Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations

Graduate College

3-1970

A Study of the Relation between Group and Individual Counseling Supervision and Three Relationship Measures

Wayne Lawrence Lanning
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>

Part of the Counseling Commons, and the Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons

Recommended Citation

Lanning, Wayne Lawrence, "A Study of the Relation between Group and Individual Counseling Supervision and Three Relationship Measures" (1970). *Dissertations*. 3050.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/3050>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.

**A STUDY OF THE RELATION BETWEEN GROUP
AND INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING SUPERVISION
AND THREE RELATIONSHIP MEASURES**

by
Lawrence
Wayne L. Lanning

**A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of the School of Graduate
Studies in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education**

**Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
March, 1970**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his grateful appreciation to the following people who have contributed generously to the successful completion of this research.

To Dr. Robert L. Betz, major advisor and friend, whose encouragement, understanding, and availability contributed significantly to my professional growth.

To Dr. William D. Coats for his unique contribution to my understanding of research and statistics and also for his friendship and support during the course of my program.

To Drs. Louise Forsleff and Lewis Walker for their interest and assistance in the project and for their willingness to serve as members of my committee.

To Drs. William Carlson, Donald Tosi, and Thelma Urbick for their cooperation in serving as supervisors for the study.

To Larry Osborne for his willingness to lead all of the basic encounter groups, and to Bob Hardy and Don Boccardi for their help in securing and scheduling the clients in the schools.

To all of the students in the practicum classes who so generously cooperated throughout the duration of the research.

To my children, Jeff, Kim, and Amy, but especially to my wife, Delaine, for her typing assistance and, more importantly, for her support and encouragement when they were needed most.

70-20,639

LANNING, Wayne Lawrence, 1941-
A STUDY OF THE RELATION BETWEEN GROUP AND
INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING SUPERVISION AND
THREE RELATIONSHIP MEASURES.

Western Michigan University, Ed.D., 1970
Education, guidance and counseling

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	THE PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	The Statement of the Problem	3
	Theoretical Framework	4
	Definition of Terms	8
	Hypotheses	9
II	REVIEW OF SELECTED RESEARCH	11
	The Effect of Supervision on Trainee Learning	11
	The Nature of the Therapeutic Relationship	17
	The Initial Interview	24
	Summary	26
III	DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	28
	Selection of Subjects	28
	Selection of Instruments	30
	Design and Data Collection	34
	Data Analysis	36
	Summary	37
IV	RESULTS	39
	Approach to Data Presentation	39
	Trainee Perceptions of the Supervisory Relationship	40
	Trainee Expectations of his Counseling Relationships	43

CHAPTER		PAGE
IV	Client Perceptions of the Trainee's Counseling Relationships	45
	Correlations Between Dependent Variables	47
	Summary	48
V	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS	50
	Summary	50
	Discussion	52
	Implications	57
	References	60
	Appendix	65

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Mean Scores on the Relationship Inventory for Trainee Perceptions of the Supervisory Relationship	41
2 Analysis of Variance for Trainee Perceptions of the Supervisory Relationship	42
3 Mean Scores on the Relationship Inventory for Trainee Expectations of Their Counseling Relationship	43
4 Analysis of Variance for Trainee Expectations of Their Counseling Relationship	44
5 Mean Scores on the Relationship Inventory for Client Perceptions of the Trainee's Counseling Relationship ..	46
6 Analysis of Variance for Client Perceptions of the Trainee's Counseling Relationship	45

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

There is agreement among counselor educators that the supervised practicum is, at least in theory, the key program element in the preparation of counselors (Munger and Johnson, 1960; Patterson, 1964; Sorenson, 1966). Both the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) Policy Statement (1961) and the American Psychological Association (APA) Division 17 Statement (1952) on counselor education support the important position of the supervised practicum. The APA Division 17 Statement declared that the practicum is in some respects the most important phase of the whole process of training in counseling. The APGA Statement was even more specific when it stated that the supervised practice should consist of approximately one-fourth of the entire counselor education program.

The practicum in counselor education curricula is typically made up of both didactic and process components. A counselor trainee not only becomes involved with lectures and discussions, but also participates in process components such as basic encounter groups and counseling supervision. The supervision component involves a tutorial experience in which the counselor educator attempts to "teach" the trainee how to become a counselor.

While considerable agreement exists regarding the importance of the supervised practicum, little research has attempted to investi-

gate the process of supervision itself. Elements of the practicum other than the process of supervision have been studied at some length. For example, Betz (1969) compared the effects that two types of group counseling had on the performance of counselor candidates. Davidson and Emmer (1966) evaluated the effects that different supervisor behaviors had on counselor candidates. Delaney and Moore (1966), Johnston and Gysbers (1966) and Hansen (1965) all investigated the student expectations of either the supervisor or of supervision. Walz and Roeber (1962) studied supervisors' responses to counseling tapes in an attempt to determine if counselor educators practiced in supervision what they taught in the classroom.

To date, however, few studies have focused on the supervision process in an attempt to determine just what occurs in supervision that helps the trainee learn to be a better counselor. Althucher (1967) states that, "Supervision of counselors in their work with clients has always been considered one of the cornerstones of the training process, if not its foundation" (p. 165), while Patterson (1964) states that it is "high time" we give some considerations to the supervision process itself.

If supervision is considered such an important element in the training of counselors, then research is urgently needed to determine just what supervision is and what it does. Traditionally, and mostly in imitation of psychiatric and psychological training programs, supervision has been programmed as an individual learning activity, that is, one counselor educator working with one counselor trainee. Recently, however, small-group process has been introduced as an

alternative medium of instruction. Tradition and assumptions should not be permitted to "lock us in" to established methods of operation without evaluating them in terms of new and possible more efficient methods.

The present study, therefore, is an attempt to explore the supervisory process and to determine if group methods of teaching are equally, or more, efficient at achieving desired program outcomes as individual methods.

The Statement of the Problem

The problem of the present study is to determine the relation between group and individual supervision and three separate but related measures. The three measures are the trainee's perceptions of the supervisory relationship, the trainee's expectations of his own counseling relationship, and clients' perceptions of the trainee's counseling relationship. While the primary purpose of the present study is to determine the relation between two types of supervision and client perceptions of the trainees, it is, at the same time, recognized that considerable distance exists between the supervision received and the actual trainee-client relationship. Therefore, in order to help assess the distance between the type of supervision and client perceptions, two intermediate measures were obtained. Those measures (trainee perceptions of the supervisor and trainee expectations of his own counseling relationship) were obtained to provide additional information for interpreting the results with the primary criterion measure.

The study was designed to answer the following basic questions:

1. Do trainees who receive group supervision perceive the supervisory relationship the same as trainees who receive individual supervision?
2. Do trainees who receive group supervision expect to be seen the same by their clients as trainees who receive individual supervision?
3. Do clients of trainees who receive group supervision perceive the same levels of relationship qualities in the counseling sessions as clients of trainees who receive individual supervision?
4. Is the supervisor a major source of variance in the outcome measures regardless of the type of supervision used?
5. Is the interaction of the individual supervisor with the type of supervision used a significant element in the outcome of supervision?
6. Are there positive correlations between the way a trainee perceives his supervisor, the way he expects to be perceived by his client, and the way he is perceived by his client?

Theoretical Framework

The fact that little research has been done with the group method of supervision seems to indicate that supervision in individual settings is assumed to be superior. That assumption is probably due to the fact that counseling and psychotherapy have been done

traditionally in individual settings and supervision adopted the model of psychotherapy. It is only recently that the group method has become popular in counseling and many mental health agencies and other clinical settings have turned more and more to group counseling as a way to reach more people without increasing the existing staff. It is obvious that it takes less money and time to see people in groups rather than individually whether it is for counseling, teaching, or supervising. Hence, if counseling supervision can be performed effectively both in groups and individually then the savings in staff time and department funds is readily apparent, and, if supervision has many of the same characteristics as counseling, and if counseling is being done successfully in groups, then there is little reason to believe that counseling supervision cannot be performed effectively in groups

As noted earlier, considerable support exists for the power and importance of counseling supervision in the practicum experience of counselor trainees. Although counselor educators define supervision in slightly different ways, there appears to be an important common element running through most opinions. Kell and Mueller (1966) propose that supervision is "...another instance of a significant interpersonal relationship which shares many similarities to a counseling relationship" (p. 99). Arbuckle (1963) feels that the supervisor should function primarily as a counselor rather than as an educator. Supervision to Arbuckle, then, becomes the same as therapy. Patterson (1964) defines supervision as "...a relationship which is therapeutic, and in which the student learns. But

the learning is not the kind that takes place in the usual classroom. It is more like the kind of learning that takes place in counseling and psychotherapy" (p. 48). Althucher (1967) speaks of supervision as a relationship which concerns itself with attitudes rather than techniques, with feelings rather than content, and with helping trainees use themselves more effectively. The general agreement in these expert views is that supervision does contain many of the same elements as counseling and psychotherapy. The most obvious common characteristic is that both involve a significant interpersonal relationship in which changes in the client and trainee can be facilitated.

The theoretical conditions necessary for therapeutic change are as varied as the schools of thought on the matter. Depending on the theoretical approach, the stress is placed on the primary importance of such things as rationality in the interview, transference and the unconscious, conditioning, and the establishment of a good relationship. The present study is concerned with the importance of the relationship that is established between counselor and client, and between supervisor and trainee.

