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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess empirically the effects of a modified interpersonal communication skill training program upon specific attitudes and behaviors of selected correctional employees at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women. The primary objective was to determine through the use of an appropriate rating scale the longitudinal (sixty days) and immediate effects of the training program upon the correctional employees' ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness. The secondary objective was to examine the effects of the training program upon the employees' levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance.

The subjects for this study were twelve correctional officers and eight administrative personnel. Both the experimental and control group contained six correctional officers and four administrative personnel. The subjects were selected by the Chief of Security on the basis of their availability.

The "Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning" rating scale (Carkhuff, 1969a:115) was used to test the major hypotheses of this study. The California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956) was used to test the minor hypotheses.

There were three phases of the present study: the pre-evaluation phase, the training phase, and the post-evaluation phase. The pre-evaluation phase consisted of presenting the subjects with ten written stimuli statements, to which they responded in writing, to
determine their pre-training levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness. The California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956) was administered to the subjects to determine their pre-training levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance. The training phase consisted of five one day a week (eight hours a day) sessions in which the trainees were taught the interpersonal communication skills of empathy, respect, and genuineness. The post-evaluation phase was in two segments: immediately after training and sixty days after training. The subjects were presented with seven written stimuli statements immediately after training to which they responded in writing, and were administered the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956). The subjects then were introduced to client-volunteers who presented them with personal problems. The subjects and client-volunteers were paired according to a randomized assignment procedure, and their conversations were tape recorded. This concluded the first segment of the post-evaluation phase of the study. The second segment of the post-evaluation phase began sixty days after training when the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956) was administered to the subjects, and they were introduced to client-volunteers who presented them with personal problems. The subjects and client-volunteers were paired according to a randomized assignment procedure, and their conversations were tape recorded. This concluded the post-evaluation phase of the study.

Based upon the findings and results reported, it was concluded:

1. There was a significant longitudinal (sixty days) and immediate change in the correctional employees' ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness as a result of the training they received;
2. There was no significant longitudinal (sixty days) and immediate difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness;

3. There was no significant immediate or longitudinal (sixty days) change in the experimental and control groups' levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance;

4. There was no significant immediate or longitudinal (sixty days) difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in their levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance; and,

5. There was a significant negative correlation within the experimental and control groups between the levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness and self-acceptance.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

For the first time in the history of the United States a commission was appointed in 1971 by the United States Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to formulate national criminal justice standards and goals specifically aimed at preventing and reducing crime at the state and local levels. The following statement was made:

The American correctional system today appears to offer minimum protection for the public and maximum harm to the offender. The system is plainly in need of substantial and rapid change. Figures on recidivism make it clear that society today is not protected--at least not for very long--by incarcerating offenders, for many offenders return to crime shortly after release from prison. Indeed, there is evidence that the longer a man is incarcerated, the smaller is the chance that he will lead a law-abiding life on release (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973:173).

Additionally, the commission set forth the following priorities to upgrade the correctional system: (1) there should be equity and justice for offenders; (2) the base of corrections should be narrowed by excluding many juveniles, minor offenders, and sociomedical cases; (3) there should be a shift of emphasis away from institutions and toward community programs; (4) there should be a unification of corrections and system planning; (5) manpower development is needed; and (6) there should be greater public involvement in corrections (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973).

The commission recommended that the foundation for correctional
reform should be equity and justice in corrections. Offenders should be treated in a nondiscriminatory, just, and humane manner. Not only should the offender have the same legal and social rights as other citizens, but he should recognize these rights as just, fair, and available.

The economics of correctional reform pose another major problem. The Federal Bureau of Prisons concluded after analysis of a treatment project that correctional institutions can not afford adequate numbers of professionally trained personnel. Even if they were financially able, a sufficient number of qualified professional personnel to provide the amount of control, attention, training, and therapy to assure a maximum rehabilitative effort are not available. As a result of the Bureau study, it was suggested that correctional officers, in many instances, could be more effective models and could communicate more meaningfully with inmates than professional specialists (Megathlin, 1969).

