

COUNSELOR-CANDIDATES' INTERNALITY, GENUINENESS,
AND RESPECT AS DEMONSTRATED WITH
RELUCTANT CLIENTS

By

KAREN K. TONNELL

Bachelor of Music
Lawrence University
Appleton, Wisconsin
1961

Master of Science in Education
University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh
Oshkosh, Wisconsin
1976

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1979

Thesis
1979D
T666c
cop. 2



COUNSELOR-CANDIDATES' INTERNALITY, GENUINENESS,
AND RESPECT AS DEMONSTRATED WITH
RELUCTANT CLIENTS

Thesis Approved:

Judith E. Dobson

Thesis Adviser

David W. Perin

John M. Willard

Jim M'Neal

James Dobson

Norman D. Burkhardt

Dean of the Graduate College

1041538

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Judith Dobson, chair of the Doctoral Committee, without whose support and advisement this project would have been exceedingly more difficult. Gratitude is also expressed to Dr. David Perrin, Dr. John Dillard, Dr. Russell Dobson, and Dr. James Seals, who served as members of the committee.

Special thanks are extended to Bill Baker, Cecil Bolding, and Patricia Chaffino, the doctoral candidates who volunteered their time to serve as raters; thanks also to the counselor-candidates who served as subjects for this study, and to the professors of ABSED 5562, whose cooperation made the study possible.

Credit is due to my daughters, Mara and Mandi, and to my husband, Robert Priebe, for sharing their mother/wife with the academic process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Background.	3
Relationship and Process	3
Facilitative Dimensions.	4
Assumption.	7
Statement of the Problem.	8
Definition of Terms	8
Limitations	9
Hypotheses.	10
Significance of the Study	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Introduction.	11
The Reluctant Client.	11
Introduction	11
Sources of Reluctance.	12
Research Concerning Reluctance	13
Counselor Reactions to Reluctance.	16
Facilitative Counselor Characteristics.	18
Respect and Genuineness.	18
Internality.	24
The Counseling Relationship	26
Summary	30
III. INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY.	31
Introduction.	31
Nowicki-Strickland	31
Carkhuff Scales.	33
Methodology	37
Population	37
Procedure.	38
IV. RESULTS.	41
Interjudge Reliability.	41
Analysis of Experimental Hypotheses	45
Hypothesis One	45

Chapter	Page
Hypothesis Two	46
Hypothesis Three	46
Summary	48
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	49
Summary	49
Conclusions	51
Recommendations	58
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	60
APPENDIXES.	68
APPENDIX A - DISCRIMINATION TRAINING PROGRAM	69
APPENDIX B - JUDGES' RATINGS OF RESPECT AND GEN- UINENESS.	80
APPENDIX C - INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY.	83
APPENDIX D - INTERNALITY INSTRUMENT AND SCORES	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Reliability Reports of Rating Scales for Respect and Genuineness	36
II. Interjudge Reliability Computed with K-Index During Discrimination Training	42
III. Interjudge Reliability Computed via Snedecor.	42
IV. Interjudge Reliability Computed with Scott's Pi-Extended.	43
V. Marginal Frequencies of Category Usage.	43
VI. Interjudge Reliability Computed on Actual Data with K-Index	44
VII. Comparison of Interjudge Reliability Coefficients	45
VIII. Analysis of Variance for the Multiple Linear Regression.	46
IX. Partial Correlation Coefficient Respect with Internality	47
X. Partial Correlation Coefficient Genuineness with Internality	47
XI. Discrimination Training Ratings, Respect.	79
XII. Discrimination Training Ratings, Genuineness.	79
XIII. Ratings of Data	81
XIV. Data Rating Means	85

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Patterson (1974) defines counseling as "the helping process in which the relationship is necessary and sufficient" to therapeutic outcome (p. 13). Combs, Avila, and Purkey (1971) define the professional helper as one who "enters an encounter with his client," and "perceives his role as facilitator, helper, assister in a cooperative process of exploration and discovery" (p. 213). Inspection of the preceding definitions reveals two major assumptions: the presence of a helper who is personally involved with the client; and, the presence of a cooperative client.

Since a helper is one who is personally involved with the client, the question arises: What competencies and characteristics does this helper possess? First, as a professional person, the helper would demonstrate certain professional competencies such as reflection, interpretation, confrontation, goal-setting, and decision-making skills. Second, the helper would possess certain personal qualities. Rogers (1957) calls for the qualities of empathy, acceptance, and congruence; Jourard (1971) calls for transparency; Pietrofesa, Leonard, and Van Hoose (1972) call for authenticity. Patterson (1974), drawing heavily on the research of Maslow (1956), calls for a self-actualizing person. Patterson (1974) describes self-actualization as a set of observable characteristics involving

"acceptance of and respect for others, understanding or empathy with others, and openness, genuineness, or honesty in interpersonal relationships" (p. 45). Patterson (1974) continues by describing the counselor as a person who is "secure and thus does not have to be defensive--his locus of control is internal rather than external, so that he is autonomous, independent, and develops his own value system" (pp. 45-46).

As was previously indicated, both the Patterson (1974) and Combs (1971) definitions were predicated upon the cooperation of the client. But, what of the client who hesitates to be facilitated, helped, or assisted; the one who is reluctant to enter into a relationship with the counselor? Increasingly, the counselor is faced with clients who are not self-referred, whose motivation is not intrinsic, who are resistant to entering the therapeutic encounter (Dyer and Vriend, 1975). Often, these clients enter counseling because they are referred by parents, teachers, physicians, clergy, spouses, the courts, and others. Involuntary clients have reached a high proportion of the caseloads of the majority of counselors. Dyer and Vriend (1975) believe that "effectively dealing with reluctant clients might be the most important competency that counselors can develop" (p. 102).

However, is the ability to establish an effective relationship with reluctant clients merely a competency, a facilitative skill that can be transmitted from teacher to student-counselor in a didactic manner? Or, is the establishing of an effective counseling relationship with a reluctant client a function of skill plus some personal

counselor variable such as those suggested by Maslow (1956), Jourard (1971), Pietrofesa (1972), Patterson (1974), or Combs (1969).

Theoretical Background

Fundamental to the purpose of this study is the idea of the counseling relationship. Therefore, two basic theoretical questions must be discussed. First, how does the counselor-client relationship relate to therapeutic process? Second, what elements constitute a facilitative counseling relationship?

Relationship and Process

Taft (1933) was one of the first to present therapy as an ongoing process that takes place within a developing relationship. Rogers (1942) was the first to use the term "relationship therapy" and spoke of it as a helping encounter in which "the therapeutic contact itself is a growth experience" (p. 30). Wyatt (1948) spoke of psychotherapy as "a delicate interaction" (McGowan, 1962, p. 307). Combs et al. (1971) define the helping relationship as one in which "one party determines to set aside his own needs temporarily to help another" (p. 214). Brammer (1973) suggests that "the helping process takes place in a relationship" (p. 47). Patterson (1974) believes that "the essence of psychotherapy is that it is a good human relationship" (p. xi). It seems that over the past 40 years, the terms relationship and process have become nearly synonymous. The therapeutic process is currently defined as the developing relationship between counselor and client.

Facilitative Dimensions

Rogers (1951) described the counseling relationship from the clients' point of view as freedom from threat, where "every aspect of self which he exposes is equally accepted, equally valued" (pp. 192-193). The relationship is characterized by the "therapist's attitude of calm acceptance" (Rogers, 1951, p. 194). Benjamin (1969) brought further clarification to the concept of relationship in the therapeutic process:

I think it is to the establishing of trust and respect that those who teach and write in the field of interpersonal relations primarily refer when they speak of 'contact,' good 'rapport,' and good 'relationship' (pp. 5-6).

Pietrofesa et al. (1972) agree that trust and respect are essential conditions. They state that, although professional competence is a factor to be considered in the creation of trust and respect, it is the "self of the counselor" (p. 60) that is the most important element.

The concept of self-as-instrument was introduced by Snygg and Combs (1949) in regard to the teaching profession. They contended that "good teaching [is] a matter of the effective use of the teacher's unique personality" (p. 398); and that personality depends upon the teacher's perceptions of such things as the nature and adequacy of self and others. Combs (1969) extended these ideas to other helping professionals on the basic assumption that

persons who have learned to use themselves as effective instruments in the production of helping relationships can be distinguished from those who are ineffective on the basis of their characteristic perceptual organizations (p. 14).

In a study of counselors, Combs (1969) found that one perceptual element which significantly facilitated effectiveness was an internal, as opposed to external, frame of reference.

Fiedler (1950) conducted studies which indicated that the core elements of a facilitative relationship cut across all boundaries of ideology and theoretical disposition and were as readily observable to the layman as to the practitioner. Fiedler requested three groups of people to complete a Q-sort concerning the nature of the ideal therapeutic relationship. The first group was expert clinicians from different therapeutic schools of thought, the second was beginning therapists from those same orientations, the third group was composed of therapy-naive individuals. His first finding was that experts, no matter what their school of thought, were more consistently similar in their conceptualization of a good therapeutic relationship than were beginners and experts from the same school. His second discovery was that the man on the street could describe an ideal therapeutic relationship almost as well as the experts. In his discussion, Fiedler (1950) states: "This investigation supports the theory that relationship is therapy, that the goodness of therapy is a function of the goodness of the therapeutic relationship" (p. 443).

Rogers (1957) published "The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change" in which he identified four counselor variables as core elements of a facilitative relationship. Those elements were empathic understanding, unconditional positive regard, genuineness in the relationship, and the extent to which the counselor's response matches the client's expression in intensity of

affective expression. By 1958, he had modified that statement in favor of the facilitative conditions now known as empathy, unconditional positive regard, and congruence.

These three counselor-offered variables of congruence, positive regard, and empathy became the foundation of continued research by Truax (1961, 1962a, 1962b), Truax and Carkhuff (1967), and Carkhuff and Berenson (1967). Although most theorists of the period were concerning themselves with therapy from the client perspective, Truax and Carkhuff (1967) were approaching the divergent theoretical viewpoints from the perspective of the counselor. In their search for common dimensions, they discovered theoretical convergence upon three basic characteristics of an effective therapist. The first common characteristic is that the counselor is non-defensive, is integrated, and is authentic or genuine within the therapeutic encounter. Secondly, the effective counselor is able to provide a non-threatening, trusting, safe, and secure atmosphere by his acceptance, love, unconditional positive regard, or nonpossessive warmth for the client. The third basic element of an effective therapist is his ability to "be with," "grasp the meaning of," or accurately and empathically to understand the client on a moment-to-moment basis.

Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) define one additional facilitative dimension as being necessary to therapeutic outcome. They suggest that respect (or positive regard), empathic understanding, and facilitative genuineness are necessary, but that personally relevant concreteness is also essential. They further state:

. . . counseling and psychotherapy can have constructive or deteriorative consequences for clients, and these changes can be accounted for by the level of the

therapists' functioning on facilitative dimensions, and independently of the therapists' orientations; therapeutic processes may be 'for better or for worse' (p. 13).

After decades of exposure to the concept of relationship in therapy, there is still no definitive statement concerning its nature. However, both theoretical viewpoints and empirical findings appear to be pointing in one direction. Constructive human encounters are essential to emotional growth. The counselor who wishes to establish such a relationship must bring to the client a Self who genuinely offers acceptance, respect, and understanding.

Assumption

The research was based upon the assumption that the stress of dealing with a reluctant client in this experimental situation would minimize beginning counselor-candidates' use of newly learned responses, thereby allowing candidates to demonstrate those relationship-facilitating skills which they had previously internalized. Rationale rests with Phillips, Martin, and Meyers' (1972) statement that, "Generally, it is found that anxiety will debilitate performance early in learning" (p. 435). Additional evidence for the validity of this assumption is provided by Spence (1958) and Taylor (1956). In their review of the Hullian explanation of the Yerkes/Dodson Law (1908) they indicate that high anxiety is beneficial to the achievement of easy tasks, while difficult tasks are best accomplished under conditions of low anxiety.

Statement of the Problem

Counselor-candidates, in the early stages of their first experiential course, must depend upon internalized characteristic responses as opposed to learned responses when establishing a relationship with clients. The willing client, whose motivation is intrinsic, presents few barriers to the establishment of the relationship. The reluctant client, however, presents a threat to the relationship and to the role of the neophyte counselor. When posed with such a threat, the ability of the counselor to remain proactive, relying upon an internal frame of reference and an internalized support system to maintain his/her behavior would seem to be essential. Therefore, this research was designed to explore the relationship between the counselor-candidate's internality and his/her ability to establish a relationship with a reluctant client.

Definition of Terms

Counseling Relationship: The rapport and subsequent interaction between counselor and client; operationally defined as a score on the Carkhuff scales of Respect and Genuineness.

Reluctant Client: One who is overtly resistant, though not aggressively so, to entering the therapeutic process (the concept of reluctance is expressed in Freudian terms through the concept of transference); operationally it is defined as Level Four (silence and questioning the competence of the counselor) on the Brammer and Shostrom (1968) continuum.

Respect: Warmth and understanding offered by the counselor; acceptance of the client as a worthwhile person capable of making his/her own decisions; operationally defined as a score on the Carkhuff (1969) scale.

Genuineness: Ability of the counselor to constructively communicate his/her own authentic Being; a sharing of the counselor's true Self within the context of a nonexploitative relationship; operationally defined as a score on the Carkhuff (1969) scale.

Internality: A dependence upon self-support as opposed to externality or support from the environment; a perception of events as being contingent upon one's own behavior; a belief in internal control; operationally defined as a score on the Adult Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale (ANS-IE).