A number of studies have demonstrated the importance of positive relationship qualities in good therapists. These qualities seem to transcend theoretical approaches to counseling and are not dependent upon techniques employed by the counselor (Fielder, 1950). Barrett-Lennard (1963) demonstrated more therapeutic change in clients who perceived their therapist as high in empathy, congruence, level of regard, and unconditional positive regard. Fiedler (1950)

found that desirable characteristics of a good therapist were empathy, acceptance, warmth, and understanding. Conversely, Dittes (1967) showed that when therapists displayed a lack of warmth and acceptance the client's anxiety level increased appreciably as measured by the galvanic skin response.

Theoretically, then, for therapeutic change to occur in supervision, the relationship in supervision must contain positive amounts of the relationship qualities. As previously indicated, supervision is therapeutic and a good relationship is necessary to bring about therapeutic change. It would be expected, too, that good supervision, whether with individuals or with groups, must establish and maintain a significantly high positive relationship.

It is also reasonable to expect that the trainee who perceives the supervisory relationship in a positive manner will also be more likely to expect to establish a good relationship with his client. Bandura (1961), in a discussion of his social modeling theory, states, "Although a certain amount of learning takes place through direct training and reward, a good deal of a person's behavior may be acquired through imitation of what he observes in others" (p. 271). Miller and Dollard (1941) demonstrated that subjects who experienced a rewarding interaction with the experimenter/model adopted significantly more of the model's behavior than the subjects who did not experience a rewarding interaction. Betz (1969) found that trainees who were exposed to an affectively oriented group counseling leader responded to their clients in an affective manner to a significantly greater degree than did the

counselor trainees whose group leader was cognitively oriented. Therefore, the trainee who perceives a significantly higher degree of relationship qualities in supervision will also be likely to expect to project or transfer higher degrees of those same qualities to his clients.

Studies in role theory have investigated the relationship between the way a person expects to behave in a given situation and the way he actually does behave. One study with counselors (Lennard and Bernstein, 1966) reported a consistent relationship between the therapist's expectations as to their verbal activity, and their actual verbal activity as measured in the counseling situation. The trainee, then, who expects to behave in ways that result in a highly positive relationship will be likely to behave consistently with his expectations.

Definition of Terms

In order to focus more clearly on the specific scope of the study, the following definitions were used.

Supervision The interaction process between two or more people for the purpose of facilitating in one or more counselor trainees the ability to establish successful and productive counseling relationships.

Individual supervision The process of supervising which occurs between one supervisor and one trainee for the purpose of facilitating the ability to establish successful and productive counseling relationships.

Group supervision The process of supervising which occurs in a situation with one supervisor and several trainees for the purpose of facilitating the ability to establish successful and productive counseling relationships.

Relationship refers to the human interaction in counseling and supervision characterized by some degree of empathy, level of regard, congruence, and unconditional positive regard.

Trainee perceptions refer to what the trainee experiences in the relationship with his supervisor as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (R-I).

Trainee expectations refer to how the trainee expects to be perceived by his clients in the counseling relationship as a result of his behavior as measured by the R-I.

Client perceptions refer to what the client experiences in the relationship with the trainee as measured by the R-I.

Hypotheses

The study was designed to test the following nine null hypotheses:

- Ho₁: There is no relation between types of supervision and trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.
- Ho₂: There is no relation between different supervisors and trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.
- Ho₃: There is no relation between the interaction of the type of supervision with the supervisor and trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

- Ho4: There is no relation between types of supervision and trainee expectations of their counseling relationships.
- Ho5: There is no relation between different supervisors and trainee expectations of their counseling relationships.
- Ho6: There is no relation between the interaction of the type of supervision with the supervisor and trainee expectations of their counseling relationship.
- Ho7: There is no relation between types of supervision and client perceptions of the trainees' counseling relationships.
- Ho8: There is no relation between different supervisors and client perceptions of the trainees' counseling relationships.
- Ho9: There is no relation between the interaction of the type of supervision with the supervisor and client perceptions of the trainees' counseling relationship.

In addition, the following separate but related directional hypotheses were formulated to provide additional information about the relation between pairs of the dependent variables.

- H10: A significant positive correlation exists between the trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship and the trainee expectations of his own counseling relationship.
- H11: A significant positive correlation exists between the trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship and client perceptions of the trainee's counseling relationship.
- H12: A significant positive correlation exists between the trainee expectations of his counseling relationship and client perceptions of the trainee's counseling relationship.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED RESEARCH

The basic question asked in the present study is what relation different types of supervision have with the trainee's ability to establish a good relationship with his client in the initial interview. In addition, it is an investigation of the correlation between the trainee's perception of the supervisory relationship and the client's perception of the trainee's counseling relationship. It was noted in Chapter I that the learning which occurs in supervision is in many ways similar to the learning that occurs in a counseling situation. The quality of the relationship is important for both situations.

The present chapter is devoted to a review of literature that is relevant to the questions asked in Chapter I. The review will be conducted in the following three areas: (1) the effect of supervision on trainee learning, (2) the nature of the therapeutic relationship, and (3) the initial interview.

The Effect of Supervision on Trainee Learning

It has been generally acknowledged in the literature that supervisor-trainee interaction has exerted a greater influence on what practicum counselors learned than the number and variety of counselees with whom they counseled or the intensity and duration of their work with counselees (Patterson, 1964; Pierson, 1965; Blane, 1968). While no studies were found that attempted to

compare the effects of group and individual supervision, a number of studies have been conducted to determine the extent to which a trainee changes as a result of his contact with the supervisor. The present study was an attempt to determine the extent of the relation between group and individual supervision and some meaningful outcome measures. The present section of Chapter II will, therefore, cite evidence that supervision of various types can have an effect upon trainee learning.

Desrosiers (1967) studied the relation between the trainee's perception of his supervisor in a group setting and changes in the trainee's self concept. He reported that change in self-concept was related to levels of therapeutic conditions offered by the supervisor and measured by means of the trainee perceptions of those conditions.

Blane (1968) investigated the changes in trainee empathic understanding, as a result of positive and negative supervisory sessions. He used three groups of ten trainees and received premeasures on all of them by having judges rate their level of empathic understanding in thirty-minute recorded interviews. Following the first interview one group of ten received a fifteen-minute supervision session which emphasized the positive aspects of the counseling interview. Another group of ten trainees received fifteen minutes of supervision that focused on the negative aspects. The third group of ten served as the control and received no supervision. Immediately following the supervision, each trainee conducted another thirty minute recorded interview with a different

client and another rating of empathic understanding was obtained. The results revealed that while there was no difference between the groups initially, the pre-post changes were significant beyond the .01 level only for the positive supervision group. The least change occurred in the control group and only minimal change was revealed in the negative supervision group. As Blane points out in his discussion of the study, the experiment was an attempt to study only the immediate effect of short supervision sessions on counselor trainees. Long range effects must still be studied, but it is clear that the supervisor behavior does affect the immediate behavior of the trainee in the counseling session.

In an earlier study, Stewart (1958) attempted to determine if counselor trainees were influenced by their supervisors in terms of their approach to counseling. He stressed that there were no "inducements, course requirements or variables identified or discussed that would stimulate counselors to emulate their supervisor's approach to counseling" (p. 275). At the end of the practicum, however, the trainees were more like their supervisors in terms of the counseling approach, than they were at the beginning. The change in trainee counseling orientation was attributed by Stewart to the influence of the supervisor even though Stewart does not indicate any specific causative factors such as relationship, personality, or orientation.

Althucher (1967), however, suggests that many of the trainee's problems in learning to counsel can be a reflection of the supervisory relationship:

Whenever repeated attempts to explore the counselor's difficulties with clients lead up predictable blind alleys, it is probable that the difficulty lies in the relationship between counselor and supervisor. In the circumstance discussed earlier, where the counselor is chronically unaware of his repeated errors and, in fact, sees nothing wrong with his behavior, and where the supervisor has encountered repeated frustration in his efforts to help him gain greater awareness, it can be reasonably expected that the main source of difficulty lies in their relationship (p. 336).

To accept the Althucher assumption would give added weight to the present investigation and there are some studies which give both direct and indirect support to the assumption. Miller and Oetting (1966) asked fifteen counseling psychology trainees to respond to two projective questions which asked them to give reasons for their satisfaction and dissatisfaction ensuing from a supervisory session. Responses were classified into four variables: (1) the personality of the supervisor, (2) the supervisor's attitude toward the student, (3) the supervisor's professional competency and ability to be specific, and (4) the ability of the student to communicate his feelings to the supervisor. The personality and attitude of the supervisor viewed as good by the trainees was characterized as "non-threatening," "tactful," "non-authoritarian," "possessing a good sense of humor," "warm and friendly," "supportive," and "understanding and accepting".

The latter variable, ability of trainee to communicate his feelings to the supervisor, indicates the importance of a successful relationship between supervisor and trainee because the ultimate trainee responses are derived from his perceptions of the situation at hand.