Glaser (1964) conducted a study of inmate-staff relationships in five federal correctional institutions. He concluded that correctional officers and other staff members can have a major impact on inmates. While correctional officers were the most frequent personnel whom the inmates disliked most, they were, paradoxically, also frequently liked the most. In addition, approximately one-half of the successful releasees who were interviewed said that their rehabilitation occurred while they were in prison. One-fourth of the group credited prison personnel with having a major influence on their rehabilitation. Of the latter group, one half credited a particular work supervisor
with being a major reformative influence.

It appears that the supply of professional personnel--i.e., psychologists, psychiatrists, and counselors--is inadequate and that
inmates are influenced by nonprofessionals. It also appears that
correctional employees desire greater and deeper involvement in the
rehabilitation process. For example, a significant finding of the 1968
Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training survey of nearly
one hundred state and federal organizations and agencies was that
correctional employees asked for more special treatment programs for
inmates and better education and training for the staff (Harris and

Although the need for correctional reform is a national problem,
Louisiana is unique in that it is one of three states in the Deep South
to be specifically criticized in the recent past for its penal system.

Modern penology, with its necessarily higher costs,
professional personnel, and popularly exaggerated overtones
of convict-coddling, has had a difficult time supplanting the
old ways in Louisiana, where public officials have preferred
to utilize the penal system as a patronage mill, where public
opinion has been satisfied when it could be assured that
convicts were being punished, and where both public officials
and public opinion have long agreed that the least expensive
penal system is the most desirable one (Carleton, 1971:194).

It appears that the State has to commit itself both philosoph-
ically and financially before modern penology in Louisiana can become
a reality. Both public apathy and a penal system that is politically
controlled have contributed to limited correctional reform.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to assess empirically the effects of a modified
interpersonal communication skill training program upon specific attitudes and behaviors of selected correctional employees at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women.

The primary objective was to determine through the use of an appropriate rating scale the longitudinal (sixty days) and immediate effects of the training program upon the correctional employees' ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness as defined by Carkhuff (1969a). The secondary objective was to examine the effects of the training program upon the correctional employees' self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance as measured by the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956).

**Predictive Hypotheses**

1. There will be a significant longitudinal (sixty days) change in the correctional employees' ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness as a result of the interpersonal communication skill training they received.

2. There will be a significant immediate change in the correctional employees' ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness as a result of the interpersonal communication skill training they received.

3. There will be a significant longitudinal (sixty days) difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel receiving interpersonal communication skill training in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness.

4. There will be a significant difference between the
correctional officers and administrative personnel immediately after receiving interpersonal communication skill training in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness.

5. There will be a significant interaction between the type of respondent and treatment group in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness.

6. There will be a significant change in the experimental groups' levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance immediately after the conclusion of the training program.

7. There will be a significant change in the experimental groups' levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance sixty days after the conclusion of the training program.

8. There will be a significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the immediate effects of the training program on their levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance.

9. There will be a significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the sixty day effects of the training program on their levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance.

10. There will be a significant interaction between the type of respondent and treatment group in their levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance.

11. There will be a significant correlation within the experimental and control groups between the levels of empathy, respect, and
genuineness and self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance immediately after the training program.

Significance of the Study

The Louisiana State penal system population in 1974 (including people in work release programs and "in transit") was approximately 5,300. The number of full- and part-time professionals employed by the Louisiana Department of Corrections who served the inmates in various capacities is presented in Table 1. Computation of the number of available professionals and of the total number of inmates revealed that these professionals had a mean caseload of ninety-one inmates (Stalder, 1974).

While there was no established overall recidivism rate available for Louisiana, the parole recidivism rate in 1973 was 25.5 percent. Of the inmate population at Angola (the major Louisiana institution for adult male offenders), in 1974, 47 percent were second or multiple offenders (Stalder, 1974). From a review of these statistics it can be inferred that there were insufficient professional personnel available to staff a realistic rehabilitative effort. In addition, a study of the history of Louisiana's correctional system with attention given to its place in the political structure of the state indicates that funds sufficient to maximize the rehabilitation efforts of the Louisiana Department of Corrections will not be available in the immediate future (Carleton, 1971).

It seems evident that correctional officers and other non-professional members of the staff need to become a part of the treatment
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Case Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Case Worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Counselor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Social Worker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist's Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Social Worker</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and rehabilitation process. The federal government, from whom various states often take their lead, has indicated the importance of such involvement on the part of all prison employees (Megathlin, 1969).