Limitations

1. Empirical validation of the Carkhuff scales is limited to distinctions between levels measured. Based upon the Discrimination Training Sessions provided, the writer assumes that the three judges had conceptualized and were indeed rating the constructs of respect and genuineness.

2. The ANS-IE was selected as the best measure of the factor of interaction-with-others for both males and females. However, the ANS-IE yields a second factor characterized by the word luck for males and by a futility of effort dimension for females (Dixon, McKee, and McRae, 1976). This research made no attempt to remove from the internality score the variance accounted for by Factor II.

Hypotheses

The .05 level of significance was established as necessary to reject or not to reject the following hypotheses:

1. There is no relationship between counselor-candidates' scores on the facilitative measures of respect and genuineness and counselor-candidates' scores of internality when relating to reluctant clients.

2. There is no relationship between counselor-candidates' scores on the facilitative dimension of respect and counselor-candidates' scores of internality when relating to reluctant clients.

3. There is no relationship between counselor-candidates' scores on the facilitative dimension of genuineness and counselor-candidates' scores of internality when relating to reluctant clients.

Significance of the Study

The American Personnel and Guidance Association (1963) recommends that selection of applicants to programs in Counselor Education be based upon personal qualities and abilities to master coursework. Graduate Record Exam scores and grade point averages typically serve as quantification systems for and predictors of cognitive variables. Non-cognitive variables are often addressed subjectively through personal interviews and/or letters of recommendation.

The present research was undertaken in an attempt to establish and quantify the non-cognitive variable of internality as a possible predictor for use in counselor-candidate selection procedures.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three major sections. The first section deals with the client, specifically the reluctant client. Sources of reluctance, pertinent research, and counselor reactions to reluctance are included. The second section is devoted to the counselor and explores the counselor-offered facilitative conditions of respect and genuineness, and the construct of counselor internality. The final section addresses itself to the concept of relationship in counseling.

The Reluctant Client

Introduction

Client reluctance takes many forms. Dyer and Vriend (1975) state that reluctance may be displayed as intellectualization, silence, over-compliance, defensiveness, pessimism, failure to keep appointments, over-solicitude, avoidance of topic, overt hostility, and unequivocal agreement. Jourard (1971) defines the resistant client as one who is

. . . reluctant or unable to disclose his thoughts, fantasies, feelings, or memories as these spontaneously arise in the therapeutic session. Rather than make

himself known, the patient tries to manipulate his own disclosing behavior so as to shape the therapist's perceptions, feelings, and attitudes (p. 144).

Brammer and Shostrom (1968) list five levels of reluctance. Lagging and inertia are levels one and two, respectively. The third level is tentative resistance, which includes such behaviors as arguing, showing physical tension, qualifying, or inhibiting expression of feelings. Level four is the "true resistance" level, involving such client behaviors as silence or questioning the competence of the counselor. Rejection, either of the counselor through hostile remarks or the counseling process through premature termination, is the fifth level.

Sources of Reluctance

Sources of client reluctance are as varied as the forms of reluctance. There appears to be general agreement that the primary source of client reluctance is the fear of giving up known ways of behaving and the concomitant risk of change (Brammer, 1973; Redl, 1966; Dyer and Vriend, 1975; Pietrofesa, Leonard, and Van Hoose, 1972; and Beier, 1952). Repressed hostility is cited by Brammer and Shostrom (1968); Davis and Robinson (1949); and Crider (1946), as another source of client reluctance. Some clients see counseling as being of little value or experience it as being a sign of weakness (Dyer and Vriend, 1975; Beier, 1952; Redl, 1966; and Brammer, 1973). Closely related to this is the client who regards the counselor as part of the "system" against which (s)he, the client, is constantly at odds (Dyer and Vriend, 1975; and Redl, 1966). In fact,

the act of resistance to any authority, including the counselor's perceived authority, is designated as good and is therefore highly reinforced by many clients' peer groups (Dyer and Vriend, 1975). Redl (1966) states that frustration of children's basic needs or important goals and overtly rejective behavior on the part of parents are typically in the profile of aggressive children. These children often display reluctance in the counseling situation.

Normal reticence in discussing problems (Davis and Robinson, 1949) and fear of self-disclosure (Hopper, 1978) are other sources of client reluctance. Mowrer (1953); Davis and Robinson (1949); and Brammer and Shostrom (1968), look to the Freudian concept of transference as one explanation of reluctance. Dyer and Vriend (1975) suggest that reluctance is built into the counseling situation when, in order to be a client, the individual must admit to some weakness.

Rogers (1942) and Truax and Carkhuff (1967) also call attention to the counseling situation itself when they state that the actions of the therapist who does not show sufficient respect to the client can trigger reluctance in that client. A cautionary note is suggested by Dyer and Vriend (1975). A counselor might sense reluctance to participate in therapy when what the client is actually demonstrating could be an adaptive, coping behavior in his everyday environment.

Research Concerning Reluctance

Observation and speculation have been the main source of information regarding the reluctant client. Few empirical studies have

dealt with this question. Crider (1946) analyzed six case studies of hostility which are applicable to this area of research. Two groups emerged from his observations: the passively resentful and the overtly aggressive. The two cases of overt aggression manifested both verbal and motor aggressions. Therapy was considered successful with one case and a failure with the other. The four cases of passive resentment were more varied in symptomatology and in results. Crider states that repressed hostility manifested itself in a variety of somatic symptomatology such as headaches, gastrointestinal disorders, fatigue, muscle pains, particularly in the neck area, constipation, itching sensations, impotence, and breathing difficulties in these four persons. The physical complaints confounded the therapeutic endeavors in that the clients were especially resistant to accepting that their symptoms had a psychogenic basis. These four cases also shared a consistent belief that life had treated them unfairly, and all were personally maladjusted in relationships with teachers, parents, other authority figures, and siblings. Nevertheless, results of therapy were considered successful for two of these cases, partially successful for one, and a failure for one case.

Beier (1952) also used the case study approach when exploring ways of assisting the involuntary-reluctant client toward "therapy-readiness" (p. 332). Six cases were referred to therapists who would not accept the involuntary client but who made it known to the client that he had a free choice and that anytime the client chose to be counseled the therapist would be available. This was, in all

cases, an attempt to increase the client's own motivation. The approach was successful in three cases, and unsuccessful in three cases. In regard to the unsuccessful cases, Beier speculated that the invitation to the client to make his own decision was misunderstood by the client as another rejection. Five cases were referred to therapists who accepted the clients and engaged in reluctance reflections. Beier sees this approach as one of offering specific support aimed at helping the client work through the feelings of reluctance in a non-threatening atmosphere. The approach was successful with three clients and unsuccessful with two. Three cases in this study were referred to counselors who attempted to motivate the clients toward therapeutic readiness through anxiety-arousal. Specifically, the involuntary-reluctant clients were told that indeed they were clients, and that they should behave as such. Beier considers this to be "a crude method at best" (p. 336). This approach worked well in one case, partially in the second, and not at all in the third. Beier calls for more research on pretherapeutic procedures designed to bring involuntary-reluctant clients to counseling readiness.

Davis and Robinson (1949) studied the relationship between counselor-leading and the types of reluctance-reducing techniques used with college students. The problem areas included study skills, vocational planning, and items of a personal nature. The authors state that the students' "problems of resistance represent normal reticence in discussing their problems and hesitancy in wanting to change their ways" (p. 298). Twenty-two counselors, advance students

of psychology, and professional therapists, took part in the experiment. It was found that the reluctance-reducing techniques most often used were, in order of frequency: (1) mild interpretation in question form; (2) a personal reference by counselor; (3) approval; (4) assurance that the client's problems would be solved; (5) non-personal anecdote or illustration; and (6) humor. Analysis of data showed the reluctance-reducing techniques of assurance, personal reference, and non-personal anecdote occurred significantly more often in the cases of low rapport and were significantly related to high directiveness in counselors. These findings are not conclusive. One interpretation might be that, when low rapport occurs, the counselor becomes more directive, thereby trying to reassure both himself and the client. Another interpretation might be that the more directive counselor, prone to using anecdotal material and reassurance, establishes a level of low rapport with the client.

Hopper (1978) explored reluctance in counseling groups. Source of reluctance and the behavioral forms reluctance takes are similar in the group and individual counseling situations. Hopper makes an excellent point in summarization. He states that when resistance is expected as a part of the therapeutic process, the counselor is less threatened by the resistance and therefore is less likely to act in a defensive manner.

Counselor Reactions to Reluctance

Blocher (1966) draws attention to the same problem when he states that counselors often feel impatient, inadequate, or hurt by the

client's reluctance. In turn, they tend to blame their own clumsiness or misperceptions and find it difficult to accept the client in whose presence they feel insecure. Dyer and Vriend (1975) suggest that ". . . many counselors ignore the immediacy of the reluctance, becoming in turn reluctant themselves to identify what is happening in the relationship" (p. 99). Mowrer (1953) agrees:

If . . . the therapist does not see the meaning of such behavior [transference], he will almost certainly personalize it, and consciously or unconsciously, begin to show similar antagonisms with respect to the patient. When this occurs, the therapist is said to have fallen into the error of 'counter-transference,' to be 'countering' the transference. . . . (p. 81).

Countertransference can be interpreted as counselor-reluctance to building the therapeutic relationship. Brammer and Shostrum (1968) recommend that the counselor "must increase self-awareness so as to avoid counter-transference" (p. 222).

Although empirical evidence is sparse, the theoretical literature does contain some suggestions for the counselor who is attempting to deal with client reluctance. Vriend and Dyer (1973) suggest direct confrontation; Glasser (1965) concurs and urges acceptance of responsibility by the client. Krainen (1972) interprets reluctance as a form of client manipulation, and suggests maneuvers of countermanipulation on the part of the therapist. Fleischer (1972) calls for an "active, involved, and direct" (p. 69) counselor who presents a strong personal value system to the client, but nevertheless acts in a nonauthoritarian manner. Riordan, Matheny, and Harris (1978) approach the issue of client reluctance from the viewpoint of lack of motivation. Accordingly, the verbal and nonverbal techniques which they propose are

based upon such motivational principles as affiliation and encouragement, learned helplessness, extrinsic and intrinsic reward systems, goal setting, and consistency. Mowrer (1953) suggests that the counselor faced with a reluctant client actively model nondefensive behavior. Another suggestion made by Mowrer (1953), and one with which Brammer and Shostrum (1968) concur, is that the counselor should react in a manner that is inconsistent with the client's view of authority. Non-directive procedures, including reflection of feeling, warmth, and a supportive and accepting atmosphere, are recommended by Rogers (1942), Dyer and Vriend (1975), and Pietrofesa et al. (1972). Interpretation of reluctance is suggested by Dyer and Vriend (1975), Mowrer (1953), and Pietrofesa et al. (1972). However, they all agree that interpretation is seldom useful in the early stages of counseling. Pietrofesa et al. (1972), Truax and Carkhuff (1967), and Mowrer (1953) refer to the importance of emphasizing the feeling level, of speaking about the emotion rather than acting it out. Pietrofesa et al. (1972) suggests that silence may sometimes be effective. Dyer and Vriend (1975) state that a mutually agreed upon behavioral contract is often an effective way to handle client resistance. Blocher (1966) stated:

There are no general pat solutions or techniques that will solve relationship problems. The best approach to most of these relationship phenomena is one of direct, open, and honest reaction to the client. If the counselor can be secure enough. . . . (p. 153).

Facilitative Counselor Characteristics

Respect and Genuineness

Rogers (1957) included unconditional positive regard, or respect, as one of the conditions for constructive personality change.

The essential component of counselor-offered respect is the counselor's acceptance of the client as a worthy and capable individual. Rogers (1961) addresses respect in the following manner:

Another issue is whether I can be acceptant of each facet of this other person which he presents to me. Can I receive him as he is? --Can I permit him to be what he is-- honest or deceitful, infantile or adult, despairing or over-confident? Can I give him the freedom to be? --Can I free him from the threat of external evaluation? (pp. 53-54).

Another of the conditions for constructive personality change included by Rogers (1957) was congruence, or counselor-genuineness within the relationship. This condition calls for the therapist to be an honest, real, open, and sincere person. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) explain genuineness as "basically a direct personal encounter," as a "meeting on a person-to-person basis without defensiveness or retreat into facades," and as an "openness to experience" (p. 32). The counselor must be able to differentiate the construct of genuineness from that of facilitative genuineness. Patterson (1974) explains:

The emphasis upon the therapist's being freely and deeply himself in a nonexploitative relationship incorporates one critical qualification. When his only genuine responses are negative in regard to the second person, the therapist makes an effort to employ his responses constructively as a basis for further inquiry for the therapist, the client and their relationship (p. 63).

The counselor-offered facilitative conditions of respect and genuineness are interrelated. This is stressed by Truax and Carkhuff (1967) when they state that counselor-genuineness is the most basic quality needed in the relationship. Once this "reality of the person of the therapist" is established, then the respect communicated to the client "becomes the second central ingredient." Finally, they

stated that "given a relationship characterized by warmth and genuineness, the 'work' of therapy and counseling begins" (p. 32).

Truax (1963) makes two statements that are of additional interest to the aspect of the interrelatedness of the core conditions:

The achievement of a high level of accurate empathy is dependent upon first obtaining at least a minimally high level of unconditional positive regard. --Neither of these two conditions [respect or empathy] could function properly without the therapist being himself integrated and genuine within the therapeutic encounter (p. 259).