An excellent study of the relevance of the supervisory relationship to the counselor trainee's level of experiencing and self-awareness was done by Hansen (1963). He used twenty-eight graduate students in an institute program in Counseling and Guidance. Prior to the practicum a measure of self-awareness was acquired for each trainee. At the conclusion of the practicum each trainee had an interview with his supervisor from which his experiencing level was determined by using the Experiencing Scale. In addition, each trainee rated the supervisory relationship on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. The supervisors rated the supervisory relationship with the same instrument. The data analysis indicated that the quality of the trainee-supervisor relationship is related to differences in trainee behavior. Trainees who perceived the supervisory relationships highest also achieved the highest experiencing scores. The results on the correlations between a positively perceived supervisor-trainee relationship and the trainee's increase in self-awareness were somewhat confusing. Only one of the three groups showed a significant relationship between a positively perceived supervisor-trainee relationship and a positive change in self-awareness. The other two groups showed no relationship or a slight decrease in self-awareness.

Hansen states in his summary that, "An overall conclusion would be that supervisors establish different relationships with their trainees, drawn from the same population, and these relationships appear to affect different trainee behaviors" (p.95).

Although few studies have been conducted to look at the

effects of group supervision, as noted in Chapter I there is good reason to believe that supervision can be performed equally well in groups as individually. Supervision does have an effect upon the trainee and although it has traditionally been performed in a one to one situation, many of the same changes could probably be affected in a group situation as well.

In addition to the supervision studies that have been done, investigations in other areas give support to the proposition that what the trainee perceives in his supervisor he will more likely attempt to exhibit himself. His behavior as a counselor can be influenced by the relationship with his supervisor.

Bandura (1961), in a discussion of his social modeling theory, states, "Although a certain amount of learning takes place through direct training and reward, a good deal of a person's behavior may be acquired through imitation of what he observes in others" (p. 271). It might be added, in Rogers' terms, that the more "significant" the other is, the more learning will be acquired, and the better the relationship is, the more significant two people are to each other.

Miller and Dollard (1941) demonstrated that children who experienced a rewarding relationship with the adult model adopted more of the model's behavior than did children who experienced a relatively distant and cold relationship with the adult model.

In a more recent study, Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1961) investigated the generalization of imitative response patterns to new settings in which the model is absent. They focused primarily on the generalization of aggressive behaviors exhibited by models to the subjects.

The prediction that exposure of subjects to aggressive models increases the probability of aggressive behavior in the subjects was clearly confirmed for both physical and verbal imitative aggression. No studies were found that attempted to investigate the generalization of more "positive" qualities such as warmth, empathy, and unconditional positive regard.

In a slightly different type of study, Betz (1969) found that trainees who were exposed to an affectively oriented group counseling leader responded to their clients in an affective manner to a significantly greater degree than did the counselor trainees who were exposed to a group leader who was cognitively oriented. Betz concludes that,

The present study demonstrated that the climate of the group was generalized to individual behavior outside of the group. The counselors-in-training who were treated in an affective manner by their group leader, in turn focused on their client's affect when they counseled individually and independently of the group (p. 10).

The above-mentioned studies, then, indicate that supervision does make a difference in the way a trainee behaves in the counseling sessions and that when the trainee perceives the behavior of the supervisor, it is likely that he will attempt to behave in a comparable way with his clients in the future.

The Nature of the Therapeutic Relationship

The relationship established between a counselor and his client has received more attention in the literature than counseling techniques (Rogers, 1961, 1962; Arbuckle, 1963, 1965; Carkhuff and

Truax, 1966; Kell and Mueller, 1966; Carkhuff and Berensen, 1967; Patterson, 1969). The emphasis began with the rather systematic theoretical approach of Carl Rogers who lists certain conditions which he considers to be necessary and sufficient for personality change.

For constructive personality change to occur, it is necessary that these conditions exist and continue over a period of time: (1) Two persons are in psychological contact. (2) The first, whom we shall term the client, is in a state of incongruence, being vulnerable or anxious. (3) The second person, whom we shall term the therapist, is congruent or integrated in the relationship. (4) The therapist experiences unconditional positive regard for the client. (5) The therapist experiences an empathic understanding of the client's internal frame of reference and endeavors to communicate this experience to the client. (6) The communication to the client of the therapist's empathic understanding and unconditional positive regard is to a minimal degree achieved. No other conditions are necessary. If these six conditions exist, and continue over a period of time, this is sufficient. The process of constructive personality change will follow (Rogers, 1957, p. 96).

While much opposition has arisen to the sufficiency of these conditions, there is widespread agreement that they are necessary (Adler, 1956; Ullman and Krasner, 1964; Stefflre and Matheny, 1968; Allen, T. W., 1969; Geis, 1969; Lazarus, 1969).

Most counseling theorists agree that the relationship is absolutely important as a foundation for the interview. Some claim that it is only a beginning and that within this relationship, the therapist must become active and apply his techniques in order to facilitate change in his client. However, even many of the more technique-oriented therapists recognize the primary importance and the potential power of a good relationship between counselor and client. In

fact, Joseph Wolpe, a Behaviorist, states:

I have a strong clinical impression that patients who display strong positive emotions towards me during the early interviews are particularly likely to show improvement before special methods for obtaining reciprocal inhibition of anxiety are applied. (Wolpe, 1958; p. 194)

Empirical research gives substantial support to the necessity of the relationship in counseling. In 1950, Fiedler, through the use of Q-sorts representing descriptions of patient-therapist relationships, found no significant difference between therapists of differing schools in their conceptions of what constitutes the ideal therapeutic relationship. Characteristics seen as desirable in therapists were empathy, warmth, acceptance, and understanding. Characteristics seen as undesirable in therapists were coldness, hostility, rejection, and authoritarianism.

Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Hoehn-Saric, Nash and Stone, (1966) investigated the correlation between direction of client-change and therapist offered levels of empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness for forty outpatients at Johns Hopkins. Their findings revealed that there was an overall improvement rate of seventy percent in the clients. The striking part of this study was the discovery that therapists who provided high levels of the above-mentioned conditions produced a ninety percent improvement rate, while those who provided low levels of the conditions produced an improvement rate of only fifty percent. The authors conclude that "the importance of the three conditions combined to therapeutic outcome is clearly supported in the study" (p. 400). The study, then,

strongly suggests that psychotherapy can be for better or worse depending upon the level of therapeutic conditions offered by the therapists.

In another study, the same authors investigated the therapist's contribution to the relationship conditions that were offered and flatly concluded from their results that, "The present findings fit the causal hypotheses suggesting (that) the therapist determines the level of conditions occurring in therapy which in turn determines the level of psychotherapeutic outcome" (Truax, et al. 1966, p. 334).

Barrett-Lennard (1962) conducted an extensive study to investigate the effect of the variables expressed in Rogers' necessary and sufficient conditions. He hypothesized that each of five aspects of the therapist's attitudes and responses, as perceived by the client, is influential in the process of therapeutic change. The five variables are level of regard, unconditional positive regard, empathic understanding, congruence, and willingness to be known. Two hypotheses were tested. First, the extent to which therapeutic change occurs in the client depends, in part, on the client's perceptions of his therapist's level of the five variables. Second, more successful therapists facilitate more therapeutic change in their clients because they respond in ways that lead their clients to experience the therapist as possessing higher degrees of the five variables.

To test these hypotheses, Barrett-Lennard developed a questionnaire called the Relationship Inventory which measured the five

therapist dimensions. The scores on the Relationship Inventory were then compared with measures of client change as rated by therapists, and with measures of therapist competence. His results supported both hypotheses for four of the five variables. All but the "willingness to be known" variable were significant beyond the .01 level and that variable was subsequently dropped from the instrument.

From his results Barrett-Lennard made the following interpretations: Support of the first hypothesis was interpreted to mean that, theoretically, four of the relationship measures, as perceived by the client, were indications of primary change-producing influences. Barrett-Lennard states that "this appears to be particularly compelling evidence of the primary relevance to therapeutic change of the client's perception of the relationship rather than the therapist's actual experience" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p. 15). Support of the second hypothesis implies that therapeutic change depends on how much the therapist's response causes his client to experience the relationship in a highly positive manner. This study gives strong support to Rogers' contention that these conditions are necessary for constructive therapeutic change.

Carl Rogers, et al. (1967) conducted a rather extensive study investigating the impact of the therapeutic relationship with schizophrenics. They used a stratified sample of the population of hospitalized schizophrenics and attempted, among other things, to determine the extent to which the relationship variables were important in working with schizophrenics. Their evidence confirmed the

hypothesis that the greater the degree to which the conditions of therapy exist in the relationship, the greater will be the evidences of constructive outcome. Included in their measures of outcome were changes in the scores obtained on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Thematic Apperception Test, Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Stroop Interference Test, Q-sort of self-perception, and the Truax Anxiety Scale.

The single most striking result showed that the patients who perceived a high degree of congruence and empathy in their relationship with their therapist were independently rated as showing the greatest degree of change and also changed more on the MMPI than the control group who received no therapy. The patients who perceived a low degree of the relationship qualities showed no change or frequently even regressed.

Numerous other studies reveal the crucial nature of the relationship in facilitating therapeutic change. Gross and DeRidder (1966) found that significant client movement in short-term counseling correlated highly with client perceptions of relationship variables as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (congruence, empathy, unconditional positive regard, level of regard).