The United States Civil Service Commission Bureau of Policies And Standards (1971) recognizes that there is a severely limited number of professional personnel available for correctional work, and that the contact of those who do work with inmates is infrequent. They state that it is because of this limitation that it is particularly important for correctional officers to take advantage of their opportunity to change the undesirable attitudes and behavior patterns of inmates. Correctional officers have the opportunity to develop a therapeutic type of relationship with inmates; and because of this relationship, they have the opportunity to counsel inmates concerning their personal, emotional, and institutional adjustment problems.

Peizer, Lewis, and Scollon (1956) reviewed the functioning of prisoner rehabilitation programs and determined that one of the most important factors in promoting the rehabilitation process is productive interpersonal relationships. Personnel who come into contact with inmates must possess the personal and social attributes of acceptable character models and must be able to respond to the needs of the inmates rather than submit to their own needs. Correctional employees establish rapport by being able to understand, accept, and respect the inmates as individuals.

Few states use standard methods of research in evaluating treatment or training programs. Ward (1973) reported a survey of forty-eight correctional systems which showed that only nineteen systems used
any kind of research operation, and that only one-third of one percent of the total annual budget for adult corrections in the United States was devoted to self-study. The Louisiana Department of Corrections does not budget money for research, and the Training Division of the Department of Corrections has never formally evaluated training programs which have been conducted by them.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The limitations of the study were as follows:

1. This study was limited to the evaluation of forty hours of interpersonal communication skill training administered by one trainer to a selected population of ten correctional personnel at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women beginning September 13, 1974 and ending on October 11, 1974.

2. This study was limited to evaluating changes in the level of the communication of empathy, respect, and genuineness both at the conclusion of the training period and sixty days later as measured by a five-level rating scale developed by Carkhuff (1969a).

3. This study was limited to the evaluation of the attitudes of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance both at the conclusion of the training program and sixty days later as measured by the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956).

4. This study was limited by the inability to randomly select the subjects (correctional employees).
Definition of Terms

Interpersonal Communication Skill

Carkhuff (1969a) defines interpersonal communication skill as facilitative interpersonal functioning. The person who possesses such skill is described as follows:

The facilitator is a person who is living effectively himself and who discloses himself in a genuine and constructive fashion in response to others. He communicates an accurate empathic understanding and respect for all of the feelings of other persons and guides discussions with those persons into specific feelings and experiences. He communicates confidence in what he is doing and is spontaneous and intense. In addition, while he is open and flexible in his relations with others, in his commitment to the welfare of the other person he is quite capable of active, assertive, and even confronting behavior when it is appropriate (Carkhuff, 1969a:115).

Helper

A helper is a person who helps another by functioning at a high level of responsive and initiative interpersonal behavior. The desire to be helpful is communicated to that person through the high interpersonal skills of empathy, respect, and genuineness. For the purpose of this study the correctional personnel at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women who received the training were the helpers.

Helpee

A helpee is one who comes in contact with a helper within the context of the helper's work setting. For the purpose of this study the inmates at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women were helpees.
**Skill Training Program**

The Skill Training Program was a training program in which interpersonal communication skills were taught.

**Rating Scale**

The rating scale is a five-level comprehensive scale developed by Carkhuff (1969a) and used to measure the level of empathy, respect, and genuineness of a helper. In this paper the mnemonic device, ERG-C, was used.

**Behavior**

Behavior is defined as the subjects' empathy, respect, and genuineness as measured by Carkhuff's (1969a) scale and as rated by three judges.

**Attitude**

Attitude is the subjects' state of mind toward self and others as measured by the Self-acceptance, Self-control, and Tolerance scales of the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956). In this paper the mnemonic device, SaScTo-CPI, was used.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature related to this study will be presented in four sections: (1) foundations of interpersonal communication; (2) core conditions of a helping relationship; (3) development of interpersonal communication skill training model; and (4) longitudinal effects of interpersonal communication skill training.