The research of Delaney, Long, Masucci, and Moses (1969) tends to support the preceding statements. Delaney et al. studied the impact of the counseling practicum on the facilitative conditions of empathy, warmth (respect), and genuineness. Ten subjects were evaluated at the beginning, middle, and end of a 15 week supervised practice in counseling. Mean empathy, warmth, and genuineness scores were obtained for each of the three stages. One-tailed t-tests for the significance of difference between correlated means were used to test the hypothesis that the facilitative conditions would increase with practice. Data in support of this hypothesis was significant beyond the .05 level. But, it is another aspect of the Delaney study that is of particular interest to the concept of interrelatedness. The empathy scale proved to be the most efficient in that its variance could best be accounted for by the practice variable. The authors concluded that counselor "warmth and genuineness may be variables conceptually independent of empathy [although] they will tend to covary with the latter" (p. 279).

Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) also add to the understanding of the relationship between empathy and the other core conditions of

respect and genuineness. They make a clear distinction between "initial" empathy and final "accurate" empathy and state that counselors are able to "technique-it during early phases of therapy" (p. 26). It was for this reason that empathy was not included in this study.

The aforementioned statements of Truax (1963), Carkhuff and Berenson (1967), and Delaney et al. (1968) appear to lend credence to the theory that empathy is developmental within the counselor relationship, while respect and genuineness are more generalized and internalized counselor characteristics.

Respect and genuineness have been empirically correlated with successful therapeutic outcome. Muehlberg (1969) selected three practicing counselors, all male, on the basis of their success-treatment ratios. Each counselor saw the same client for a single therapeutic interview. Two experts rated the interviews on the basis of the Carkhuff scales of empathy, respect, genuineness, concreteness, and self-disclosure. Ratings of counselors were found to be rank-ordered consistently with their success-treatment ratios.

Wiggins (1978) divided 30 counselors on the basis of their performance on the Carkhuff measures as rated by three independent judges. The mean group rating for the top half was 3.05; bottom half mean was 2.04. Thirty middle school boys were referred for counseling by their language arts teachers. The teachers completed behavioral rating forms for each boy a month prior to counseling and six weeks after counseling was concluded. Clients and counselors met for 30 minutes, once a week for four weeks. Students counseled by the bottom group showed a mean gain on the behavioral rating forms of 1.60, compared with a mean gain of 3.27 for those counseled by the top half group of counselors ($t=1.828$, $df=28$, $p<.05$).

Akridge and Bergeron (1975) used the Carkhuff (1969) scales for the measurement of the facilitative conditions of respect and genuineness to discriminate counselor orientation. Employment service counselor trainees served as clients and as counselors for 38 simulated counseling sessions. Tapes were evaluated on a five-point continuum ranging from placement oriented to counseling oriented, on the facilitative conditions scales, and on frequency of type of response. A stepwise multiple regression ($R=.74$) yielded a significant multiple R ($p<.01$), indicating that each of the facilitative variables was positively correlated with counseling oriented behavior. A second hypothesis, that counselors providing a high level of the facilitative conditions would manifest a different pattern of responses than those providing a low level of the core conditions, was tested by means of a chi-square. The difference in response patterns for the two groups was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. The researchers concluded that high facilitators

confront their clients in an active, expressive, concrete, and genuine encounter which communicates helpful caring, empathic understanding, personal warmth, and a strong belief in the client's worth. There is a notable absence of cold, rejecting, or hostile behavior or of demanding and controlling behaviors [and] of passive, evasive, and guarded behaviors (p. 162).

The constructs of respect and genuineness appear to be more easily related to counseling in a non-directive or existential framework. However, these counselor-offered, facilitative conditions are also of interest when therapy is conducted from the point of view of other theoretical orientations. Mickelson and Stevic (1970) studied the core or facilitative conditions when counseling was conducted in the behavioral mode. Counselors were divided into high

facilitative (above 2.5 on the Carkhuff scales) and low facilitative (below 1.5) groups. Both groups were given equal training in verbal reinforcement procedures prior to the experiment. Counselor goal was to increase the frequency of client information-seeking behavior. Client information-seeking behavior was the criterion variable. Hypotheses were tested for significance by using an analysis of variance. No difference was found in amount of counselor verbal reinforcement between facilitative and non-facilitative counselors. However, the criterion variable was significantly higher for those counselors identified as having high levels of empathic understanding, positive regard, and genuineness.

Attempts have been made to relate the facilitative conditions with a measure of self-actualization. Results have been non-conclusive. Foulds (1969a) used the Carkhuff scales together with the Shostrum Personal Orientation Inventory (POI, 1963). Trained judges rated 30 practicum students on the scales of empathy, respect, and genuineness. Mean scores for the top 27 percent and the lowest 27 percent and scores on the POI were analyzed by means of one-tailed t-tests. Significant differences were determined for 12 scales of the POI. These scales were Self-Actualizing Value, Existentiality, Feeling Reactivity, Spontaneity, Self-Regard, Self-Acceptance, Nature of Man, Synergy, Acceptance of Aggression, and Capacity for Intimate Contact. Foulds (1969b) treated the same data to correlation measures. Ability to communicate facilitative genuineness was positively correlated to ten POI scales ($p < .05$). Ability to communicate respect was not significantly related to any of the scales.

Winborn and Rowe (1972, 1973) replicated Fould's experiment using 50 subjects. The t-tests showed a significant difference on only one scale of the POI. Foulds' findings were also unsubstantiated by the correlational matrix. The one relationship that was found was attributed to chance.

Internality

Rogers (1961) states that the "optimal helping relationship is the kind of relationship created by the person who is psychologically mature" (p. 56). Perls (1971) states that "maturity is the transcendence from environmental to self-support" (p. 30). Self-support is the foundational aspect of the concept of locus of control, or internality. Rotter (1966) explains:

When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way by the individual, we have labeled this a belief in 'external control.' If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in 'internal control' (p. 1).

The concept of internality has been correlated with variables such as age, parental permissiveness, leadership, academic behavior, anxiety, and defensiveness (Moursund, 1976). Three recent studies are of particular interest to this research.

Martin and Shepel (1974) studied lay counselors' perceptions of helpful counseling conditions as related to their internality. Subjects were 21 senior female nursing staff members from urban hospitals. An 18 hour training program, based on variables outlined by

Carkhuff (1972), was used to train them in the helping relationship. Pre- and post-testing with the Discrimination Index (Martin, 1971), and the James I-E Scale (James and Shepel, 1973), revealed a significant increase in the ability to discriminate helpful counseling conditions and a significant shift toward internality. In addition, a significant relationship was noted between the post increased internality scores and post increased Discrimination Index scores ($r = -.56, p < .0001$).

Loesch, Crane, and Rucker (1978) found no significant correlation between internality and counseling effectiveness. Subjects of the experiment were 51 counselor-candidates. Internality was measured using the Rotter Internality-Externality (I-E) Scale (1966). Effectiveness was measured by supervisors using the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (Myrick and Kelly, 1971).

After reviewing over a thousand studies that dealt with either locus of control or levels of interpersonal functioning and finding none that dealt with both, Drasgow, Palau, Taibi, and Drasgow (1974) designed an initial exploration into this area. Three groups of adult male subjects were used. The first group consisted of 12 prisoners in a penitentiary; the second group consisted of 12 hospitalized alcoholics. These groups were reported to be alike in several ways: subjects had rarely held a job for an extended period of time, they were frequently unemployed, frequently collected unemployment or were on welfare, they were mostly school drop-outs, most had no skill or trade, most were not well-adjusted maritally. The third group consisted of 12 subjects selected as the antithesis of the first two groups. The subjects in this "success" sample were judged to be

effectively coping vocationally, maritally, socially, and economically. Six items were selected from Rotter's original list and used as the locus of control measures; three items requiring gross discrimination of interpersonal functioning were adopted from Carkhuff's (1969) standardized list. Mean, median, and modal locus and level scores were analyzed. No significant differences were found. In addition, the level and locus scores were correlated $-.54$ overall: $-.33$ in the success sample, $-.70$ with the prisoners, and $-.58$ in the alcoholic groups. The experimenters suggest that the correlatedness between the levels and locus indicates "that internality of locus may be a characteristic of successful functioners" (p. 368). However, results of this study must be interpreted in light of the brevity of the measuring instruments.

The Counseling Relationship

Tyler (1969) states:

At the very heart of the counseling process is a meeting of counselor and client . . . whatever influence counseling has is related most closely to the nature of the relationship that grows out of this encounter (p. 33).

Therapists of varying persuasions have been concerned about the nature of the counseling relationship. Ellenberger (1970), when speaking of psychiatry at the latter part of the 19th century, writes that "special consideration [was] given to the rapport between patient and magnetizer" (p. 111). Fine (Corsini, 1973) speaks for the contemporary use of psychoanalysis when he states that patient insight is a function of the patient's free associations and of "his acceptance by the analyst" (p. 21). Adler (1924) addresses himself to the

nature of the relationship when he writes of "understanding" and a "friendly way."

Krumboltz and Thoreson (1969) consider the relationship when counseling proceeds in a behavioral mode:

The counselor begins by listening carefully to the client's concerns. The counselor tries to understand and assess the client's thoughts and feelings. He first tries to see things from the client's point of view. He communicates his understandings to the client and attempts to determine if he is accurately perceiving the client's thoughts and feelings (p. 8).

Learning theorists, Dollard and Miller (1950), speak of the counselor who is calm, accepting, and noncondemning. Likewise, Wolpe and Lazarus (1966) state that the first things a counselor must do are to establish a trusting atmosphere, communicate a desire to help, and display empathy.

May (1961), as one representative of the existential school, believes that a relationship can only be developed in a non-threatening atmosphere. Later May (1967) speaks of "encounter" and "feeling into" the client. Jourard (1971) calls for "an honest relationship gradually developing into one of I and Thou; a dialogue, in which growth of both parties is the outcome" (p. 145). Assagioli (1965) emphasizes "the central, decisive importance of the human factor, of the living interpersonal relation between the therapist and the patient" (p. 67).

Moustakas (1959) draws attention to the living relationship when working with children:

The alive relationship between the therapist and the child is the essential dimension, perhaps the only significant reality in the therapeutic process and in all interhuman growth (p. xiii).

Wrenn (1973) is so concerned with the relationship that, for him, "counseling is caring" (p. 248).

Very few attempts have been made to empirically define the concept of the counseling relationship. Fiedler (1950b) was the first to attempt this task. His research led him to two conclusions. First, a good therapeutic relationship was easily recognized by lay persons as well as therapists of varying orientations. Second, the elements constituting a facilitative therapeutic relationship were identical to those of any good interpersonal relationship. Heine (1950) carried out a study similar to Fiedler's, with much the same results; i.e., there is a common character to the helping professions which exists within the parameters of the fundamental relationship.

The second major impetus to the definition of the relationship was provided by Rogers (1957) when he hypothesized the necessary and sufficient conditions for therapeutic personality change. Rogers' (1958) paper on the characteristics of the helping relationship outlined his conclusions concerning the therapeutic variables. Truax (1961, 1962a, 1962b), as a result of his work with Rogers and Gendlin at the Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, published three Discussion Papers describing scales for the measurements of the Rogerian therapeutic variables of accurate empathy, unconditional positive regard, and self-congruence. Thus, the counseling relationship was delineated into measurable facilitative elements.

Truax (1963) reported on his earlier work at the Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute. In that research, the scales of accurate empathy, unconditional positive regard, and self-congruence were applied

to 358 tape recorded segments taken from every fifth session of 14 schizophrenic patients. These samples were coded before being given to naive lay raters. Examination of the data showed that therapists in improved cases were judged to be consistently higher ($p < .05$) in offered levels of accurate empathy, unconditional positive regard, and self-congruence than therapists in unimproved or failure cases. The facilitative elements were now associated with counseling effectiveness. Carkhuff (1969) has since modified the Truax scales, renaming them empathic understanding, respect, and genuineness.

Combs (1969), building on the work of Fiedler, Heine, and Rogers, introduced, in 1959, the concept of self-as-instrument, the use of the helper's self/person as the primary tool in the helping process. The concept was tested during the academic year of 1961-1962 with 31 beginning counselors. It was found that 12 perceptual variables were significantly correlated ($p > .01$) with counselor-effectiveness. Effectiveness was evaluated by those professors who had primary responsibility for supervision of the students. The perceptual variables included: (1) internal frame of reference; (2) people orientation; (3) sees people as able; (4) sees people as dependable; (5) sees people as friendly; (6) sees people as worthy; (7) sees self as identified; (8) sees self as enough; (9) sees self as revealing; (10) sees purpose as freeing; (11) sees purpose altruistically; and (12) sees purpose in larger meanings.

Although there appears to be a theoretical difference between relationship as defined by Tyler (1969), Jourard (1971), Adler (1924), and Combs (1969), and the operational definition submitted by Truax

(1961, 1962a, 1962b) and Carkhuff (1969), current research reflects no such distinction. High levels of counselor-offered, facilitative variables have become empirically equated with sound interpersonal relationships.

Summary

The reluctant client has been introduced as a person who is unable or unwilling for whatever reason to enter into a therapeutic relationship with the counselor. Research on reluctance is sparse, and is directed mainly toward counseling techniques rather than counselor characteristics.

The facilitative characteristics of respect and genuineness, and the hypothesized facilitative characteristic of internality have been discussed as they relate to counseling effectiveness. Effectiveness has also been shown to correlate with the therapeutic use of the counselor's person in the developing interaction with the client.

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The first section of this chapter is a presentation of the tests used in this research, i.e., the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control and the Carkhuff scales for the measurement of genuineness and respect. The discussion covers test construction, reliability, validity, and norm data. Section two presents the method and procedures used in conducting this study. Subject selection, role-playing client, procedures involved in training judges, administering the Nowicki-Strickland, and the taping and rating of the counseling sessions is presented. A discussion of the statistical treatment of data concludes this chapter.