Braaten (1961) demonstrated a significant shift from non-self to self in clients engaged in client-centered therapy where the relationship qualities were present. Seeman (1961) found that patients' success as a result of psychotherapy is related to a mutual liking and respect between counselor and client. Kamin and Caughlin (1963) found

that the attitudes held by the client toward the therapist were the most significant variables influencing prognosis one to two years later. Hountras and Anderson (1969) hypothesized that positive relationship qualities of empathy, respect and genuineness in the counselors would promote greater self-exploration in university student counselees. The data collected demonstrated highly significant relationships between each of the variables and the criterion which was determined by judges' ratings.

The Behaviorists, too, recognize the importance of the relationship in laboratory conditioning studies (Orne, 1962; Ullman and Krasner, 1964). To cite only one study involving conditioning and the relationship, Sapolsky (1960) found that effectiveness of verbal reinforcement depended upon the relationship between the experimenter and the subject. Subjects who received instructions that made the experimenter appear pleasing conditioned well. Those who were led to see the experimenter as displeasing did not condition, at least during the experimental period although there was some evidence of delayed conditioning. Ullman and Krasner (1964, p. 43), speaking as Behaviorists, agree that "the best results are obtained when the therapist and patient form a good interpersonal relationship".

While the above-mentioned studies may not demonstrate the sufficiency of positive relationship conditions, they seem to clearly indicate the primary necessity of a good relationship in order to facilitate therapeutic change. Although the studies were primarily concerned with therapeutic change in clients, they have

implications for all interpersonal relationships, including that between counseling trainee and supervisor.

As noted extensively in Chapter I, most counselor educators view supervision as another interpersonal relationship in which therapeutic learning or change occurs (Arbuckle, 1963; Patterson, 1964; Kell and Mueller, 1966; Althucher, 1967). The call of Rogers and others for congruence, warmth, unconditional positive regard, and empathy in therapeutic relationships is as appropriate for the trainee-supervisor relationship as the counselor-client relationship.

The Initial Interview

Based upon the evidence presented in the preceding section, the present study used measures of the quality of the relationship in both supervision and counseling as dependent variables. This section of the chapter will cite evidence that it is not only important for relationship qualities to exist in the therapeutic encounter, but also important that the clients perceive these qualities in their therapists. It will also be shown that these qualities, as perceived by the clients during the initial stages of therapy, contribute to desirable client behaviors in therapy.

Studies have been conducted which demonstrate that the behavior of the client in the initial interview is to a certain degree a function of the way he perceives his therapist. Bordin (1955) stated that "clients who come expecting to talk about personal problems and about themselves will be likely to see more personal characteristics of the counselor as an important part of

the process" (p. 20).

Consistent with Bordin's statement are the findings of Grater (1964) who examined client preferences for affective or cognitive counselor characteristics and initial interview behavior. He tested the hypothesis that clients who preferred affective counselor characteristics would differ from clients who preferred cognitive counselor characteristics with respect to their focus on a discussion of personal-social problems in the initial interview. Prior to the first session eighty-six clients were given an adjective check list (Cognitive - Affective Inventory) to determine their preference of counselor characteristics. Immediately following each initial interview the counselor completed a form indicating whether the client's primary focus was personal-social or educational-vocational. A chi-square analysis revealed differences between the two preference groups (cognitive preference versus affective preference) significant beyond the .01 level. Clients who preferred affective counselor characteristics focused more on personal-social discussions in the initial interview than the group of clients who preferred cognitive characteristics in their counselors. Some of the typical affective characteristics used in Grater's study were warmth, friendliness, kindness, acceptance, maturity, and sociability and the results would seem to suggest that the focus of the client on his problems is, to some degree, a function of the extent to which he perceives his counselor as possessing those characteristics.

Truax and Carkhuff (1963) suggested in one of their papers

that the levels of patient self-exploration during the initial stages were significantly predictive of outcomes from six months to three and one-half years later. Hountras and Anderson (1969) investigated the relationship between counselor-offered conditions of empathy, respect, and genuineness and client behavior in the first interview following intake. They found significant correlations between each counselor-offered condition and the level of client self-exploration in that initial interview.

The above-mentioned studies indicate that the behavior of the client during the initial interview is determined, at least in part, by his perception of the relationship qualities offered by the counselor. It is apparent that some counselors are perceived by their clients as possessing high levels of empathy, congruence, and positive regard while other counselors are perceived as possessing those qualities to a significantly lesser degree. In addition, the evidence reveals that clients who work with counselors possessing higher levels of qualities change more on various dimensions than clients whose counselors lack those qualities. The research cited also indicated that the client's perceptions of his counselor in the initial stages of therapy was highly predictive of how the client would behave in therapy.

Summary

In the present chapter a review of research pertinent to the present investigation has been presented. It was organized into three distinct but related sections. The conclusions which can be

drawn from the review of literature are as follows:

(1) Although little research has been conducted on group supervision, it is clear that supervision of counseling trainees does have an influence upon the subsequent behavior of the trainee. It can be expected that the trainee will adopt for himself many of the behaviors which he perceives in his supervisor if their relationship is satisfying. It is expected also that group supervision can influence the trainee in the same way as individual supervision, just as group counseling is able to effect changes similar to those brought about by individual counseling.

(2) A positive relationship between two people facilitates more learning in that situation whether it is counseling or supervision. Both Phenomenologists and Behaviorists agree that a positive relationship between counselor and client is a necessary condition for maximum therapeutic change.

(3) Meaningful therapeutic outcomes are better facilitated and predicted when the client perceives the counselor as warm, empathic, and congruent in the early stages of therapy. Also, the behavior of the client in the initial interview is influenced by his perceptions of such personal qualities in his counselor.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

A review of the literature pertinent to the present study indicates that greater learning occurs in situations where the interpersonal relationship is perceived in a positive manner than in situations where the relationship is perceived as unfavorable. The present study is an investigation of that relationship in two specific situations: (1) supervision and (2) counseling.

Chapter III is devoted to a description of the design and procedures used in the study and contains the following sections: selection of subjects, selection of instruments, design and data collection, and data analysis.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects used in the study consisted of a sample of counseling trainees, three counseling supervisors, one basic encounter leader, and clients.

Trainees

The twenty-nine counselor trainees were drawn from three practicum classes at Western Michigan University. The students had been arbitrarily assigned by the department chairman to one of three classes and changes were made only if the student was unable to attend at the time assigned. The class sizes were eight, nine, and twelve, and each class was composed in the approximate ratio of four

males to one female. All trainees were beginning practicum students in the Master's Degree program in Counseling and Personnel at Western Michigan University. All of the students had progressed through the program in the normal manner and the same selection procedures had been used with them as with all other students who enroll in the program. There is no reason to believe, therefore, that the students used in the study were atypical from any sample of students that might enroll in the beginning practicum at the University during other semesters.

Supervisors

The three counseling supervisors who participated in the study were all full-time staff members in the Counseling and Personnel Department of Western Michigan University. Two were males and all three had an earned doctorate in counselor education. In addition to being experienced counselors, all had supervised a number of counseling practicums prior to the study. None of them, however, had used the method of group supervision in any systematic way prior to the present research.

Basic Encounter Leader

The leader of the basic encounter group for each practicum section was a full-time male doctoral student in counselor education at Western Michigan University. Prior to the study he had acquired five years experience working with groups and conducting group counseling sessions.

Clients

Male and female clients used in obtaining the criterion measure of the study were all high school students (grades nine through twelve) in the Kalamazoo area. Twenty-nine clients were from a school of about 800 in a small rural area near Kalamazoo and an equal number were from a parochial school of all boys with an enrollment of about 500 in the city of Kalamazoo. Each of the clients was assigned at random to the trainees in such a way that each group of trainees saw an equal number of male and female clients.

Selection of Instruments

All perceptions of the relationships were measured by means of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (R-I). The instrument was developed by Barrett-Lennard (1962) to obtain an objective measure of the "necessary and sufficient" conditions of the helping relationship set forth by Rogers (1957). The "necessary and sufficient" conditions of Rogers were translated into four subtests: level of regard, congruence, unconditional positive regard, and empathic understanding. A total score can also be computed which represents a global view of the general satisfaction with the relationship and that was the measure consistently used in the present study.

The form of the Relationship Inventory used in the present investigation consists of sixty-four items, sixteen for each of the four dimensions. Each of the items is responded to on a six-point

scale ranging from strong agreement (+3) to strong disagreement (-3). The complete instrument can be found in the Appendix.

Although the instrument was primarily designed to measure the relationship between counselor and client, the design also permits its use to describe any interpersonal relationship.