Foundations of Interpersonal Communication

Numerous empirical studies conducted during the 1950s and the 1960s concerning the effectiveness of psychotherapeutic techniques for helping others indicated that traditional techniques were no more effective than no treatment at all (Eysenck, 1952, 1965; Harris, 1954; Rosenthal, 1955; Rosenbaum, 1956; Mason, 1956; Betz, 1962; Cartwright & Lerner, 1963; Levitt, 1963, Endicott & Endicott, 1963; Fiske & Goodman, 1965; Lewis, 1965; Weber, Elinson, & Moss, 1965; Heilbrunn, 1966; Koegler & Brill, 1967; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, & Truax, 1967). Other empirical studies indicated that traditional psychotherapeutic techniques have a positive effect on clients (Schjelderup, 1955; Ellis, 1956; Orgel, 1958; Lorr, McNair, Michaux, & Raskin, 1962; Schlien, Mosak, & Dreikurs, 1962; Feifel & Eells, 1963; Sager, Riess, & Grendlach, 1964; Riess, 1967; Persons, 1967; Aronson & Weintraub, 1968; Varble & Landfield, 1969).

A comprehensive review of outcome studies within the past fifteen years has led Bergin to conclude:
It now seems apparent that psychotherapy, as practiced over the past 40 years, has had an average effect that is modestly positive. It is clear, however, that the averaged group data on which this conclusion is based obscure the existence of a multiplicity of processes occurring in therapy, some of which are now known to be either unproductive or actually harmful (Bergin, 1971:263).

While the efficacy of psychotherapy continued to be debated, it was recognized that the process of psychotherapy is a relationship between two or more people and that the therapist plays a key role in that relationship. A systematic theoretical view of the content of the relationship was constructed by several researchers (Fiedler, 1950; Rogers, 1951; Shoben, 1953; Bordin, 1955; Shaffer & Shoben, 1956). It was primarily Rogers who qualified and later quantified the content of a therapeutic interpersonal relationship. He concluded that certain conditions must exist and continue over a period of time if personality change is to occur. It is necessary that:

(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 (Rogers, 1957:96).

Rogers's conceptions of congruence, accurate empathy, and unconditional positive regard have been recognized as essential ingredients of the psychotherapeutic process. A study by Halkides (1958) lent support to the importance of interpersonal skill in a therapeutic relationship. He showed that therapists with high levels of empathy, unconditional
positive regard, and self-congruence produced significantly better results than those who did not possess such skill.

A now-classic study by Whitehorn and Betz (1954) established the significance of a therapeutic relationship. They conducted a retrospective study of fourteen psychiatrists who had had similar training and had worked with schizophrenic patients at Johns Hopkins Hospital. Seven of the psychiatrists had an improvement rate of 75 percent with their patients, while the other seven had an improvement rate of 27 percent. The evidence gathered in the study indicated that the former therapists' success rate was the result of the personal, warm, understanding, immediate, and idiosyncratic relationship that they had with their patients. The latter therapists were less personal and more formal with their patients.

A four-year study by Rogers, Truax, Gendlin, and Kiesler of sixteen hospitalized schizophrenics generated further studies which showed that the three core conditions were predictive of therapy outcome (Rogers, 1962; Truax, 1963; Truax & Carkhuff, 1963; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, & Truax, 1967). The clients of therapists who displayed high levels of nonpossessive warmth, genuineness, and accurate empathic understanding showed significant improvement.

Truax and Carkhuff (1967), Carkhuff and Berenson (1967), and Carkhuff (1969a) have defined Rogers (1957) original core conditions as (1) accurate empathic understanding of the client, (2) the therapist's genuineness, and (3) respect for the client. Numerous studies have shown the positive effects and the importance of these core conditions
in therapeutic relationships (Truax, Carkhuff, & Kodman, 1965; Dickerson & Truax, 1966; Truax, Wargo, & Silber, 1966; Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Hoehn-Saric, Nash, & Stone, 1966; Truax & Wargo, 1967a, 1967b; Truax & Wargo, 1969). These studies suggest that there is a direct relationship between the therapist's use of the core conditions and client outcome. The relationship appears to hold true for a wide variety of therapeutic techniques and a wide variety of clients (neurotics, schizophrenics, juvenile delinquents, and college students who are undersachievers).