The purpose of this research is to test the relationship between the counselor-offered facilitative conditions of genuineness and respect and the counselor's internality.

Instrumentation

Nowicki-Strickland

The Adult Nowicki-Strickland Internal-External Control Scale (ANS-IE) (Nowicki and Duke, 1972) is suitable for use with college and non-college populations. It is a 40 item paper and pencil test

requiring yes and no responses. The items were derived through alteration of the Children's NS-IE (Nowicki and Strickland, 1971). Modification consisted mainly of changing the tense of some statements (N=5) to make them more appropriate for adults, and substituting the word "adult" for the word "children" in six items. The scale is scored in the external direction with the possible scores ranging from 0 to 40. Therefore, the higher the score, the greater the measured externality of locus.

Reliability. The test was originally presented by Nowicki and Duke (1974) to 158 college students and 33 adults from the general community. Internal consistency via the split-half methods was reported to range from .75 to .86 for four samples. In addition, Nowicki and Duke (1978) report that Anderson reported KR20 of .39 for a college female sample (N=40) and .69 for a college male sample (N=40).

Test-retest reliability for college subjects (N=48) over a six week period was reported .83 (Nowicki and Duke, 1974). Chandler (1976) reported .65 with a college sample (N=70) over a seven week period. For community college students (N=854), Mink (1976) reported a test-retest reliability of .56 over one year.

Validity. Non-significant correlations were reported by Nowicki and Duke (1978) between the ANS-IE scale and the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ($r=.10$, N=48, $r=.06$, N=68) for two groups of college students.

A significant relation between ANS-IE and Anomie scores was reported by Remainis (1976). Mink (1976) reported significant correlation with three scales constructed by Levinson: Internal scale

($r=-.24$, $N=1195$, $p<.01$); Chance ($r=+.40$, $N=1195$, $p<.01$); and Powerful Others ($r=+.24$, $N=1196$, $p<.01$).

In the area of psychopathology, social learning theorists have found that psychological maladjustment is related to externality (Rotter, Chance, and Phares, 1972). In support of this, Nowicki and Duke (1974) reported ANS-IE measures of externality to be significantly correlated to anxiety scores as measured by the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (males, $r=.34$, $N=36$, $p<.10$; and females, $r=.40$, $N=47$, $p<.05$) and to higher neuroticism scores on Eysenck's scale (males, $r=.36$, $N=36$, $p<.05$; and females, $r=.32$, $N=47$, $p<.05$). In addition, Chandler (1976) found that externals had a lower self-concept, lower self-acceptance, and a larger self-ideal discrepancy as measured by the Index of Adjustment and Value.

In the area of personality correlates, Mink (1976) reported internality related to lower Debilitating Anxiety scores ($r=.25$, $N=826$, $p<.01$). Duke and Nowicki (1971) concluded that externals show more interpersonal distance. Nemec (1973) correlated externality with authoritarianism.

Carkhuff Scales

The facilitative dimensions offered by the counselor-candidates during the tape recorded counseling session were measured by the Carkhuff (1969) scales of "Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Processes" and of the "Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes."

Each of these scales is set along a five-point continuum from negative (low) to positive (high). Level 1 is indicative of a

retarding therapist; 2 indicates the moderately retarding therapist; level 3 describes the counselor who is functioning neutrally, neither adding nor detracting from the client's communication; this is the minimally effective level. Level 4 indicates the more potent therapist who relates well interpersonally and offers a climate conducive to growth. Level 5 indicates optimal interpersonal functioning. Specific to the scales of respect and genuineness are the following brief descriptions. Respect: (1) counselor communicates a clear lack of regard; (2) counselor communicates little respect; (3) counselor communicates positive respect and concern; (4) clearly communicates deep respect, (5) deepest respect for a client's worth is communicated. Genuineness: (1) counselor's verbalizations are clearly unrelated to what he is feeling; (2) counselor's verbalizations are slightly unrelated to what he is feeling; (3) counselor provides no negative cues and no positive cues; (4) counselor presents some positive cues indicating a genuine response; (5) counselor is deeply and freely himself. (See Appendix A for complete nonfacilitative and facilitative response descriptions.)

The scale for the measurement of "Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Processes" (Carkhuff, 1969) was derived from a compilation of "A Tentative Scale for the Measurement of Therapist Genuineness or Self-Congruence" (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) and from an earlier multi-dimensional model described by Carkhuff and Berenson (1967). The scale for the measurement of the "Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes" (Carkhuff, 1969) was derived from a compilation of "A Tentative Scale for the Measurement of Unconditional Positive Regard" (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) and from the earlier

work discussed by Carkhuff and Berenson (1967). Both of the present scales were developed in an attempt to reduce ambiguity and increase reliability.

Reliability. The consideration of reliability (can you get repeated measures that are closely related?) was addressed by Truax and Carkhuff (1967) through a review of 28 studies. The review encompassed screening interviews, individual therapy, and group process. The reliability data reported for the scales of Respect and Genuineness during regular one-to-one counseling (except as indicated by notes 1 and 2) is presented in Table I. Range of coefficients for respect was .48 to .86. Genuineness coefficients ranged from .40 to .83. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) concluded that "Most often a moderate to high degree of reliability is obtained with the scales" (p. 44).

Validity. The question of validity (do the scales measure what they are designed to measure?) has traditionally been addressed from the point of view that the scales are capable of significant differentiation between levels measured (Truax, 1967).

Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Hoehn-Saric, Nash, and Stone (1966) analyzed tape recordings of 40 patients randomly assigned to two psychiatrists for screening interviews. The findings indicated that the two therapists differed significantly from each other on self-congruence (genuineness; $p < .01$). Similar analysis was carried out after the patients had been randomly assigned to four different psychiatrists for therapy. Findings indicated that the different therapists offered different levels of nonpossessive warmth (respect; $p < .05$) and genuineness ($p < .001$).

TABLE I
RELIABILITY REPORTS OF RATING SCALES FOR
RESPECT AND GENUINENESS

Study	Samples n=	Clients n=	Therapists n=	Respect	Genuineness	Statistic
Truax (1961)	384	8	7	.50	.40	Pearson
Wargo (1962)	297	14	10	.50		Pearson
Truax (1962)	104	26	1	.55	.40	Pearson
Truax and Carkhuff (1963)	297	14	10	.50	.40	Pearson
Truax and Carkhuff (1963)	112	28	24	.55		Pearson
Truax and Carkhuff (1963)	64	8	8	.62	.45	Pearson
Truax and Carkhuff (1965)	45	3	1	.70	.83	Ebel
Carkhuff and Truax (1965)	151	70	28	.48	.62	Pearson
Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Nash, Hoehn-Saric, and Stone (1966)	182	40	4	.59	.60	Ebel
Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Nash, Hoehn-Saric, and Stone (1966)	80 ¹ 182	40 40	2 4	.57 .59	.55 .60	Pearson Ebel
Truax (1966)	283	63	1	.86	.81	Ebel
Truax (1966)	50 ² 50	5 5	5 5	.84 .81		Pearson Pearson

¹Screening Interview

²Edited

Carkhuff, Piaget, and Pierce (1967) discuss three studies in which the levels of functioning of college freshmen, college senior psychology majors, and beginning graduate students in clinical and counseling psychology were assessed. Beginning college students' mean interpersonal functioning level was 1.5 overall. Senior psychology majors were found to be functioning at 1.9 overall, significantly above the freshmen. The psychology graduate students were functioning at a level significantly higher than the seniors (\bar{X} = 2.3 overall).

Carkhuff and Truax (1965) rated and compared a group of 15 prominent therapists, a group of 12 graduate students in clinical psychology, and a group of five lay hospital personnel. The respective ratings of the three groups were consistently rank-ordered by level of experience: (a) the practicing therapists; (b) the graduate students; and (c) the lay personnel. Therapist self-congruence (Truax, 1962b) ratings were likewise rank-ordered by experience.

Methodology

Population

Subjects for this research were 31 counselor-candidates enrolled in their first experiential course, the Laboratory Experience in Counseling or pre-practicum. This course is customarily taken in the first semester of the graduate program at Oklahoma State University. One subject was dropped from the study because of previous relationship with the coached client. Therefore, a total of 30 counselor-candidates were the subjects for this study.

Procedure

Training of Judges. In accordance with the guidelines set forth by Carkhuff (1969) a 12 hour Discrimination Training Program was designed for the three Counseling Psychology doctoral candidates who served as raters. The format included a didactic session, paper-work exercises, video-taping rating, and discussion in three areas: gross discrimination, respect discrimination, and genuineness discrimination. (See Appendix A for copies of written exercises and handouts.) Interjudge reliability was assessed during the training period by means of a simple proportion of pairwise agreements. Actual data was not rated until mean reliability for each dimension rated reached a minimum of .60.

Administration of Nowicki-Strickland. In order that data collected during the counseling sessions not be contaminated by a possible counselor "set," the internality measure was administered during a regularly scheduled didactic class period approximately two weeks prior to video-taping of counseling sessions.

Role-Playing Client. A female, upper-level drama major served as a role-playing, reluctant client in this research. The concern was defined as relationship in nature; specifically, a roommate problem. The coached client was provided with a list of indicators of reluctance which were appropriate to her role. The list included: (1) arguing; (2) vague answers to counselor questions; (3) hostile attitude toward counselor; (4) questioning the competence of the counselor; (5) vituperative language; (6) fist-pounding; and (7) silence.

In addition, the coached client was provided with a list of suggested remarks: (1) You counselors are all alike; (2) Nobody's going to tell me how to live my life; (3) I don't know what you're talking about; (4) That's not what I meant; (5) I'm trying to explain this to you, but you just don't seem to understand; (6) Maybe we should just forget this whole thing; (7) I don't really want to be here. My roommate and I were supposed to do this together but she didn't show up; (8) Why do you keep interrupting me?; (9) I just said that; (10) Don't hand me any of that counselor junk; and (11) That's a stupid question. How do you think I felt?

Taping. One week prior to mid-term exams, each counselor-candidate made a 10 to 12 minute video tape with the coached client. The candidates were informed that this was a research project, that the client was role-playing, and that this experience was designed to provide them with additional practice in building a relationship with an unfamiliar client.

Rating. Each of the 30 counselor-candidates' video-tapes was assessed according to the Respect and Genuineness measured by each of the three judges. Each tape was rated on both measures simultaneously once every two minutes for a total of five times. This yielded five ratings per measure per judge per subject. Thus, each subject received a total of 15 separate ratings on the Respect measure and 15 separate ratings on the Genuineness measure. Each set of 15 ratings was then averaged in order to obtain a single score per subject per dimension.

Interjudge Reliability. Interjudge reliability was assessed during the Discrimination Training Program by means of a K-Index, K being equal to the number of observed pairwise agreements divided by the number of possible pairwise agreements.

Snedecor's adaption of Fisher's intraclass coefficient (Ebel, 1951) was used to assess interjudge reliability once actual data ratings began. The intraclass coefficient provides a reliability estimate of the average of judges' ratings. Scott's Pi Coefficient-Extended (Whitney and Enger, 1975) was used to provide a functional analysis of pairwise agreements. Pi-Extended yields the proportion of pairwise agreements above that which can be expected by chance, given the marginal frequencies of category usage.

Statistical Treatment. Relationships between respect, genuineness, and internality were determined by multiple regression (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973). F ratios were computed to ascertain the significance of the relationships.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Chapter IV presents the results of all statistics used in this study. Interjudge reliability was assessed by means of a simple proportion, herein designated as the K-Index, and Snedecor's adaption of Fisher's intraclass correlation (Ebel, 1951). Scott's Pi-Coefficient-Extended (Whitney and Enger, 1975) was used to evaluate pairwise agreements. Experimental hypotheses were analyzed by multiple regression (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973).

Interjudge Reliability

During the Discrimination Training Program (see Appendix A), proportion of possible pairwise agreements was determined through the use of a K-Index. K equaled the observed pairwise agreements of judges' ratings divided by the total pairwise agreements possible. Results are presented in Table II. Reliability coefficients computed on each of five samples for the respect dimension ranged from .46 to 1.0, with a mean of .73. Reliability coefficients computed on each of five samples for genuineness ranged from .33 to .86, with a mean of .62.

Reliability of the three judges' ratings of actual data was determined by using Snedecor's adaption of the Fisher intraclass correlation (Ebel, 1951). Snedecor's formula is designed to yield a reliability coefficient of the average ratings. Results are presented in Table III.

Reliability for the averages of three judges' ratings was .60 on the respect dimension and .72 on the genuineness dimension.

TABLE II
INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY COMPUTED WITH K-INDEX
DURING DISCRIMINATION TRAINING

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	Mean
Respect	.73	.46	.73	.73	1.0	.73
Genuineness	.86	.67	.83	.33	.40	.62

TABLE III
INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY COMPUTED
VIA SNEDECOR

	r _{ABC}
Respect	.60
Genuineness	.72

Reliability of judges' ratings of actual data was also assessed by means of Scott's Pi-Coefficient-Extended (Whitney and Enger, 1975). This statistic incorporates an adjustment for chance agreements. It

yields the proportion of pairwise agreements above that which can be expected by chance, given the marginal frequencies of category usage. Results are presented in Table IV. Reliability coefficients were computed for each two minute segment (N=30). Coefficients for respect ranged from .09 to .34, with a mean of .19. Coefficients for genuineness ranged from .02 to .19, with a mean of .10. Marginal frequency of category usage is reported in Table V.