Reliability

Internal consistency and stability coefficients for the Relationship Inventory have been reported in many investigations. Hollenbach (1965) investigated parent-child relationships as perceived by college students and reported split-half coefficients for the four subscales ranging from .83 to .95. Tosi (1968) worked with sixty-nine clients in a college counseling center and obtained a split-half coefficient for total scores of .82. Barrett-Lennard (1962) reported stability coefficients of from .82 to .93 for the four subscales and a coefficient of .95 for the total scores. The length of time between tests was four weeks and the relationships used were close family and peer relationships. Perhaps the most striking stability coefficient reported was obtained by Rogers, et al. (1967) in their study with hospitalized patients in Wisconsin. They report a stability coefficient of total scores over a period of more than two years of .93 for patient perceptions and .94 for therapist perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Validity

In the construction stages of the instrument, content

validity was determined by a panel of five expert judges who rated each item either positive (+) or negative (-) depending upon whether in their judgement the item indicated the relevant variable for which it was designed. There was perfect agreement among judges on all except four items. Three of these were eliminated and the fourth retained because only one judge thought it a bit ambiguous. Barrett-Lennard (1962) discussed additional validation of the Inventory in the following way:

Having ensured that the elements of information from which the scale is built up are content valid, and providing internal empirical features such as the reliability and distribution characteristics of obtained scores are acceptable, the validation process seems essentially to be a matter of discovering meaningful relationships with other variables that are theoretically relevant under the conditions of the investigation. (p. 7)

Such relationships have been found in subsequent investigations by other individuals. Thornton (1960) found that R-I scores based on perceptions of either marriage partner are highly correlated with the Marriage Adjustment Schedule (a measure of the adequacy of the marriage relationship). Hansen (1963) reported significant correlations of from .11 to .67 between trainees' scores on the R-I and their scores on the Experiencing Scale. Rogers et al. (1967) reported significant correlation coefficients of from .24 to .93 between client perceptions as reported on the R-I subscales and independent ratings by judges of the same therapy sessions. The judges rated the same conditions but with different instruments than the R-I. Barrett-Lennard (1962) found a significant difference in the amount of client change, as rated by the therapist, between a

group of clients who perceived the relationship as less satisfying. The quality of the relationship was measured with the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

There is some question concerning the relationships between the four subtests. Despite the attempt to make the items within each subtest independent, the intercorrelations of the subtests have been reported as being positive and moderately high (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Mills and Zytowski, 1967; Tosi, Frumkin, and Wilson, 1968). The intercorrelations for a therapist-client population range from .16 to .85 and may suggest that there is a general factor which accounts for much of the variance for the entire instrument. While Barrett-Lennard believes this is not the case, the findings and conclusions of Mills and Zytowski (1967) strongly disagree with the author of the instrument. Working with client perceptions, therapist perceptions, and two forms of the instrument they found the intercorrelations between subtests to be approximately the same as reported by others. When they subjected the four intercorrelation matrices to a principal component analysis, they found three components which accounted for ninety-three to ninety-six percent of the variance. The largest component accounted for about two-thirds of the total variance in each case which led the authors to conclude that, "there appears to be a single dominant characteristic across all of the relationships measured to which all four subtests contribute strongly" (p. 195). That characteristic may well be a general satisfaction with the relationship. It is, therefore, the total score with which the present study is concerned.

Design and Data Collection

To control for possible intervening variables, each of the counselor trainee groups received the same instructional process throughout the practicum with the exception of the type of supervision. The instructional process for all counselor trainees was as follows:

One hour per week of basic encounter with the same qualified leader.

One hour per week of counseling practice either in the counseling lab or in another arranged setting.

Two hours per week of didactic instruction on counseling theory taught by the same three faculty members who served as supervisors.

The lecture format was as follows:

Week 3-5: One lecturer discussed the Phenomenological approaches.

Week 6-8: The second lecturer discussed the Behavioral and rational approaches.

Week 9-11: The third lecturer discussed the Psychoanalytic approaches.

While holding the basic instructional process constant, group and individual supervision (the independent variables) were manipulated in the following manner: In each of the practicum sections, fifty percent of the trainees were randomly assigned to the group treatment and fifty percent to the individual treatment. Each participating supervisor was responsible for both group and individual supervision, and, therefore the effect of preference for treatment type was partially, though not wholly, controlled. Experimental group A received one hour of group supervision per week with one of

the participating staff members while experimental group B received one hour per week of individual supervision. Each supervisor, therefore, with one exception, saw five people each week individually for supervision and five people each week in group supervision. Because only twenty-nine trainees were available, one of the supervisors saw four people individually instead of five. Therefore, to create an equal number of scores in each cell, the mean of the four scores was included as the fifth for the purposes of analysis (Winer, 1962).

Following ten weeks of basic encounter, didactic instruction, counseling practice, and supervision, each of the three practicum classes of trainees was asked to complete the R-I reporting their perception of the relationship with their supervisor. They also completed an R-I reporting how they expected to be perceived by new clients in the immediate future as a result of their behavior in the counseling relationship.

Prior to completing the two measures, each trainee was assured that his supervisor and/or instructor would never see the individual responses, and to further assure anonymity, subjects were asked to identify themselves on the instruments only by means of a student number.

For two weeks following the completion of the two measures, each of the three practicum groups met at two different high schools in the city where volunteer clients had been arranged for them. There each trainee held a 45-50 minute counseling session with a randomly-assigned high school student. Immediately following the counseling session the student was asked to complete the R-I

reporting how he perceived the relationship with the counselor he had just seen. Therefore, each trainee saw two new clients at two different high schools in the area and two R-I measures of his clients' perception were obtained.

Data Analysis

The hypotheses of the present study were analyzed statistically by analysis of variance techniques and computation of correlation ratios and product-moment correlation coefficients. A two-way analysis of variance model was used to test the relation between the type of supervision and each of the dependent variables, that is, trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship, trainee expectations of their own counseling relationships, and client perceptions of the trainees in the counseling relationship. The analysis of variance model consisted of a 2 X 3 factorial design which was used to determine the relation between group and individual supervision and the three dependent measures while statistically controlling the variance introduced by the supervisor himself and the interaction of the supervisor with the type of supervision (Kerlinger, 1964).

In addition, an estimate of the strength of association, E^2 , was computed for each of the dependent variable measures to determine the amount of variance shared by the dependent and independent variables (Kerlinger, 1964).

Product-moment correlation coefficients were used to determine the extent of the relationship between pairs of the dependent

variables (Ferguson, 1966).

Summary

The study is an investigation of interpersonal relationships in supervision and counseling. Subjects for the study were twenty-nine counselor trainees and three supervisors at Western Michigan University. The trainees were beginning practicum students in three classes and were randomly assigned to receive one hour per week of either individual or group supervision. Each of the supervisors saw five trainees in individual supervision and five in group supervision.

Following ten weeks of supervision and counseling practice, each trainee reported his perceptions of the supervisory relationship. He also reported how he expected to behave in counseling relationships with his clients. During the next two weeks each trainee saw two new volunteer clients of high school age. A report from each client on his perception of the trainee was obtained.

The instrument used in the study was the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (R-I), a sixty-four item scale which yields four subscale scores and a total score. Split-half reliability coefficients for the instrument range from .83 to .95 for the subscales. Stability coefficients over a period of four weeks to two years for total scores were .93 and .94.

The data were statistically analyzed by means of a 2 X 3 factorial analysis of variance model and computation of the estimated strength of association to determine the amount of variance shared by

the dependent and independent variables. In addition, the product-moment correlation coefficient was computed between each of the dependent variables.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The data obtained from the measuring procedures described in Chapter III were analyzed by analysis of variance models and product-moment correlation coefficients. A 2 X 3 factorial analysis of variance model was used to determine the relation between the independent variables (type of supervision, individual supervisors, and interaction) and each of the dependent variables. Correlation ratios, E^2 , were computed from the data of each of the dependent variables in order to determine the amount of variance shared by the dependent and independent variables. The product-moment correlation indicated the relationship between each of the dependent variables. The present chapter contains the results of those statistical operations.

Approach to Data Presentation

Traditionally, investigators have stated the level of significance at which the null hypothesis would be rejected before they conducted the study. Either the .05 or .01 levels of probability were selected. Recently, however, a trend in behavioral science research has been to conduct the study, analyze the results, and then report the level at which the null hypothesis can be rejected. The trend seems to be due, at least in part, to the realization that the .05 and .01 levels are nothing more than a matter of convention and have little logical or scientific basis (Winer, 1962). The

emphasis is more on the power of the test than on the possibility of committing a Type I error. When Type I and Type II errors are of approximately equal importance, then .20 or .30 levels of significance may be more appropriate than the .05 and .01 levels (Winer, 1962).

In addition, because the statistical significance of an association between two variables is directly related to the size of the sample, a meaningful addition to the analysis of the data is frequently a measure of the strength of association between the variables. A better decision about the data can be made using both the significance level and the estimated strength of association than by using the significance level alone (Hays, 1963). When the results of an experiment suggest that the strength of association is very low, more support is given to the inference that no meaningful differences exist between the types of treatment and the dependent variables.

In the following sections, the results of this study are presented by stating the hypotheses and then reporting the probability level at which they can be rejected. An estimate of the strength of association, E^2 , was also computed for each of the dependent variables (Kerlinger, 1964). The meaningfulness of the significance levels and the importance of the strength of association between each dependent variable and the independent variable is discussed further in Chapter V.

Trainee Perceptions of the Supervisory Relationship

The three hypotheses in which trainee perceptions of the

supervisory relationship was the dependent variable were:

- Ho₁: There is no relation between types of supervision and trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.
- Ho₂: There is no relation between different supervisors and trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.
- Ho₃: There is no relation between the interaction of the type of supervision with the supervisor and trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

Table 1 contains the total and cell means for the trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

TABLE 1
Mean Scores on the Relationship Inventory for
Perceptions of the Supervisory Relationship

	Group Supervision	Individual Supervision	Totals
Supervisor X	79	111.6	95.3
Supervisor Y	72.4	119	95.7
Supervisor Z	136.4	115	125.7
Totals	95.9	115.2	

The three hypotheses were analyzed by means of a 2 X 3 factorial analysis of variance model (Kerlinger, 1964) and the results are presented in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, the perceptions of the supervisory relationship between trainees who received group supervision and those who received individual supervision were different at the .20 level of statistical probability. That is, if there is in fact no relationship between group and individual supervision and

trainee perceptions of the supervisor, then the observed mean difference between group and individual supervision could be expected to occur by chance not more than twenty times in one hundred. The actual mean difference between types was about twenty (95 vs.115, Table 1) but the variance within groups was so large that the error term in the statistical model was not reduced enough to make the differences significant at a higher statistical level. That actual difference, however, must be given consideration if the consequences of committing a Type II error are important. More is said about this in Chapter V.