Other studies have also shown that a relationship exists between the therapist's level of interpersonal functioning and the client's level of self-exploration (Carkhuff & Truax, 1965; Holder, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1967; Carkhuff & Alexik, 1966; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969a). Clients of therapists who functioned at a high level moved toward higher levels of self-exploration, while clients of therapists who functioned at a low level moved toward lower levels of self-exploration. When the high functioning therapists experimentally lowered the level of their responses, there was not a corresponding decrease in self-exploration by high functioning clients. When the same conditions were repeated with low functioning clients there was a corresponding decline in self-exploration. When therapists who functioned at moderate levels experimentally lowered their level of functioning both the low and high functioning clients engaged in less self-exploration.

While it has been determined that there are significant positive
effects from a therapeutic relationship in which medium to high levels of the core conditions exist, it has also been learned that negative effects result when the therapist in the relationship possesses low levels of the same conditions. Numerous psychotherapy outcome studies show that some clients deteriorate in therapy rather than improve, and that there appears to be a relationship between the therapist's level of interpersonal skill and the direction of change within the client (Rogers, 1962; Bergin, 1963, 1966, 1967a, 1967b, 1970; Truax, 1963; Truax & Carkhuff, 1963, 1964a, 1967; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, & Truax, 1967; Strupp & Bergin, 1969; Truax & Mitchell, 1971).

In conclusion, client growth is related to the therapist possessing and using the interpersonal skills of empathy, respect, and genuineness in the counseling relationship. The levels of these three core conditions are predictive of therapy outcome. The level of client functioning is related to the level at which the therapist is functioning. Therapy clearly can be for better or worse, depending upon the level of these core conditions.

Core Conditions of a Helping Relationship

A review of the literature has indicated that empathy, respect, and genuineness are the three core conditions which are most significant in a helping relationship. The interpersonal communication skill model upon which this study was based is an outgrowth of the research centered around these therapeutic variables. Carkhuff (1969a, 1969b, 1971) added three additional process variables that he has indicated to be important in a helping relationship: concreteness, immediacy, and
confrontation. They have received less attention by researchers than the core conditions, and are not directly a part of this study. A brief examination of all six variables is important, however, for a comprehensive presentation of the training model used in this study.

**Empathy**

The process variable commonly viewed as the most important ingredient in a helping relationship is that of empathy (Freud, 1922; Rogers, 1951, 1957; Krumboltz, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969a, 1969b, 1971; Truax & Mitchell, 1971). While the definition of empathy may vary slightly from one theorist to another theorist, or from one clinician to another clinician, it is the most significant core condition. A representative definition is that:

Accurate empathic understanding involves the ability to perceive and communicate accurately and with sensitivity both the feelings and experiences of another person and their meaning and significance (Truax & Mitchell, 1971:317).

To be succinct, empathy is "... the ability to see the world through the other person's eyes (Carkhuff, 1970:170)."

Simply being empathic in a helping relationship, or even communicating empathy in the relationship, is not enough. Carkhuff (1969a) has emphasized that it is the therapist's level of communicated empathy which directly relates to the client's level of understanding of self and others.

When the first person's responses add significantly to the expressions of the second person in such a way as to express accurately feelings several levels below what the second person was able to express, or in the event of ongoing deep self-exploration on the part of the second person, when the first person is fully with him in his deepest moments, then the second
person can learn through the significant sources of learning to respond sensitively to his own world and those of others (Carkhuff, 1969a:36).

It also appears that the timing of the empathic response is equally as important as the level of the response. Client improvement is linked more with the final level of empathy than with the initial responses (Cartwright & Lerner, 1963). Additionally, there may be a negative effect if too much empathy is offered in the early stages of the helping relationship (Truax & Carkhuff, 1963). It is important for the therapist to move from one level of empathy to another, always being at a level deeper than that communicated by the client, but not being so beyond the client that he can not use the expression as a means of growth (Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967).

Respect

The term respect as used in this study evolved from Roger's (1957) core conditions which he termed warmth and unconditional positive regard. He stated:

To the extent that the therapist finds himself experiencing a warm acceptance of each aspect of the client's experience as being a part of that client, he is experiencing unconditional positive regard . . . it means a caring for the client as a separate person, with permission to have his own feelings, his own experiences (Rogers, 1957:98).

Rausch and Bordin (1957) also pointed to the importance of warmth in a helping relationship. They suggested that the therapist must be committed to the client, that he must show that he understands the client, and that he must be spontaneous with the client if he is to transmit warmth to that client.