TABLE IV
INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY COMPUTED WITH
SCOTT'S PI-EXTENDED

	Segment 1	Segment 2	Segment 3	Segment 4	Segment 5	Mean
Respect	.26	.20	.34	.09	.04	.19
Genuineness	.15	.19	.05	.02	.08	.10

Table V
MARGINAL FREQUENCIES OF CATEGORY USAGE

	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Category 5
Respect	90	204	142	14	0
Genuineness	110	204	118	18	0

For purpose of comparison, Table VI presents the reliability figures on the actual data assessed by means of the K-index. Reliability coefficients for five segments (N=30) on the respect dimension ranged from .37 to .54, with a mean of .48. Coefficients for the same five segments (N=30) on the genuineness dimension ranged from .31 to .49, with a mean of .40.

TABLE VI
INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY COMPUTED ON
ACTUAL DATA WITH K-INDEX

	Segment 1	Segment 2	Segment 3	Segment 4	Segment 5	Mean
Respect	.57	.50	.54	.37	.41	.48
Genuineness	.49	.44	.40	.36	.31	.40

Table VII presents a comparison of interjudge reliability coefficients obtained by the three different methods. Reliability of the average of the three judges' ratings was .50 for respect and .72 for genuineness when computed via Snedecor (Ebel, 1951). Mean reliability of the K-Index coefficients was .48 for respect and .46 for genuineness. Scott's Pi mean of coefficients for respect was .19 and for genuineness was .10.

TABLE VII
COMPARISON OF INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY
COEFFICIENTS

	Snedecor	Pi	K
Respect	.60	.19	.48
Genuineness	.72	.10	.40

Analysis of Experimental Hypotheses

The three null hypotheses of this research considered the relationships between respect, genuineness, and internality by means of multiple regression. F ratios were computed to test the significance of the relationships.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one is restated in null form: There is no relationship between counselor-candidates' scores on the facilitative dimensions of respect and genuineness and counselor-candidates' scores of internality when relating to reluctant clients. An alpha level of .05 was specified as necessary to reject the hypothesis. An F ratio of 3.33 with two and 27 degrees of freedom was necessary to reach the .05 level of confidence. Data pertaining to the first hypothesis is presented in Table VIII. Inspection of the data reveals an F ratio of 0.35, not large enough to conclude a statistically significant relationship. Therefore, null hypothesis one was not rejected.

TABLE VIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE MULTIPLE
LINEAR REGRESSION

Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	F
Respect and Genuineness	2	11.06242	5.53121	0.35
Residual	27	426.13757	15.78287	

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two is restated: There is no relationship between counselor-candidates' scores on the facilitative dimension of respect and counselor-candidates' scores of internality when relating to reluctant clients. Data is presented in Table IX. The partial correlation coefficient between respect and internality, with genuineness removed, was -0.1589 . With 27 degrees of freedom, the probability that this relationship is significant is 0.205. The F value was less than 1.0, and therefore was not statistically significant. Null hypothesis two was not rejected.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three is restated: There is no relationship between the counselor-candidates' scores on the facilitative dimension of genuineness and counselor-candidates' scores of internality when relating to reluctant clients. Data is presented in Table X. The

partial correlation coefficient between genuineness and internality was 0.1505. With 27 degrees of freedom, the probability of this relationship being significant is 0.218. The F value was less than 1.0, and therefore was not statistically significant. Hypothesis three was not rejected.

TABLE IX
PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENT RESPECT
WITH INTERNALITY

	Respect	df	p
Locus of Control	-0.1589	27	0.205

TABLE X
PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENT GENUINE-
NESS WITH INTERNALITY

	Genuineness	df	p
Locus of Control	0.1505	27	0.218

Summary

Based upon the results of the multiple R, the writer failed to reject all hypotheses. However, results need to be evaluated in light of the interjudge reliability coefficients which affected two of the three variables in the multiple regression equation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships between the facilitative variables of respect and genuineness and the hypothesized facilitative variable of internality. Subjects were 30 beginning counselor-candidates in their first experiential course at Oklahoma State University. Subjects made a 10 to 12 minute video tape of a counseling session with a client coached to demonstrate reluctance to entering a counseling relationship. Given that the stress of dealing with a reluctant client in this counseling situation minimized beginning counselor-candidates' use of newly learned responses, candidates were allowed to demonstrate those relationship-facilitating skills which they had previously internalized.

The 30 video tapes were rated on the facilitative dimensions of respect and genuineness, according to the Carkhuff rating scales, by three counseling psychology doctoral candidates. Ratings were taken every two minutes for a total of five ratings per judge per dimension. The raters participated in 12 hours of Discrimination Training (see Appendix A) on the use of the scales. The hypothesized facilitative dimension of internality for each counselor-candidate was assessed by the Adult Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale.

No statistically significant relationships were found between the facilitative variables of respect and genuineness and the hypothesized facilitative variable of internality. However, the multiple regression data was confounded by low interjudge reliability.

During the Discrimination Training Program, interjudge reliability coefficients were obtained with the use of the K-Index, K being the proportion yielded by dividing the observed pairwise agreements by the total possible pairwise agreements. Total possible pairwise agreements at this stage of the study was 15 per subject per dimension. Training reliability on the respect dimension ranged from .46 to 1.0, with a mean of .73 and a median of .73. Genuineness coefficients ranged from .33 to .86, with a mean of .62 and a median of .67.

Snedecor's (Ebel, 1951) intraclass coefficient was used to obtain interjudge reliability on actual video taped data. This statistic is designed to yield a reliability coefficient based upon the average ratings of two or more judges. Reliability of the average of the three judges' ratings for respect was .60; reliability of average ratings on the genuineness dimension was .72. It was expected that some discriminatory data had been lost, and since interjudge reliability was crucial to the validity of the regression equation, Scott's Pi Coefficient-Extended (Whitney and Enger, 1975) was computed to examine patterns of agreement more closely.

Pi-Extended is designed to yield reliability coefficients which indicate the proportion of pairwise agreements above that which can be expected by chance, given the marginal frequencies of category usage by the judges. Total possible pairwise agreements at the data-rating stage

of the research was .90. Mathematically, the Pi-Extended will always be equal to or less than the K-Index used for training. Mean reliability coefficients on video tape rating were .19 on the respect dimension and .10 on the genuineness dimension. Medians were .20 for respect and .08 for genuineness. K reliabilities were also computed on the actual data; means were .48 and .40 for respect and genuineness, respectively. (See Table VII for comparison of interjudge reliability estimates.)

Conclusions

Since no significant relationships between respect, genuineness, and internality can be concluded based upon this research, several areas are open to inquiry in an effort toward explanation and understanding.

1. The research questions posed in this study, although exploratory in nature, may have been ill formulated. Although over a thousand studies address either locus of control or levels of interpersonal functioning, the literature bearing upon the relationship of these variables is sparse. Those studies which have dealt with the issue (Martin and Shepel, 1974; Drasgow, Palau, Taibi, and Drasgow, 1974; Loesch, Crane, and Rucker, 1978) offer little support for a significant correlation.

The Martin and Shepel research (1974; see Chapter II), although it supports a relationship between internality and interpersonal functioning, does so from an observational point of view. In other words, Ss of their research were not required to demonstrate levels of

interpersonal functioning, but only to recognize them. This writer hesitates to generalize from the cognitive awareness of effective interpersonal functioning required in the aforementioned research to the behavioral demonstration of interpersonal effectiveness required of the subjects in the current study.

The Drasgow et al. research (1974; see Chapter II) concluded no significant differences between internality and interpersonal functioning, and additionally, reported a $-.54$ correlation between the variables for the groups studied. Counselors were not among the groups studied; nor were the subjects asked to demonstrate relationship facilitating dimensions. Also, the writer questions these conclusions on the basis of the brevity of the measuring instruments: six Rotter I-E (1966) items and three interpersonal functioning items from Carkhuff's (1969) standardized list.

Interpersonal functioning was measured quite differently in the Loesch et al. study (1978, see Chapter II). The variable was labeled "effectiveness," the subjects were counselor-candidates, and the instrument was the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (Myrick and Kelly, 1971). The internality measure was the Rotter I-E. No significant correlation was observed between counseling effectiveness and internality. The results of this research can be questioned on the basis of several factor-analytic studies of the Rotter I-E in which little mention is made of internal control in interaction with other persons. Factor I of the Rotter scale was characterized as "a belief concerning felt-mastery over the course of one's life" (Mirels, 1970, p. 227; Abrahamson, 1973, p. 320; MacDonald and Tseng, 1973). These same writers

described Factor II as "a belief concerning the extent to which the individual citizen is deemed capable of exerting an impact on political institutions." Dixon, McKee, and McRae (1976) identify Factor I as "control of world-political affairs," Factor II as "control of personal mastery" for males and "control of academic/career success" for females, and Factor III as "control of leadership success" (p. 316). Factor III encompassed an interpersonal dimensions for males only.

It would appear that the current study is the first to attempt correlation of the variables of respect and genuineness, as indices of interpersonal functioning in counselor-candidates, with an internality instrument which indicates a primary factor for "interaction with others" (Dixon, McKee, and McRae, 1976, p. 317). It is possible that no significant correlation exists.

2. The results of this research may have been invalidated by interjudge reliability. The Snedecor statistic yields a reliability of the average ratings for two or more judges. In this research, three judges each rated a single subject five times; these five ratings were averaged before the formula was applied. Therefore, the Snedecor coefficient in this research is actually the reliability of the average of the averages. It was suspected that some discriminatory data had been lost. Therefore, based upon the longstanding concern regarding interjudge reliability estimates (Fisher, 1964; Horst, 1949; Ebel, 1951; Whitney and Enger, 1975), a second formula was applied. The Scott's Pi-Extended allowed functional interpretation of the relationship in this instance because it is based upon

pairwise agreement. Pi-Extended is designed to yield the percent of total agreement above that which can be expected by chance given the marginal frequencies of category usage. As expected, percent of agreement above chance was low. Marginal frequencies clustered in categories two and three for respect, with occasional use of category one, infrequent use of category four, and no use of category five. For genuineness, marginal frequencies clustered in category two, with less frequent use of categories one and three, infrequent use of four, and no usage of category five (see Chapter IV, Table V). Thus, restricted range was a limiting factor in the reliability of the ratings. However, the K-Index, a simple proportion of pairwise agreements, showed estimates only slightly above those indicated by Pi.

3. The assumption upon which the data-gathering process rested may have been invalid. The assumption is restated: Given that the stress of dealing with a reluctant client in this counseling situation minimized beginning counselor-candidates' use of newly learned responses, candidates were allowed to demonstrate those relationship-facilitating skills which they had previously internalized. Rationale rests with Spence (1958) and Taylor's (1956) review of the Hullian explanation of the Yerkes/Dodson Law (1908): high anxiety is beneficial to the achievement of easy tasks; difficult tasks are best done under low anxiety. In addition, Phillips, Martin, and Meyers (1972) state that, "Generally, it is found that anxiety will debilitate performance early in learning, whereas later in learning anxiety is less likely to hinder performance. . . ." (p. 435). The difficulty of counseling with a reluctant client has been previously documented

in this study (Chapter II). Thus, the stress level engendered by this situation, a video taped interview with a client coached to reluctance, should have resulted in increased difficulty in accomplishing the task of remembering and using newly learned counseling responses. However, this assumption can be challenged by optimal-level theories (Arkes and Garske, 1977) which are interactionistic in nature and state that characteristics of both the environment and the individual must be taken into account. Each person prefers his or her own level of optimal stimulation and functions best when that internal level of preference is matched by the environment. It is possible that subjects of this research had a variety of organismic preferences for high/low levels of psychological complexity. No attempt was made to control for this possibility.

4. The method used to collect respect and genuineness ratings may have been inappropriate. Each two minute segment was rated on both the respect and genuineness dimensions. Thus, each subject was rated on each dimension five times by each of three judges. The fifteen judges' ratings per dimension were averaged for each subject to yield a mean score for entrance into the regression equation. If this research had been designed to address changes within the counseling relationship, then ratings which reflected transitions across each two minute period would have been necessary and appropriate. However, this research addressed overall levels of interpersonal functioning on the two dimensions of respect and genuineness. Perhaps the judges should have been allowed full ten minute perusal and requested to make a single, overall rating. It is possible that

every two-minute ratings intensified judges' concern for the process of discrimination rather than discrimination itself.

5. The Discrimination Training Program developed for and used in this study may have been inadequate for purposes of maximizing reliability. The training was undertaken by the volunteer judges for the expressed purpose of agreement. During the written exercises and practice tapes, ratings and rationale were freely discussed (this did not occur during reliability checks, however). Training for agreement resulted in use of a limited range, restricting variability and consequently all correlational measures. Training which is undertaken for the purpose of sensitivity is based upon a different premise, namely discrimination across the full range of the scale. It is this difference which affected reliability. Perhaps it is only with lengthy and intensive training in sensitive discrimination that agreement can be raised significantly above the level of chance.

6. Interjudge reliability is particular susceptible to instrumentation effects. Drew (1976, p. 215) states that instrumentation can be defined as the "threat to internal validity that occurs when changes in the calibration of a measuring instrument result in alteration of the scores that are recorded" or "changes in calibration in human observers that may result as a function of systematic differences in the way they judge and record observations." It is the latter half of the definition which particularly applies to interjudge reliability.

Interjudge reliability is essentially a function in the use of observational instruments; the reason being that an observational

instrument, such as the Carkhuff scales of Respect and Genuineness are designed to be, is only as valid as the observer. In effect, the scales serve as guidelines and the judges become the measuring instrument. The process is this: (1) observation and selection--the judge sees and hears certain behaviors; (2) perception--the judge defines and interprets those behaviors; (3) judgment--the judge compares his/her perception to the guideline; and (4) categorization--the judge rates the behavior. The instrument can be in error at any of the four steps in the process.