TABLE 2
Analysis of Variance for Trainee Perceptions
of the Supervisory Relationship

Source	df	MS	F	p=
Type of Supervision	1	2861.6	1.85	(.20)
Supervisor	2	3121.6	2.02	(.17)
Interaction	2	3142.1	2.03	(.17)
Error	24	1540.6		

The strength of association, E^2 , computed from the data with this dependent variable was .05. This means that about five percent of the variance in trainee perceptions of the supervisor can be accounted for by knowing the type of supervision received.

The mean differences among trainees who were supervised by different supervisors and the mean differences because of interaction

were significant at the .17 level of probability and involves a rejection of the other two hypotheses at that level.

Trainee Expectations of His Counseling Relationship

The three hypotheses in which trainee expectations of his counseling relationship was the dependent variable were:

- Ho₄: There is no relation between types of supervision and trainee expectations of their counseling relationships.
- Ho₅: There is no relation between different supervisors and trainee expectations of their counseling relationships.
- Ho₆: There is no relation between the interaction of the type of supervision with the supervisor and trainee expectations of their counseling relationship.

The mean for each cell and the total mean for each main effect with this dependent variable are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Mean Scores on the Relationship Inventory for Trainee
Expectations of Their Counseling Relationship

	Group Supervision	Individual Supervision	Totals
Supervisor X	58.8	81	69.9
Supervisor Y	90.2	126.2	108.2
Supervisor Z	106.6	62	84.3
Totals	85.2	89.7	

Table 4 contains the results of the 2 X 3 factorial analysis of variance model with which this group of hypotheses was statistically analyzed.

TABLE 4
Analysis of Variance for Trainee Expectations
of Their Counseling Relationships

Source	df	MS	F	p=
Type of Supervision	1	154.1	.19	(.69)
Supervisor	2	3742.4	4.55	(.03)
Interaction	2	4645.4	5.64	(.01)
Error	24	822.5		

As is evident from Table 4, with trainee expectations as the dependent variable, there was no statistically meaningful difference between the total means of the different types of supervision. The first null hypothesis cannot be rejected at a better than chance level of probability.

The data obtained with this dependent variable give no reason to believe that either type of supervision is significantly different from the other as far as the trainee's expectations of his counseling relationships are concerned. The hypothesis cannot be rejected at any meaningful level and therefore no evidence exists from this study that the relationship between one of the types of supervision and the trainee expectations is stronger than the other.

The strength of association, E^2 , computed for trainee expectations was .004 and means that only about four-tenths of a percent of the variance in trainee expectations can be accounted for by knowing the type of supervision received.

The difference among supervisors across both types of supervision was significant at the .03 level of probability. The second null hypothesis was rejected at that level and gives support to the contention that the supervisor himself is an important element in the outcome of supervision.

In addition, the interaction of the supervisor with the type of supervision resulted in mean differences among the cells that were significant beyond the .01 level. Inspection of the cell means in Table 3 indicates that neither of the types of supervision shows consistent cell means among the supervisors. Instead, there was a "cross over" effect between types, with one supervisor scoring higher with group treatment and the other two scoring higher with individual treatment.

Client Perceptions of the Trainees' Counseling Relationships

The three null hypotheses for which the client perceptions of the trainees' counseling relationship was the dependent variable were:

- Ho₇: There is no relation between types of supervision and client perceptions of the trainees' counseling relationships.
- Ho₈: There is no relation between different supervisors and client perceptions of the trainees' counseling relationships.
- Ho₉: There is no relation between the interaction of the type of supervision with the supervisor and client perceptions of the trainees' counseling relationships.

The mean for each main effect and for each cell for the client perception measure appear in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Mean Scores on the Relationship Inventory for Client Perceptions of the Trainees' Counseling Relationships

	Group Supervision	Individual Supervision	Totals
Supervisor X	62	109.4	85.7
Supervisor Y	107.2	93.7	100.5
Supervisor Z	106.2	98.7	102.1
Totals	91.7	100.6	

The statistical results of the factorial analysis of variance for this dependent variable are presented in Table 6 below.

TABLE 6

Analysis of Variance for Client Perceptions of the Trainees' Counseling Relationships

Source	df	MS	F	p=
Type of Supervision	1	1152.8	1.10	(.31)
Supervisor	2	1681.6	1.60	(.22)
Interaction	2	5638.1	5.38	(.01)
Error	54	1046.8		

The results with this dependent variable reveal that the total mean difference between the types of supervision was significant at the .31 level of probability. In addition, the differences between means among the individual supervisors were significant at a statistical level of .21.

The strength of association, E^2 , computed for this dependent variable was .01. This means that by knowing the type of supervision the trainee received we can decrease our uncertainty about how he was perceived by his client by only one percent.

When the type of supervision combined with the individual supervisor, however, the interaction effect was again highly significant and the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of probability. The interaction with this dependent variable, however, was different from the interaction effect obtained with trainee expectations. Inspection of these means reveals that there was very little difference among the supervisors with respect to individual treatment but the means for trainees of one supervisor were appreciably lower than the means for trainees of the other two with respect to group treatment.

Correlations Between Dependent Variables

The three hypotheses tested by means of the product-moment correlation coefficient were:

- H₁: A significant positive correlation exists between trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship and the trainee expectations of his own counseling relationship.
- H₂: A significant positive correlation exists between the trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship and the client perceptions of the trainee's counseling relationship.
- H₃: A significant positive correlation exists between the trainee expectations of his counseling relationship and the client's perception of the trainee's counseling relationship.

The product-moment coefficient of correlation (Ferguson, 1966) between the trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship was

.73, statistically significant beyond the .001 level. The square of the coefficient is .53 which represents the proportion of variance that is common to, or shared by, the two variables. That means that over half of the variance in the way a trainee expects to be seen by his clients is accounted for by the way he perceives his supervisor. By knowing how the trainee perceives his supervisor, the uncertainty of knowing how he expects to behave with his clients is reduced by more than half.

The coefficient of correlation between the trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship and the client perceptions of the trainee's counseling relationship was .15 and was not statistically significant at any meaningful level. The amount of variance shared by those two variables is only about two percent which permits very little prediction from one to the other.

The coefficient of correlation between the trainee's expectations of his counseling relationship and the client perceptions of the relationship was .16. That coefficient is also not significant and the coefficient of determination is only about .03. Very little prediction can be made from the way a counselor expects to be perceived to the way he actually is perceived.

Summary

Analysis of variance models and product-moment correlation coefficients were used to analyze the data obtained from the measuring procedures described in Chapter III

The findings of the investigation were organized under the

following headings: trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship, trainee expectations of his counseling relationships, and client perceptions of the trainee's counseling relationship. The hypotheses for each variable were presented with a statement of the level of probability at which they could be rejected and also an estimate of the strength of association between the variables.

Chapter V contains the overall summary, discussion, and recommendations for possible application and future research.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The literature reveals that, at least in theory, the key program element in the preparation of counselors is the supervised counseling practicum. In addition, considerable agreement exists that supervision of trainees involves a significant interpersonal relationship which in many ways is similar to the counseling relationship.

Behaviorists and phenomenologists alike recognize the importance of establishing a positive relationship in the counseling situation. While Rogers (1957) claims that a good relationship is both "necessary and sufficient" for successful counseling, others, such as Ullman and Krasner, (1964) suggest that while it is undoubtedly necessary, it is probably not sufficient. Nevertheless, nearly all counseling theorists agree that the foundation of more successful counseling is the establishment of a positive relationship. It is the position, too, of authors writing about supervision (Patterson, 1964; Kell and Mueller, 1966; Althucher, 1967) that the establishment of a positive relationship is related to growth of the trainee.

Although little research has been conducted with group supervision, it is reasonable to expect that group supervision can produce many of the same outcomes as individual supervision just as group counseling can produce many of the same changes as individual counseling. If the same supervision outcomes can be accomplished with groups

as with individuals, the economy of staff time and counselor education department funds is readily apparent.

The present study, therefore, was undertaken to investigate the relation between type of supervision and measures of the relationship between supervisor-trainee and trainee-client.

The instrument used in the study was the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (R-I). This instrument was developed to measure the quality of the relationship between counselor and client but its design permits its use to describe any interpersonal relationship. It consists of sixty-four items which are responded to on a six-point scale ranging from strong agreement (+3) to strong disagreement (-3). It yields four subscores and a total score. The present study was concerned only with the total score which was interpreted as the degree of general satisfaction with the relationship.

Reliability studies with the R-I have yielded split-half coefficients for the subscales from .83 to .95. Stability coefficients for the total scores over a period of time from four weeks to two years have been reported from .93 to .95. The content validity was established by a panel of five experts and concurrent validity has been established with such measures as marriage adjustment, experiencing level, and judges' ratings.

