reason to try and not to help you. I have every reason to want to help you.

Only when we establish mutual understanding and trust and only then can we proceed to work on your problem effectively.

It's disappointing and disillusioning to think you have made so little progress.

I feel badly that you feel that way. I do want to help. I'm wondering, "Is it me? Is it you, both of us?" Can we work something out?
Excerpt 16.

HELPEE: Who do you think you are? You call yourself a therapist! Damn, here I am spilling my guts out and all you do is look at the clock. You don't hear what I say. Your responses are not attuned to what I'm saying. I never heard of such therapy. You are supposed to be helping me. You are so wrapped up in your world you don't hear a thing I'm saying. You don't give me the time. The minute the hour is up you push me out the door whether I have something important to say or not. I - uh - it makes me so goddam mad!

HELPER RESPONSES:

You are suggesting I'm wrapped up in myself. Do you think that perhaps, in fact, this is your problem?

I'm only trying to listen to you. Really, I think we are making a whole lot of progress here.

You are pretty displeased with what has been going on here.

All right, you are furious, but I wonder if it's all mine or is there something else eating you.
RATING GUIDE FOR COMMUNICATION INDEX

Sample helpee statement: "I'm so down and I don't know why... I mean, I shouldn't be down just because...(pause) there's just no reason for it."

RESPONSE CLASSIFICATION OR LEVEL

I. Cliche' Response: Not related to helpee's statement. 1.0
   eg. "I know lots of people who get funny feelings, too."
   Cliche' Response: Somewhat related to helpee's statement. 1.5
   eg. "What do you think causes people to get depressed?"

II. Advice Response: Poor advice; no understanding. 2.0
    eg. "You should think of the good things in your life.
    Advice Response: Good advice; no understanding. 2.5
    eg. "You know what's on your mind! Just try and say it!"

III. Interchangeable Response: Simple understanding reflective. 3.0
     eg. "You are feeling down."
     Interchangeable Response: Complete understanding reflective. 3.5
     eg. "You're pretty sad and you just don't know why."

IV. Additive Response: High understanding; beginning initiation 4.0
    eg. "You can't let yourself think about the things that might be causing you to feel so bad."
    Additive Response: High understanding; high initiation
    eg. "You're really feeling low...you have an idea why... but it's pretty painful to think about it."
Lecture Topics for Experimental Course

I. An Overview of Human Relations Training

II. Principles of Human Relating

III. Understanding the Levels of Helper Conditions

IV. Attending to Words, Feelings, Behavior

V. Total Listening

VI. Communication and Discrimination of Empathy

VII. Communication and Discrimination of Respect

VIII. Communication and Discrimination of Concreteness

IX. Communication and Discrimination of Genuineness

X. Communication and Discrimination of Confrontation

XI. Communication and Discrimination of Immediacy

XII. Review of the Elements of Human Communication

XIII. Self-Disclosure: Growth in Human Sharing

XIV. Building a Sharing Community

XV. Helping As A Way of Life

XVI. Principles of Personal Effectiveness: A Summary
Group Interaction Exercises for Experimental Course

I. Fishbowl Exercise: Who Am I?

II. Fishbowl Exercise: How Do I Relate to Others?

III. Squares Exercise in Group: Do I Give and Receive Help?

IV. Dyad Exercise: Listening to Another

V. Silence Walk: Listening to Nature

VI. Empathy Skills: Group Practice

VII. Respect Skills: Group Practice

VIII. Concreteness Skills: Group Practice

IX. Genuineness Skills: Group Practice

X. Confrontation Skills: Group Practice

XI. Immediacy Skills: Group Practice

XII. Communication of the Core Conditions: Advanced Group Practice

XIII. Communication of the Core Conditions: Advanced Group Practice

XIV. Building Community: Small Group Exercise in Self-Disclosure

XV. Conflict in Community: Unequal Resources Task Exercise

XVI. Human Sharing: Party (last class)
## INTER-RATER COMPARISON DATA (N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater I</td>
<td>Rater II</td>
<td>Rater I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (N=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INTER-RATER COMPARISON DATA (N=62)

Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater I</td>
<td>Rater II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental (N=31)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control (N=31)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNICATION DATA (N=62)  
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISCRIMINATION DATA (N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCRIMINATION DATA (N=62)
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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