When the instrument, in this case the judge, reacts systematically to any variable other than the one being measured, it is in error. Human instrumentation is particularly susceptible to extraneous influences. Maturational factors such as hunger and fatigue affect the instrument. History, as a specific event, can intervene at any point and change the calibration of the instrument. Testing influence appears in the human instrument as increased facilitation or perhaps boredom with the process.

Any variable which systematically produces change in the instrument also systematically introduces change in the measurements yielded by that instrument. Thus, the respect and genuineness scores collected in this research could have been affected at any of the four steps in the rating process by the previously mentioned or any other extraneous variables. This study made no attempt to control for such variables.

Recommendations

Based upon the investigation undertaken in this study, the writer recommends the following plan of research:

1. The issue of training judges to rate levels of interpersonal functioning needs to be addressed. The design of separate studies to investigate different programs of discrimination training and their effects on interjudge reliability is suggested. Consideration should be given to: (a) the desirability of training separate judges to rate separate dimensions of functioning; (b) the behavioral components involved at each level of functioning; (c) the effects of a priori construct definition on judges' ratings; and (d) the length of training.

2. Literature pertaining to the measurement of interjudge reliability (product-moment correlation, multiple-regression, simple proportion, intraclass coefficients, pairwise agreement, etc.) needs to be compiled and re-assessed in order to make available to those persons involved in behavioral research a basis for informed decision-making.

3. The development of an instrument for the measurement of locus of control in interpersonal situations requires consideration. It is possible that compilation of those items of the Nowicki-Strickland, Rotter, and James I-E which load on the factor of interaction-with-others may be a beginning in this area.

4. The present study should not be replicated, but rather re-designed to include: (a) training for sensitive discrimination of all levels of functioning that results in maximization of interjudge

reliability; (b) use of a single statistic which effectively measures interjudge reliability at all stages of the research; (c) periodic checks on reliability as rating progresses; (d) a locus of control instrument adequate for measurement of internality in interaction with others; (e) control of the data-rating process to minimize internal threat to validity by instrumentation effects; (f) use of subjects' optimal-level of psychological complexity as a moderator variable; and (g) a single, overall rating on each dimension for each subject by each judge.

The writer also recommends further investigation into the issue of non-cognitive variables as additional selection criteria for counselor education programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahamson, D. Replication of dimensions of locus of control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41, 320.
- Adler, A. The practice and theory of individual psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1924.
- Akridge, R. L. & Bergeron, W. L. Empirical comparisons of counselor orientations. Journal of Employment Counseling, 1975, 7, 156-162.
- American Personnel and Guidance Association. The counselor: Professional preparation and role. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 41, 480-485.
- Arkes, H. R. & Garske, J. P. Psychological theories of motivation. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1977.
- Assagioli, R. Psychosynthesis. New York: Viking, 1965.
- Beier, E. G. Client-centered therapy and the involuntary client. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1952, 16, 332-337.
- Benjamin, A. The helping interview. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.
- Bialer, I. Conceptualization of success and failure in mentally retarded and normal children. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 303-320.
- Blocher, D. H. Developmental counseling. New York: Ronald Press, 1966.
- Brammer, L. M. The helping relationship. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Brammer, L. M. & Shostrom, E. L. Therapeutic psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and human relations. 2 vols. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and human relations: A brief guide for training lay helpers. In Readings in Human Relationships, edited by H. Altman. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1972.

- Carkhuff, R. R. & Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.
- Carkhuff, R. R., Piaget, G., & Pierce, R. The development of skills in interpersonal functioning. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 45-46.
- Carkhuff, R. R. & Truax, C. B. Training in counseling and psychotherapy: An evaluation of an integrated didactic and experiential approach. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 333-336.
- Chandler, T. A. A note on the relationship of internality-externality, self-acceptance, and self-ideal discrepancies. Journal of Psychology, 1976, 94, 145-146.
- Combs, A. W. Florida studies in the helping professions. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1969.
- Combs, A. W., Avila, D. L., & Purkey, W. W. Helping relationships: Basic concepts for the helping professions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Crandall, F. J., Katkowsky, W., & Crandall, V. C. Children's belief in their own control of reinforcement in intellectual-academic situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.
- Crider, B. The hostility pattern. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1946, 2, 267-273.
- Corsini, R. (Ed.). Current psychotherapies. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1973.
- Davis, S. E. & Robinson, F. P. A study of the use of certain techniques for reducing resistance during the counseling interview. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1949, 9, 297-306.
- Delaney, D. J., Long, T. J., Masucci, M. J., & Moses, H. A. Skill acquisition and perception change of counselor candidates during practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 8, 273-282.
- Dixon, D. N., McKee, C. S., & McRae, B. C. Dimensionality of three adult objective locus of control scales. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1976, 40, 310-319.
- Dollard, J. & Miller, N. Personality and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- Dragow, F., Palau, J., Taibi, R., & Dragow, J. Levels of functioning and locus of control. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1974, 30, 365-369.

- Drew, C. J. Introduction to designing research and evaluation. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1976.
- Duke, M. & Nowicki, S. Interpersonal distance as a function of race and sex of stimuli as mediated by locus of control. Paper presented at Southeastern Psychological Association, Miami Beach, 1971.
- Dyer, W. & Vriend, J. Counseling techniques that work. Washington, D.C.: APGA Press, 1975.
- Ebel, R. L. Estimation of the reliability of ratings. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 407-424.
- Ellenberger, H. The discovery of the unconscious. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- Fiedler, F. E. The concept of an ideal therapeutic relationship. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 239-245(a).
- Fiedler, F. E. A comparison of therapeutic relationships in psychoanalytic, non-directive, and Adlerian therapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 436-445 (b).
- Fisher, R. A. Statistical methods for research workers. (10th ed.) Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1946.
- Fleisher, G. Treatment of "unmotivated" adolescents and juvenile offenders. Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 1972, 5, 67-72.
- Foulds, M. L. Self-actualization and level of counselor interpersonal functioning. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1969, 9, 87-92 (a).
- Foulds, M. L. Self-actualization and the communication of facilitating conditions during counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 132-136 (b).
- Gazda, G. M. Human relations development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.
- Glasser, W. Reality therapy. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Goldstein, A. P., Heller, K. & Sechrest, L. B. Psychotherapy and the psychology of behavioral change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Graduate College. Thesis writing manual. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, Revised, 1975.
- Hansen, J. C., Stevic, R. R., & Warner, R. W. Counseling: Theory and process. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

- Heine, R. W. A comparison of patients' reports on psychotherapeutic experience with psychoanalytic, non-directive, and Adlerian therapists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.
- Hopper, G. Resistance in counseling groups. Together, Spring, 1978, 3, 37-48.
- Horst, R. A generalized expression for the reliability of measures. Psychometrika, 1949, 14, 21-31.
- James, W. H. & Shepel, L. F. Restandardization and factor-analytic study of the Likert method of measuring locus of control. Proceedings of the American Psychological Association, 1973, 8, 19-20.
- Johnson, O. G. Tests and measurements in child development. Vol. I. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Jourard, S. The transparent self. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1971.
- Kerlinger, F. N. & Pedhazur, E. J. Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.
- Krainen, J. Psychotherapy by countermanipulation. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1972, 129, 749-751.
- Krumboltz, J. D. & Thoreson, C. E. Behavioral counseling: Cases and techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Loesch, L. C., Crane, B. B., & Rucker, B. B. Counselor trainee effectiveness: More puzzle pieces? Counselor Education and Supervision, March, 1978, 17, 195-204.
- MacDonald, A. P. & Tseng, M. S. Dimensions of internal versus external control revisited. Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, 1973.
- Martin, R. D. Discrimination training with lay counselors. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Guidance and Counseling Association, Toronto, June, 1971.
- Martin, R. D. & Shepel, L. F. Locus of control and discrimination ability with lay counselors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 741.
- Maslow, A. H. Self-actualizing people: A study of psychological health. In C. E. Moustakas (Ed.), The self: Explorations in personal growth. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

- May, R., Ed. Existential psychology. New York: Random House, 1961.
- May, R. The art of counseling. New York: Random House, 1961.
- May, R. Psychology and the human dilemma. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1967.
- Mickelson, D. J. & Stevic, R. R. Differential effects of facilitative and nonfacilitative behavioral counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 18, 314-319.
- Mink, O. G. Impact of instruction and counseling on high risk youth. National Institute of Mental Health Project, Progress Report, 1976.
- Mirels, H. L. Dimensions of internal vs. external control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 226-228.
- Moursund, J. P. Learning and the learner. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1976.
- Moustakas, C. E. Psychotherapy with children. New York: Ballantine, 1959.
- Mowrer, O. H. Psychotherapy: Theory and research. New York: Ronald Press, 1953.
- Muehlberg, N. The factorial dimensions of high, moderate, and low functioning therapists. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 93-95.
- Myrick, R. D. & Kelly, F. D. Jr. A scale for evaluating practicum students in counseling and supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 330-336.
- Nemec, A. The effect of attitude similarity and locus of control on simulated jury decisions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1973.
- Nowicki, S. The development of a locus of control scale for children. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meeting, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Nowicki, S. & Duke, M. P. A locus of control scale for adults: An alternative to the Rotter. Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1972.
- Nowicki, S. & Duke, M. P. A locus of control scale for noncollege as well as college adults. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1974, 38, 136-137.

- Nowicki, S. & Duke, M. P. The Adult Nowicki-Strickland internal-external control scale (ANS-IE) college and noncollege forms. Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1978. (Mimeographed.)
- Nowicki, S. & Strickland, B. R. A locus of control scale for children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 148-154.
- Patterson, C. H. Relationship counseling and psychotherapy. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Perls, F. S. Gestalt therapy verbatim. New York: Bantam, 1971.
- Phillips, B. N., Martin, R. P., and Meyers, S. Interventions in relation to anxiety in school. In C. E. Spielberger (Ed.), Anxiety (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Pietrofesa, J. J., Leonard, G. E., & Van Hoose, W. The authentic counselor. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972.
- Redl, F. When we deal with children. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Redl, F. & Wineman, D. The aggressive child. Glencoe, Ill.: 1957.
- Remainis, G. Effects of counseling of locus of control orientation. A symposium: Developmental aspects of locus of control: New methods and prospects. American psychological Association Meetings, Washington, D.C., 1976.
- Riordan, R. J., Matheny, K. B., & Harris, C. W. Helping counselors minimize client reluctance. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1978, 18, 6-13.
- Rogers, C. R. Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1942.
- Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Rogers, C. R. The characteristics of a helping relationship. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1958, 37, 6-16.
- Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (whole no. 609).

- Rotter, J. B., Chance, J. E., & Phares, J. E. Applications of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972.
- Rotter, J. B. Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 56-67.
- Rowe, W. & Winborn, B. B. Self-actualization and counselor interpersonal functioning--a replication. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1973, 13, 79-84.
- Shostrom, E. L. Personal orientation inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1963.
- Snedecor, G. W. Statistical methods (4th ed.). Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1946.
- Snygg, D. & Combs, A. W. Individual behavior: A new frame of reference for psychology. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Spence, K. W. A theory of emotionally based drive and its relation to performance in competition and noncompetitive paired-associates. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1956, 52, 262-305.
- Taft, J. The dynamics of therapy in a controlled relationship. New York: Macmillan, 1933.
- Taylor, J. Drive theory and manifest anxiety. Psychological Bulletin, 1956, 53, 303-320.
- Truax, C. B. A scale for the measurement of accurate empathy. Discussion Paper, No. 20. Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1961.
- Truax, C. B. A tentative scale for the measurement of unconditional positive regard. Discussion Paper No. 23. Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1962(a).
- Truax, C. B. A tentative scale for the measurement of therapist genuineness of self-congruence. Discussion Paper No. 35. Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1962(b).
- Truax, C. B. Effective ingredients in psychotherapy: An approach to unraveling the patient-therapist interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 256-263.
- Truax, C. B. & Carkhuff, R. R. Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1967.

- Truax, C. B., Wargo, D. G., Frank, J. D., Imber, S. D., Battle, C. C., Hoehn-Saric, R., Nash, E. H., & Stone, A. R. Therapist's contribution to accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth and genuineness in psychotherapy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 22, 331-334.
- Turabian, K. L. A manual for writers. 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Tyler, L. E. The work of the counselor. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.
- Vriend, J. & Dyer, W. Counseling the reluctant client. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 240-246.
- Whitney, D. R. & Enger, J. M. Methods for estimating the reliability of categorical judges. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., 1975. (Mimeographed.)
- Wiggins, J. D. A comparison of counselor interview responses and helpee behavioral changes. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1978, 18, 95-99.
- Winborn, B. B. & Rowe, W. Self-actualization and the communication of facilitative conditions--a replication. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 26-29.
- Winborn, B. B. & Rowe, W. Self-actualization and counselor functioning: A replication. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1973, 13, 79-83.
- Wolpe, J. & Lazarus, A. Behavior therapy techniques. New York: Pergamon, 1966.
- Wrenn, C. G. The world of the contemporary counselor. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
- Wyatt, F. The self experience of the psychotherapist. In Counseling: Readings in theory and practice, pp. 303-309. Edited by McGowan, J. F. & L. D. Schmidt. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962.
- Yerkes, R. M. & Dodson, J. D. The relation of strength of stimulus to rapidity of habit formation. Journal of Comparative and Neurological Psychology, 1908, 18, 459-482.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DISCRIMINATION TRAINING PROGRAM

Respect

Level 1

The behavioral and verbal expressions of the counselor communicate negative regard or a clear lack of respect.

Example. The counselor may try to impose his own beliefs and values onto the client, may focus attention on himself by dominating the interchange, may challenge the accuracy of the client's perceptions, or devalue the worth of the client by indicating that the client is not capable of functioning properly on his own. The counselor may become the focus of evaluation.