The subjects used in the present study were twenty-nine counselor trainees from Western Michigan University, three supervisors, a basic encounter leader, and fifty-eight clients. The trainees were all enrolled in a beginning practicum class in the Master's Degree program during the fall term of 1969. The supervisors were

full-time, experienced staff members in the Counseling and Personnel Department of Western Michigan University and all had earned doctorates in counselor education. The basic encounter leader was a full-time, male doctoral student with five years experience in group counseling. The clients were all high-school age (grades 9-12) volunteers from two high schools in the Kalamazoo area. They were seen by the trainees in the setting of their own schools.

Each of the dependent variables used in the study was statistically analyzed by means of a 2 X 3 factorial analysis of variance model and strength of association estimates. This model permitted conclusions about the relationship between type of supervision and the dependent variables while at the same time controlling for the variance due to the individual supervisors and the interaction of the supervisor with the type of supervision. Correlation ratios were used to obtain an estimate of the amount of variance in each of the dependent variables that was determined by the independent variable. Product-moment correlation coefficients were also used to determine the extent of the relationship between pairs of the dependent variables.

Discussion

While it is recognized that acceptance of the null hypothesis is a weaker statistical statement inferentially than its rejection, it is, nevertheless, true that the data of the present study give little evidence that group supervision was much different from individual supervision on the three dependent measures used.

The results of the study give little reason to believe that there is a meaningful difference between group and individual supervision on the three dependent measures obtained. Although all of the mean differences were in the direction of individual supervision, the largest mean difference was obtained with the trainee perceptions of the supervisory relationship and that difference was statistically significant at the .20 level of probability. That level is meaningful only if the consequences of assuming differences between types of supervision are important. However, when the mean differences between types of supervision with the other two dependent variables are examined the differences are much smaller and the levels of statistical significance are less meaningful. Since the primary purpose of the study was to investigate the relation between the type of supervision and client perceptions, the other measures were obtained to assist in the interpretation of the results for that relation. Therefore, in terms of supporting or rejecting the importance of group supervision, the large mean difference observed with trainee perceptions is considerably minimized due to the small mean difference observed with the other dependent variables. The ultimate purpose of supervision is to help the trainee work more effectively with clients and since the client perceptions measure is the most closely related to client change, it must be given primary consideration when judging the value of group supervision.

Additional support for the contention that meaningful differences do not exist between types of supervision and any of the outcome measures is obtained from the low strength of association

computed between the independent variable and each of the dependent variables. Very little prediction can be made about any of the dependent variables by knowing the type of supervision received. The largest amount of variance accounted for by the independent variable occurred in the trainee perceptions of the supervisor and that was only five percent. Four-tenths of one percent was found in trainee expectations and in perhaps the most meaningful measure related to client change (client perceptions of the trainee) only one percent of the variance was accounted for by knowing the type of supervision received. Therefore, although the direction of the relation was in favor of individual supervision, the strength of that association was so small that the practical significance of the difference was appreciably minimized.

Of additional importance was the significance of the relation between the individual supervisors and the dependent measures as well as the relation between the interaction of the supervisor with the type of supervision and the dependent measures. With the "trainee expectations" measure a significant difference was found among supervisors and with both "trainee expectations" and "client perceptions" the interaction was a major source of variance. Inspection of the cell means revealed that there was considerable variation between means among the three supervisors. While the interaction between the supervisor and the type of supervision was probably important, only speculation can be used to explain it because only one observation of each supervisor was obtained. Although the literature cited in Chapter II suggests that theoretical orientation is not significantly related to

any meaningful outcome, such factors as sex of the supervisor, experience level, training, commitment to type of supervision, and general charisma may contribute significantly to the variance within cells.

The correlation coefficients obtained between the dependent variables indicated that a major source of the variance in how a trainee expects to be perceived by his client was how he perceived the relationship with his supervisor. The coefficient of determination (r^2) between those two dependent variables was .53. The ability to predict the client's perception of the trainee from either of those variables, however, was minimal. Only two and three percent of variance in client perceptions are accounted for by either the trainee's perception of the supervisor or by the trainee's expectations of his counseling relationship. While there seems to be little doubt that the relationship as perceived by the client was important for significant change to occur, it appears, at least in the initial interview, that the client's perceptions of the counselor were influenced significantly by factors over which the counselor had little control.

It appears that the trainee expected to achieve a relationship with his clients which was similar to the relationship that he perceived with his supervisor. The results of the research in role theory that was cited in Chapter I also seemed to indicate that the way the counselor expects to behave is rather consistent with the way he actually behaves. However, the way the client perceived that behavior was not significantly related to the way the trainee expected

that behavior to be perceived. Some reasons for that difference are found in studies which investigated factors that influence one person's perception of another. For example, Kumar and Pepinsky (1965) found that prior attitudes of the counselor and client had an effect upon the therapeutic process and outcome. Warr and Knapper (1966) reported that one person's perception of another was highly affected by his expectations of that other person. Tosi (1968) found that low dogmatic clients perceived the counseling relationships to be more satisfying than did high dogmatic clients. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that the actual behavior of the counselor was not the most significant source of variance in the client's perception of his counselor in the initial interview.

In summary, data obtained in the study suggested that no meaningful relation was found between type of supervision and any of the three dependent variables. While it was found that all of the mean differences favored individual supervision, the strength of the association between type of supervision and the dependent measures was extremely weak; therefore, there is little reason to believe that group supervision was different from individual supervision on the dependent measures used.

The study does reveal that a major source of variance in the outcome of each type of supervision can be attributed to the supervisor involved. Specific supervisor behaviors which may account for such variance cannot be identified from the data generated by the present study; they remain subject to speculation.

In addition, a high correlation was found between the way a

trainee perceived his supervisor and the way he expected to be perceived by his clients as a result of his behavior with them. More than half of the variance in the trainee's expectations was accounted for by his perceptions of the supervisor with whom he worked.

Implications

The following section will suggest some of the implications that resulted from the present study. Suggestions will be of two types: possible application of findings and suggestions for further research. Possible applications are steps that might be taken by practicum supervisors and counselor education departments. Suggestions for further research include recommendations for additional investigations that might be conducted in the area of counselor education.

Implications for Possible Application

Counselor education departments could consider using the method of group supervision with their practicum classes. If staff time and department funds are at a premium, the group method of supervision might provide a partial answer to the difficulty. The apparent reticence among counselor educators to use group methods of supervision is probably accounted for by the fact that, traditionally, supervisors have been trained in the individual method and therefore feel less comfortable working in groups. However, the data of the present study suggest that the individual method is not significantly different from the group method in producing some desirable outcomes. There is reason, therefore, to use group supervision, at least as an

adjunct to individual supervision, until further research suggests that a different method is obviously superior. The considerations of time and cost are important enough to risk taking what appears to be a small chance that individual supervision is significantly superior to the group method.

Practicum supervisors should also be aware of the impact that their behavior with the trainee is likely to have on the behavior of the trainee with his clients. Supervisors might focus more on the working relationship they establish with their trainees and in that way foster better working relationships between trainee and client.

Implications for Further Research

Replication of the study with more supervisors is needed to determine relationships between the interaction of supervisor variables with methods of supervision and meaningful criterion measures. The results of the present study suggest that some supervisors may work better in groups while others work better individually, but those results were not discussed because only one observation of each supervisor was obtained. Additional research is needed to specify which supervisor variables are related to different types of supervision.

A similar study is needed with a no-supervision control group to determine if supervision, in fact, contributes significantly to meaningful program outcomes.

Additional information is also needed to assist in the selection of supervisors and to compare the effects of different supervisor behaviors upon meaningful outcome measures.

Finally, investigations are needed to provide additional information about the effects that various client variables have upon successful counseling outcomes.

Research in supervision will likely continue to be slow and limited because of the small numbers of students enrolled in practicum classes. It is hoped, however, that additional research will continue and result in improved counselor education programs which, in turn, will ultimately result in better-trained counselors who work more effectively with people.