These responses leave the client wishing he had not talked to the counselor, and will probably lead to termination.

Level 2

The counselor responds in a way that communicates very little respect for the experiences, feelings, or potential of the client.

Example. The counselor may respond in a mechanical or casual way, and may ignore what the client is feeling or saying. The counselor withholds himself from involvement in the relationship.

Such responses tend to terminate the interaction.

Level 3

The counselor communicates a positive respect and concern for the client's experiences, feelings, and potentials.

Example. The counselor suspends acting on his judgment of the client, and communicates an awareness of the client's ability to express himself and to constructively handle his situation. The counselor communicates an openness or willingness to enter the therapeutic relationship.

These responses constitute the minimally facilitative level of interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The counselor communicates a deep respect and concern for the client.

Example. The counselor communicates a clear recognition of the client as a person of worth, free to be himself, capable of thinking and expressing himself, and able to act constructively.

These responses enable the client to experience being valued as an individual and also tend to stimulate deeper interaction.

Level 5

The counselor communicates the very deepest respect for the client's potential as a free individual as well as for his worth as a person.

Example. The counselor shows deep concern for the human potential of the client and communicates a commitment to helping the client actualize that potential.

These responses tend to deepen the client's awareness of his worthiness as a human being.

Key Words

- Level 5 - Committed, Valuing
- Level 4 - Involved
- Level 3 - Open
- Level 2 - Withholds, Mechanical
- Level 1 - Imposes, Devaluates

Respect: Written Exercises

Situation One. Student teacher to another: "If I had done it my way instead of listening to my supervisor, the girl's mother wouldn't be mad at me now."

Responses:

- _____ 1. Who is your supervisor?
- _____ 2. You're mad at yourself for depending on her opinion instead of doing what you thought was right.
- _____ 3. That's nothing. My supervisor does that to me all the time.
- _____ 4. That's hard to take. Want to talk about it?
- _____ 5. Maybe she's not really as mad as you think. Why don't you call her and explain?
- _____ 6. You didn't follow your own good judgment, and got into trouble because of it.

Situation Two. Thirteen year old girl to parent: "Please. All my friends are going."

Responses:

- _____ 1. All your friends are NOT going.
- _____ 2. It'll be hard to explain to your friends if you can't go, won't it?
- _____ 3. Sounds important to you; let's talk about it.

- _____ 4. Wash your hands and set the table. We'll talk about it when your father gets home.
- _____ 5. I really wish you could go, but I'm short of money this month. Do you suppose you could earn half the money by babysitting?
- _____ 6. Hey, Little Friend; sounds like you're pretty uptight about this business. Sit down and we'll rap.

Situation Three. High school boy to science teacher: "How come you gave everyone else an 'A' on the project and not me? That's not fair."

Responses:

- _____ 1. You're angry because you think I've singled you out unfairly. I think we need to talk this out.
- _____ 2. How do you know you're the only one who didn't get an 'A'?
- _____ 3. You know the grading policy in this class.
- _____ 4. Sounds like you're uncertain about why you didn't get an 'A'; and think maybe I'm picking on you. You'd better come in sometime so we can clear this up.
- _____ 5. How dare you call me unfair?
- _____ 6. You feel that I've mistreated you. I have to go to class right now. But, come on back in an hour and we'll talk about it.

Situation Four. Student to counselor: "You don't know what its like to have everyone laughing at you behind your back."

Responses:

- _____ 1. Everyone?
- _____ 2. Its pretty painful to be made fun of.
- _____ 3. I know its hard for you to accept right now. But, that sort of thing happens to everyone sooner or later.
- _____ 4. Its not going to be easy to talk about; but if you want to tell me some of the details, I'll listen.
- _____ 5. Why would anyone do that?
- _____ 6. I guess there are two kinds of people in the world: some make fun of others and some don't.

Genuineness

Level 1

The counselor's only genuine responses are negative in regard to the client and appear to have a destructive effect upon the client. Or, the counselor's verbalizations are obviously unrelated to his present feelings.

Example. The counselor may be defensive in his interaction. Defensiveness can be displayed through word content, voice quality, or physical discomfort. The counselor attempts to hide his feelings or uses them to punish the client.

In summary, there is considerable evidence of a wide discrepancy between the counselor's verbalization and his inner experience. Where no discrepancy exists, the counselor's reactions are employed in a destructive manner.

Level 2

The counselor's words are slightly unrelated to his feelings. Or, his genuine responses are negative and he is unable to use them for constructive inquiry into the relationship.

Example. The counselor responds according to a preconceived role. His manner may have a rehearsed quality. His responses are congruent with the role he is playing, but incongruent with his own feelings.

Level 3

The counselor offers no "negative cues" that would indicate a discrepancy between what he appears to be feeling and what he is saying; nor does he provide any positive cues that would indicate a really authentic response to the client. The absence of incongruence.

Example. The counselor listens and follows the client, thereby communicating a willingness to further involvement. Responses are appropriate and do not appear insincere.

These responses constitute the minimally facilitative level of interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The counselor's response (whether positive or negative) is communicated in a nondestructive manner and is consistent with what he is feeling. Responses at this level form a basis for further inquiry into the relationship.

Example. The counselor responds with many of his own feelings, and there is no doubt that he means what he says. Feelings, communicated in this way, strengthen the relationship. Though the counselor's verbal expressions are congruent with what he is feeling, he may be hesitant to express them fully. A controlled expression of feeling.

Level 5

The counselor is freely and completely himself in a nonexploitative relationship with the client.

Example. The counselor is clearly being himself, spontaneous in his interactions, and open to both pleasant and hurtful aspects of the experience. His responses are genuine, and employed in a constructive manner that is facilitative to the relationship.

Key Words

Level 5 - Congruent, Spontaneous

Level 4 - Controlled Expression

Level 3 - Sincere Openness to Involvement

Level 2 - Roleplayed, Mechanical, Cop-Out

Level 1 - Phony, Punishing, Defensive

Genuineness: Written Exercises

Situation One. Seventh grade boy to teacher who has just moved across the room to quiet some students: "You must be nervous about the principal coming to visit our class this afternoon."

Responses:

- _____ 1. Jeff, this is a day just like any other.
- _____ 2. Yes, I'm nervous. I hope I can count on you to help me.
- _____ 3. If you would behave yourselves, I wouldn't have to be nervous.
- _____ 4. Most people would be nervous in this situation.
- _____ 5. Of course not; he's just another person like you or me.
- _____ 6. What are you worried about me for? Mind your own business.

Situation Two. Tenth grade boy to student teacher: "Hey, I like you. Want to go to a party with me Saturday night?"

Responses:

- _____ 1. It's against the rules for teachers to date students.
- _____ 2. That really surprises me; you asking me for a date.
- _____ 3. Better ask someone your own age. I don't date kids.
- _____ 4. I have a boyfriend already.
- _____ 5. Thanks. I'm glad you like me; but I just don't know how to answer that.
- _____ 6. I feel flattered that I'm important to you. But, I think I'd feel too uptight about the difference in our ages.

Situation Three. Pam, a fourth grader who has 'forgotten' her homework for the third day: "I'm sorry. I won't do it again. I'll bring it tomorrow, I promise."

Responses:

- _____ 1. You're all alike--just trying to see how much you can get away with. Well, enough is enough. Go to the office.
- _____ 2. A teacher can't allow a student to keep putting off her work. It's time you brought in your assignments.
- _____ 3. You're having trouble remembering your homework; and I'm having trouble being patient.
- _____ 4. If you don't bring it tomorrow, I'll have to call your mother.
- _____ 5. Pam, that's the something you said yesterday and the day before. I want to believe you, but it's getting harder every day.

Situation Four. Student to Counselor: "You're just like all the rest. Nobody cares what's important to me. Just so I follow your dumb rules."

Responses:

- _____ 1. Rules are rules. And the sooner you learn that the better off you'll be.
- _____ 2. There's something about what you're saying that makes me feel really angry. I'm not sure, but I think maybe I'm mad about not being given a chance to speak for myself.
- _____ 3. I'm willing to listen if you want to tell me what is important to you.

- _____ 4. I think you're trying to make me mad so that I will behave toward you the way everyone else does.
- _____ 5. With an attitude like that, it's no wonder you get into trouble.
- _____ 6. I'll let you work out the rule violations with the assistant principal. But while you're here with me, let's see what we can do to make you a little more happy.

TABLE XI
DISCRIMINATION TRAINING RATINGS,
RESPECT

Subjects	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C
1	3·4·3·2·2	3·2·2·2·2	3·2·2·2·2
2	3·3·3·3·4	3·3·2·4·4	1·2·2·4·4
3	1·1·1·1·4	1·1·1·1·3	2·1·1·1·3
4	3·3·2·2·2	3·2·2·3·2	3·3·2·3·2
5	3·2·2·2·2	3·2·2·2·2	3·2·2·2·2

TABLE XII
DISCRIMINATION TRAINING RATINGS,
GENUINENESS

Subjects	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C
1	3·3·2·3·3	3·3·2·3·2	3·3·2·3·2
2	3·2·2·2·1	2·2·2·2·2	3·2·2·2·3
3	2·2·2·2·2	3·2·2·2·2	3·2·2·2·2
4	4·4·4·4·4	3·3·4·3·3	3·3·3·3·4
5	4·4·3·3·4	3·4·2·3·3	3·4·3·2·2

APPENDIX B

JUDGES' RATINGS OF RESPECT AND GENUINENESS

TABLE XIII
RATINGS OF DATA

Subjects	Respect			Genuineness		
	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C
1	3·2·1·1·2	3·2·2·2·2	2·2·1·1·1	3·2·1·1·1	3·2·2·1·1	2·2·1·1·2
2	2·2·2·3·3	2·2·2·2·3	2·3·2·2·2	2·2·3·3·3	3·2·2·2·2	2·3·2·2·1
3	3·2·2·3·2	1·2·1·2·1	1·1·1·1·2	3·3·2·3·2	1·2·1·1·1	1·2·1·1·2
4	2·2·2·2·1	2·2·2·1·1	2·2·1·1·1	3·2·2·3·1	2·2·2·1·2	1·1·1·1·1
5	3·3·4·3·3	3·3·3·3·3	2·2·2·2·2	3·3·4·3·4	3·3·2·2·2	2·1·1·1·1
6	3·4·3·3·2	2·3·3·2·2	2·4·3·2·2	3·4·4·3·3	2·3·2·2·2	2·4·3·2·2
7	2·2·3·2·3	2·2·2·2·2	3·2·2·2·1	2·2·3·3·3	2·2·2·2·2	1·1·1·1·1
8	3·3·3·2·3	3·3·3·3·3	3·4·3·4·4	2 3 3 3 4	2 3 2 2 3	3 4 3 4 4
9	3·3·2·2·3	3·2·3·1·2	2·2·2·1·1	3·3·2·3·3	3·2·2·2·2	2·1·1·1·1
10	2·2·1·2·2	3·3·2·3·2	2·2·2·3·2	2·2·1·2·3	2·2·2·2·2	2·2·2·3·2
11	3·3·2·2·3	3·3·2·2·2	3·2·3·2·3	3·3·2·2·3	3·3·2·2·2	3·3·3·2·2
12	3·2·1·2·3	2·2·1·2·2	1·1·1·1·1	4·2·1·2·3	2·2·1·2·2	1·1·1·1·1
13	2·2·1·2·3	3·2·3·2·2	2·1·2·1·1	3·2·2·2·3	3·2·2·3·2	3·1·1·1·1
14	2·3·2·2·3	2·3·3·2·2	1·2·2·3·1	2·3·2·2·3	2·2·2·2·2	1·1·2·3·2
15	3·3·2·2·2	4·3·2·3·3	4·2·2·2·2	3·3·2·2·2	3·3·2·3·2	3·1·1·2·1
16	2·1·2·3·2	2·2·2·2·1	2·2·2·2·1	2·1·2·3·2	2·2·1·1·1	2·2·1·1·1
17	3·3·3·3·3	2·3·2·2·2	2·2·1·1·2	3·3·3·2·3	2·2·2·2·2	2·1·1·1·2
18	3·3·3·4·3	3·2·3·2·1	2·3·2·3·1	3·4·3·4·3	2·2·2·2·2	1·2·2·3·1
19	2·3·3·2·2	3·3·1·2·2	2·3·1·1·2	2·3·3·3·2	3·2·2·1·2	3·2·1·1·1
20	3·2·4·3·3	3·2·1·2·2	3·2·1·2·2	3·3·4·3·3	3·2·1·2·2	3·2·2·2·2

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Subjects	Respect			Genuineness		
	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C
21	2·3·2·2·2	2·2·2·2·2	2·2·2·2·2	2·2·2·2·2	3·2·2·2·2	1·2·2·2·1
22	2·1·2·3·4	3·2·2·3·3	2·2·2·2·2	2·1·2·3·3	2·2·2·2·3	2·2·2·2·2
23	3·3·1·2·4	3·3·3·3·2	3·2·1·2·3	3·3·1·3·3	3·3·2·2·2	2·3·2·2·3
24	2·2·1·1·1	2·2·1·1·1	2·2·1·1·2	2·2·1·1·1	2·2·1·1·1	2·1·1·1·2
25	3·2·1·1·1	2·2·1·1·1	2·1·1·2·1	3·2·1·2·1	2·1·1·1·1	2·1·1·2·1
26	2·3·4·3·3	3·1·2·1·2	3·3·2·2·3	2·3·4·4·3	3·2·2·1·2	3·3·1·2·3
27	2·3·4·3·3	2·3·3·2·2	2·3·3·3·3	3·3·4·3·3	2·3·3·2·2	2·3·3·3·3
28	2·1·2·2·1	1·1·2·1·2	1·1·2·1·2	2·1·2·2·1	1·1·2·2·2	2·1·2·1·2
29	3·4·4·3·3	3·2·1·1·1	3·1·1·1·1	3·4·4·3·3	3·2·2·2·2	3·1·1·2·1
30	2·2·2·2·1	2·1·1·2·2	1·2·1·2·1	2·2·2·2·1	2·1·1·1·1	1·1·1·1·1

APPENDIX C

INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY

Snedecor's Intraclass Coefficient

$$r_1 = \frac{M_{\bar{x}} - M}{M_{\bar{x}} + (k-1) M}$$

TABLE XIV
DATA RATING MEANS

Subjects	Respect			Genuineness		
	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C
1	1.8	2.2	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.6
2	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.2	2.0
3	2.4	1.4	1.2	2.6	1.2	1.4
4	1.8	1.6	1.4	2.2	1.8	1.0
5	3.2	3.0	2.0	3.4	2.4	1.2
6	3.0	2.4	2.6	3.4	2.2	2.6
7	2.4	2.0	2.0	2.6	2.0	1.0
8	2.8	3.0	3.6	3.0	2.4	3.6
9	2.6	2.2	1.6	2.6	2.2	1.2
10	1.8	2.6	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.0
11	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.6
12	2.2	1.8	1.0	2.4	1.8	1.0
13	2.0	2.4	1.4	2.4	2.4	1.4
14	2.4	2.4	1.8	2.4	2.0	1.8
15	2.4	3.0	2.4	2.4	2.6	1.6
16	2.0	1.8	1.8	2.0	1.4	1.6
17	3.0	2.2	1.6	2.8	2.0	1.4
18	3.2	2.2	2.2	3.4	2.0	1.8
19	2.4	2.2	1.8	2.6	2.0	1.6
20	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.2	2.0	2.2

Scott's Pi-Coefficient-Extended

$$\pi = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^c \sum_{k=1}^s \epsilon_{jk}^f \cdot jk^2 - rs}{r(r-1)s} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^c \epsilon_{jj}^f \cdot j^2}{(rs)^2}$$

$$1 - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^c \epsilon_{jj}^f \cdot j^2}{(rs)^2}$$

Respect - Segment 1

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
2			3	(9)							3
3	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
4			3	(9)							3
5			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
6			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
7			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
8					3	(9)					3
9			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
10			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
11					3	(9)					3
12	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					0
13			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
14	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
15					1	(1)	2	(4)			1
16					3	(9)					3
17			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
18			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
19			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
20					3	(9)					3
21			3	(9)							3
22			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
23					3	(9)					3
24			3	(9)							3
25			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
26			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
27			3	(9)							3
28	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
29					3	(9)					3
30	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
Total	7	(49)	42	(1764)	39	(1521)	2	(4)			51

Genuineness - Segment 1

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
2			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
3	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
4	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
5			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
6			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
7	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
8			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
9			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
10			3	(9)							3
11					3	(9)					3
12	1	(1)	1	(1)			1	(1)			
13					3	(9)					3
14	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
15					3	(9)					3
16			3	(9)							3
17			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
18	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
19			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
20					3	(9)					3
21	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
22			3	(9)							3
23			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
24			3	(9)							3
25			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
26			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
27			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
28	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
29					3	(9)					3
30	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
Total	10	(100)	43	(1849)	36	(1296)	1	(1)			44

Respect - Segment 2

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1			3	(9)							3
2			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
3	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
4			3	(9)							3
5			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
6					1	(1)	2	(4)			1
7			3	(9)							3
8					2	(4)	1	(1)			1
9			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
10			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
11			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
12	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
13	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
14			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
15			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
16	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
17			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
18			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
19					3	(9)					3
20			3	(9)							3
21			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
22	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
23			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
24			3	(9)							3
25	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
26	1	(1)			2	(4)					1
27					3	(9)					3
28	3	(9)									3
29	1	(1)	1	(1)			1	(1)			
30	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
Total	12	(144)	45	(2025)	29	(841)	4	(16)			45

Genuineness - Segment 2

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1			3	(9)							3
2			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
3			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
4	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
5	1	(1)			2	(4)					1
6					1	(1)	2	(4)			1
7	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
8					2	(4)	1	(1)			1
9	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
10			3	(9)							3
11					3	(9)					3
12	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
13	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
14	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
15	1	(1)			2	(4)					1
16	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
17	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
18			2	(4)			1	(1)			1
19			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
20			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
21							3	(9)			3
22	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
23					3	(9)					3
24	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
25	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
26			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
27					3	(9)					3
28	3	(9)									3
29	1	(1)			1	(1)	1	(1)			
30	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
Total	20	(400)	36	(1296)	29	(841)	5	(25)			40

Respect - Segment 3

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
2			3	(9)							3
3	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
4	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
5			1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)			
6					3	(9)					3
7			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
8					3	(9)					3
9			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
10	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
11			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
12	3	(9)									3
13	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
14			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
15			3	(9)							3
16			3	(9)							3
17	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
18			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
19	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
20	2	(4)					1	(1)			1
21			3	(9)							3
22			3	(9)							3
23	1	(1)			2	(4)					1
24	3	(9)									3
25	3	(9)									3
26			2	(4)			1	(1)			1
27					2	(4)	1	(1)			1
28					3	(9)					3
29	2	(4)					1	(1)			1
30	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
Total	26	(676)	36	(1296)	23	(529)	5	(25)			49

Genuineness - Segment 3

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
2			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
3	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
4	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
5	1	(1)	1	(1)			1	(1)			
6			1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)			
7	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
8			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
9	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
10	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
11			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
12	3	(9)									3
13	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
14			3	(9)							3
15	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
16	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
17	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
18			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
19	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
20	1	(1)	1	(1)			1	(1)			
21			3	(9)							3
22			3	(9)							3
23	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
24	3	(9)									3
25	3	(9)									3
26	1	(1)	1	(1)			1	(1)			
27					2	(4)	1	(1)			1
28			3	(9)							3
29	1	(1)	1	(1)			1	(1)			
30	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
Total	29	(841)	44	(1936)	11	(121)	6	(36)			36

Respect - Segment 4

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
2			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
3	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
4	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
5			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
6			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
7			3	(9)							3
8			1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)			
9	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
10			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
11			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
12	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
13	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
14			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
15			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
16			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
17	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
18			1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)			
19	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
20			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
21			3	(9)							3
22			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
23			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
24	3	(9)									3
25	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
26	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
27			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
28	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
29	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
30			3	(9)							3
Total	21	(441)	45	(2025)	22	(484)	2	(4)			33

Genuineness - Segment 4

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1	3	(9)									3
2			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
3	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
4	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
5	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
6			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
7	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
8			1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)			
9	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
10			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
11			3	(9)							3
12	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
13	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
14			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
15			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
16	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
17	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
18			1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)			
19	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
20			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
21			3	(9)							3
22			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
23			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
24	3	(9)									3
25	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
26	1	(1)	1	(1)			1	(1)			
27			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
28	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
29			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
30	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
Total	25	(625)	42	(1764)	20	(400)	3	(9)			32

Respect - Segment 5

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
2			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
3	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
4	3	(9)									3
5			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
6					3	(9)					3
7	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
8					2	(4)	1	(1)			1
9	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
10			3	(9)							3
11			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
12	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
13	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
14	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
15			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
16	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
17			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
18	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
19			3	(9)							3
20			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
21			3	(9)							3
22			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
23			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
24	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
25	3										3
26			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
27			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
28	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
29	2	(4)			1	(1)					1
30	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
Total	24	(576)	36	(1296)	29	(841)	1	(1)			37

Genuineness - Segment 5

Ss	1	(2)	2	(2)	3	(2)	4	(2)	5	(2)	Nos. Pairs Agree
1	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
2	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
3	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
4	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
5	1	(1)	1	(1)			1	(1)			
6			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
7	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
8					1	(1)	2	(4)			1
9	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
10			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
11			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
12	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
13	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
14			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
15	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
16	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
17			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
18	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
19	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
20			2	(4)	1	(1)					1
21			3	(9)							3
22			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
23			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
24	2	(4)	1	(1)							1
25	3	(9)									3
26			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
27			1	(1)	2	(4)					1
28	1	(1)	2	(4)							1
29	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)					
30	3	(9)									3
Total	26	(676)	39	(1521)	22	(484)	3	(9)			28

APPENDIX D

INTERNALITY INSTRUMENT AND SCORES

Sex (circle) M F

Age (years) _____

Name _____

This is not a test. We are trying to find out how people think about certain things. Some questions are going to be asked to see how you feel about these things. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Some people say "Yes" and some say "No." When you read a question, if you think your answer should be yes, or mostly yes, fill in the oval under the column marked "YES". If you think your answer should be no, fill in the oval under the column marked "NO". Remember, different people give different answers and there is no right or wrong answer. Just fill in the oval for "YES" or "NO", depending on how you think the question should be answered.

	YES	NO
1. Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them?	()	()
2. Do you believe that you can stop yourself from catching a cold?	()	()
3. Are some people just born lucky?	()	()
4. Most of the time do you feel that getting good grades meant a great deal to you?	()	()
5. Are you often blamed for things that just aren't your fault?	()	()
6. Do you believe that if somebody studies hard enough he or she can pass any subject?	()	()
7. Do you feel that most of the time it doesn't pay to try hard because things never turn out right anyway?	()	()
8. Do you feel that if things start out well in the morning that it's going to be a good day no matter what you do?	()	()
9. Do you feel that most of the time parents listen to what their children have to say?	()	()
10. Do you believe that wishing can make good things happen?	()	()
11. When you get punished does it usually seem its for no good reason at all?	()	()
12. Most of the time do you find it hard to change a friend's (mind) opinion?	()	()
13. Do you think that cheering more than luck helps a team to win?	()	()
14. Did you feel that it was nearly impossible to change your parent's mind about anything?	()	()
15. Do you believe that parents should allow children to make most of their own decisions?	()	()
16. Do you feel that when you do something wrong there is very little you can do to make it right?	()	()
17. Do you believe that most people are just born good at sports?	()	()
18. Are most of the other people your age stronger than you are?	()	()
19. Do you feel that one of the best ways to handle most problems is just not to think about them?	()	()
20. Do you feel that you have a lot of choice in deciding whom your friends are?	()	()

	YES	NO
21. If you find a four leaf clover, do you believe that it might bring you good luck?	()	()
22. Did you often feel that whether or not you did your homework had much to do with what kind of grades you got?	()	()
23. Do you feel that when a person your age is angry at you, there's little you can do to stop him or her?	()	()
24. Have you ever had a good luck charm?	()	()
25. Do you believe that whether or not people like you depends on how you act?	()	()
26. Did your parents usually help you if you asked them to?	()	()
27. Have you felt that when people were angry with you it was usually for no reason at all?	()	()
28. Most of the time, do you feel that you can change what might happen tomorrow by what you do today?	()	()
29. Do you believe that when bad things are going to happen they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them?	()	()
30. Do you think that people can get their own way if they just keep trying?	()	()
31. Most of the time do you find it useless to try to get your own way at home?	()	()
32. Do you feel that when good things happen they happen because of hard work?	()	()
33. Do you feel that when somebody your age wants to be your enemy there's little you can do to change matters?	()	()
34. Do you feel that it's easy to get friends to do what you want them to do?	()	()
35. Do you usually feel that you have little to say about what you get to eat at home?	()	()
36. Do you feel that when someone doesn't like you there's little you can do about it?	()	()
37. Did you usually feel that it was almost useless to try in school because most other children were just plain smarter than you are?	()	()
38. Are you the kind of person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better?	()	()
39. Most of the time, do you feel that you have little to say about what your family decides to do?	()	()
40. Do you think it's better to be smart than to be lucky?	()	()

Internality Scores

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	6	16	9
2	5	17	4
3	11	18	9
4	7	19	5
5	7	20	3
6	7	21	4
7	9	22	6
8	10	23	7
9	14	24	4
10	10	25	6
11	19	26	4
12	16	27	7
13	9	28	11
14	1	29	7
15	4	30	7

VITA

Karen K. Tonnell

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: COUNSELOR-CANDIDATES' INTERNALITY, GENUINENESS,
AND RESPECT AS DEMONSTRATED WITH RELUCTANT CLIENTS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin, August 25, 1939,
the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Cornell.

Education: Graduated from Sturgeon Bay High School, Sturgeon Bay,
Wisconsin, in June, 1957; received the Bachelor of Music de-
gree in Vocal Music Education from Lawrence University, Apple-
ton, Wisconsin, in 1961; received the Master of Science in
Education degree in Counseling and Guidance from the Univer-
sity of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Oshkosh, Wisconsin, in 1976; com-
pleted requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in
Student Personnel and Guidance from the Oklahoma State Uni-
versity in July, 1979.

Professional Experience: Vocal Music Education, Shawano Senior
High School, 1961-1962; Vocal Music Resource, Appleton Pub-
lic Schools, 1962; Homemaker, 1962-present; Graduate Assist-
ant, Department of Counseling and Guidance, University of
Wisconsin-Oshkosh, 1975-1976; Teaching Assistant, Depart-
ment of Student Personnel and Guidance, Oklahoma State Uni-
versity, 1976-1978; Teaching Assistant, Department of Edu-
cational Psychology, Oklahoma State University, 1978-1979.
Member of American Personnel and Guidance Association, As-
sociation for Counselor Educators and Supervisors, Associ-
ation for Specialists in Group Work, and Phi Delta Kappa.