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. The individual psychology of Alfred Adler. Heinz and Rowena Ansbacher, New York: Basic Books, 1956
- Allen, T. W. A premature truce: The deradicalization of client centered therapy. The Counseling Psychologist, 1969, 1(2), 28-35.
- Althucher, N. Constructive use of the supervisory relationship. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 165-170.
- American Psychological Association Committee on Counselor Training, Division of Counseling and Guidance, The practicum training of counseling psychologists. American Psychologist, 1952, 7, 182-187.
- Arbuckle, D. S. The learning of counseling: Process not product. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 163-168.
- Arbuckle, D. S. Supervision: Learning not counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 90-94.
- Bandura, A. Psychotherapy as social learning. In B. G. Berensen & R. R. Carkhuff (Ed.), Sources of gain in counseling and psychotherapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1967.
- Bandura, A. Ross, D. & Ross, S. A. Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 23, 575-582.
- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of therapists' responses as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76, 21-44.
- Betz, R. L. Effects of group counseling as an adjunctive practicum experience. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 528-533.
- Blane, S. M. Immediate effect of supervisory experiences on counselor candidates. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 8, 39-44.
- Bordin, E. S. The implications of client expectations for the counseling process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 17-21.
- Braaten, L. J. The movement of non-self to self in client centered psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 20-24.
- Carkhuff, R. R. & Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and psychotherapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1967

- Carkhuff, R. R. & Truax, C. B. Toward explaining success and failure in interpersonal learning experiences. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 46, 723-728.
- Davidson, T. N. & Emmer, E. T. Immediate effects of supportive and non-supportive behavior on counselor candidates focus of concern. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 27-31.
- Delaney, D. J. & Moore, J. C. Student expectations of the role of practicum supervisors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 11-17.
- Desrosiers, F. X. A study of the personal growth of counseling trainees as a function of the level of therapeutic conditions offered by their supervisory groups and their supervisors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1967.
- Dittes, J. E. Galvanic skin response as a measure of patient reaction to therapists permissiveness. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 295-303.
- Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.
- Fiedler, F. E. The concept of the ideal therapeutic relationship. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1950, 14, 239-245.
- Geis, H. J. Toward a comprehensive framework unifying all systems of counseling. Educational Technology, 1969, 9(3), 19-28
- Grater, H. A. Client preferences for affective or cognitive counselor characteristics and first interview behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 248-250.
- Gross, W. F. & De Ridder, L. M. Significant movement in comparatively short-term counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 98-99.
- Hansen, J. C. Relevance of the supervisory relationship to counselor trainee's level of experiencing and self-awareness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1963.
- Hansen, J. C. Trainee's expectations of supervision in the counseling practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 75-80.
- Hays, W. L. Statistics for psychologists, New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1963
- Hollenbach, G. P. Conditions and outcomes in the student-parent relationship. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 237-241.

- Hountras, P. T. & Anderson, D. L. Counselor conditions for self-exploration of college students, Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1969, 48, 45-48
- Johnston, J. A. & Gysbers, N. G. Practicum supervisory relationships: A majority report. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 3-10.
- Kamin, I. & Caughlin, J. Subjective experience of out-patient psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1963, 17, 660-668.
- Kell, B. L. & Mueller, W. Impact and change: A study of counseling relationships. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1966.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1964
- Kumar, U. & Pepinsky, H. B. Counselor expectancies and therapeutic evaluations. Proceedings of the 73rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1965, 357-358.
- Lazarus, A. Relationship therapy: Often necessary but usually insufficient. The Counseling Psychologist, 1969, 1(2), 25-27.
- Lennard, H. L. & Bernstein, A. Expectations and behavior in therapy. In Biddle, B. J. & Thomas, E. J. (Ed.), Role theory: Concepts and research, New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Miller, D. C. & Oetting, E. R. Students react to supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 6, 73-74.
- Miller, N. E. & Dollard, J. Social learning and imitation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.
- Mills, D. H. & Zytowski, D. G. Helping relationship: A structural analysis. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 193-197.
- Munger, P. F. & Johnson, C. H. Changes in attitudes associated with an NDEA counseling and guidance institute. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1960, 38, 751-753.
- Orne, M. T. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment. American Psychologist, 1962, 19, 776-783.
- Patterson, C. H. Supervising students in the counseling practicum. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 47-53.
- Patterson, C. H. A current view of client centered of relationship therapy. The Counseling Psychologist, 1969, 1(2), 2-25.

- Pierson, G. A. Counselor education in regular institutes: An evaluation. Washington, D. C., U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1965.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rogers, C. R. The interpersonal relationship: The core of guidance. Harvard Educational Review, 1962, 32, 416-424.
- Rogers, C. R. (Ed.), The therapeutic relationship and its impact. Madison, Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Sapolsky, A. Effect of interpersonal relationships on conditioning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 60, 241-246.
- Seeman, J. A. Psychotherapy. Annual Review of Psychotherapy. 1961, 12, 172.
- Sorenson, G. Laboratory experiences: Counseling classes. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 5, 148-153
- Standards for the preparation of school counselors. A policy statement of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C., 1961.
- Stefflre, B. & Matheny, K. The function of counseling theory. Guidance Monograph Series II, New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Stewart, C. C. Attitudes change following counseling seminar. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1958, 4, 273-275.
- Thornton, B. M. Dimensions of perceived relationship as related to marital adjustment. Unpublished master's thesis, Auburn University, 1960.
- Tosi, D. J. The counseling relationship as perceived by the client following the initial encounter as a function of dogmatism within the counselor-client dyad. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1968.
- Tosi, D. J. Frumkin, R. M. & Wilson, M. E. Intercorrelations of four relationship components of the Barrett-Lennard relationship inventory. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 641-642.
- Truax, C. B. & Carkhuff, R. R. For better or worse; The process of psychotherapeutic change. Paper presented at the academic Assembly on Clinical Psychology, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, June, 1963.

- Truax, C. B. & Carkhuff, R. R. Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy. Chicago: Aldine Co., 1967.
- Truax, C. B., Wargo, D. G., Frank, J. D., Imber, S. D., Battle, C. C., Hoehn-Soric, R., Nash, E. H., & Stone, A. R. The Therapist's contribution to accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness in psychotherapy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 22, 331-334. (a)
- Truax, C. B., Wargo, D. G., Frank, J. D., Imber, S. D., Battle, D. D., Hoehn-Soric, R., Nash, E. H., & Stone, A. R. Therapist empathy, genuineness, and warmth and patient therapeutic outcome. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 395-401. (b)
- Ullman, L. P. & Krasner, L. Case studies in behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1964.
- Walz, G. R. & Roeber, E. C. Supervisors' reactions to a counseling interview. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1962, 2, 2-7.
- Warr, P. B. & Knapper, C. The role expectancy and communication context in indirect person perception. Bulletin of Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1966, 5, 244-253.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.
- Wolpe, J. Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

APPENDIX

BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY---FORM OS-M-64

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

Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with your_____.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship.

Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.

+2: Yes, I feel that it is true.

+1: Yes, I feel it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-2: No, I feel that it is not true.

-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

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

Please consider each statement with reference to how you expect your client to see you as a counselor.

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

- +3: Yes, I strongly feel it will be true my client will see me in this way.
- +2: Yes, I feel it will be true my client will see me in this way.
- +1: Yes, I feel that it will probably be true, or more true than untrue, that my client will see me in this way.
- 1: No, I feel that it will probably be untrue, or more untrue than true, that my client will see me in this way.
- 2: No, I feel it will not be true my client will see me in this way.
- 3: No, I strongly feel that it will not be true my client will see me in this way.

- ___ 1. He respects me as a person.
- ___ 2. He wants to understand how I see things.
- ___ 3. His interest in me depends on the things I say or do.
- ___ 4. He is comfortable and at ease in our relationship.
- ___ 5. He feels a true liking for me.
- ___ 6. He may understand my words but he does not see the way I feel.
- ___ 7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way he feels about me.
- ___ 8. I feel that he puts on a role or front with me.
- ___ 9. He is impatient with me.
- ___ 10. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
- ___ 11. Depending on my behavior, he has a better opinion of me sometimes than he has at other times.
- ___ 12. I feel that he is real and genuine with me.
- ___ 13. I feel appreciated by him.
- ___ 14. He looks at what I do from his own point of view.
- ___ 15. His feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him.
- ___ 16. It makes him uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.
- ___ 17. He is indifferent to me.
- ___ 18. He usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.
- ___ 19. He wants me to be a particular kind of person.
- ___ 20. I nearly always feel that what he says expresses exactly what he is feeling and thinking as he says it.
- ___ 21. He finds me rather dull and uninteresting.
- ___ 22. His own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him from understanding me.
- ___ 23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him without really making him feel any differently about me.

- ____24. He wants me to think that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.
- ____25. He cares for me.
- ____26. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels.
- ____27. He likes certain things about me, and there are other things he does not like.
- ____28. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
- ____29. I feel that he disapproves of me.
- ____30. He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.
- ____31. His attitude toward me stays the same; he is not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.
- ____32. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
- ____33. He just tolerates me.
- ____34. He usually understands the whole of what I mean.
- ____35. If I show that I am angry with him, he becomes hurt or angry with me, too.
- ____36. He expresses his true impressions and feelings with me.
- ____37. He is friendly and warm with me.
- ____38. He just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.
- ____39. How much he likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell him about myself.
- ____40. At times I sense that he is not aware of what he is really feeling with me.
- ____41. I feel that he really values me.
- ____42. He appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.
- ____43. He approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.

- ___44. He is willing to express whatever is actually in his mind with me, including any feelings about himself or about me.
- ___45. He doesn't like me for myself
- ___46. At times he thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.
- ___47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make him feel any more or less appreciative of me.
- ___48. He is openly himself in our relationship.
- ___49. I seem to irritate and bother him.
- ___50. He does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.
- ___51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to his feeling toward me.
- ___52. There are times when I feel that his outward response to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.
- ___53. At times he feels contempt for me.
- ___54. He understands me.
- ___55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in his eyes than I am at other times.
- ___56. I have not felt that he tries to hide anything from himself that he feels with me.
- ___57. He is truly interested in me.
- ___58. His response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him.
- ___59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he feels toward me.
- ___60. What he says to me often gives a wrong impression of his whole thought or feeling at the time.
- ___61. He feels deep affection for me.
- ___62. When I am hurt or upset he can recognize my feelings exactly, without becoming upset himself.

- ____63. What other people think of me does (or would, if he knew) affect the ways he feels toward me.
- ____64. I believe that he has feelings he does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.