While warmth and understanding are a part of respect, respect is
not nonpossessive warmth, nonretaliatory permissiveness, or unconditional positive regard (Carkhuff, 1969a). It is more. To respect another person is to recognize that person's worth as a person, and recognizing his potential for doing something with his life (Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff, 1968, 1969a; Pierce, 1968).

**Genuineness**

It is important in a helping relationship for the therapist to have more than empathic understanding and respect:

... empathy and warmth could not be constructively meaningful unless they were given by a person who was at least minimally "real." Even if it were possible to be experiencing warmth and understanding from an unpredictable phony or a strongly defensive individual (including a potential enemy), it would seem likely to be more threatening than facilitative. In this sense, genuineness or nondefensiveness or nonphoniness is most basic to a human relationship. This makes a trusting and open relationship possible (Truax & Mitchell, 1971:314).

Genuineness is the foundation for a helping relationship (Martin, 1967; Truax & Carkhuff, 1966).

To be genuine is to possess "... the ability to be real in relationship with another person (Carkhuff, 1971:170)." The relationship is established by the degree of honesty between the therapist and the client. There is evidence to suggest that low levels of genuineness inhibit client progress, but there also is an indication that there is no additional client progress beyond a certain level of therapist-offered genuineness (Truax & Carkhuff, 1964b).

**Concreteness**

Concreteness occurs in a helping relationship when both the
therapist and client are specific in the expression of their feelings and experiences. This process variable serves three functions: (1) the therapist is able to be close to the client's feelings and experiences; (2) the therapist's understanding of the client's responses is facilitated; and (3) the therapist's behavior promotes specificity of response from the client (Carkhuff & Truax, 1964c, 1966; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967). The therapist's concreteness in the early stages of the helping relationship facilitates empathic understanding of the client. In later stages of the helping relationship, the same concreteness facilitates problem solving and decision making by the client (Carkhuff, 1971).

**Immediacy**

The therapist's understanding of the client's feelings and experiences immediately in the present, and his activity which is based on this understanding, is the process variable of immediacy. It is through the therapist's act of immediacy in the relationship that the client learns to "... act with immediacy and later to direct the actions of others (Carkhuff, 1969a:38)." He must be able to know and to relate "... where the helpee is coming from (Carkhuff, 1971:170)."

**Confrontation**

The therapist's ability to confront the client with any discrepancies in the client's behavior or responses is directly related to the client's ability to confront himself and others (Carkhuff, 1969a). The difference or discrepancies which may occur in the helping relationship are:
(1) the helpee's expression of who or what he wishes to be and how he actually experiences himself, (2) the helpee's verbal expression of his awareness of himself and his observable or reported behavior . . . (Carkhuff, 1969a:38).

Therapist-directed confrontation is not a necessary ingredient in a helping relationship, but it can facilitate client growth when it is applied as a skill with the interpersonal communication skills. Results from several studies showed that therapists who functioned at high levels of empathy, warmth, genuineness, and concreteness were more confrontive than therapists who functioned at significantly lower levels (Anderson, 1968; Berenson, Mitchell, & Laney, 1968; Berenson, Mitchell, & Moravec, 1968).

In 1957 Rogers developed global scales to measure the level of a therapist's accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness. Truax (1961, 1962) later built upon Roger's work and developed an accurate empathy scale in 1961, and the unconditional positive regard and genuineness scales in 1962. Carkhuff (1969a) refined and expanded this early development to construct the global scale used in this study, as well as individual scales for measuring empathy, respect, genuineness, concreteness, immediacy, and confrontation.

In conclusion, research has established the significance of the core conditions of empathy, respect, and genuineness in a helping relationship. While the research has yet to determine the significance of the additional interpersonal communication skills of concreteness, immediacy, and confrontation, there is an indication that the helping relationship is enhanced when the therapist possesses and acts upon these skills.
Development of Interpersonal Communication

Skill Training Model

The research previously mentioned indicated that clients change differentially according to the therapist's level of interpersonal functioning. These studies were based upon the interpersonal functioning of professionals, i.e., therapists and counselors. This work laid the foundation for the development of an interpersonal communication skill training model by Carkhuff (1969a). The model developed in three stages: (1) generalizing the interpersonal effects to other areas of human development; (2) extending the dimensions of the helping relationship; and (3) applying the learned knowledge about interpersonal communication. The training model upon which this study was based is an adaptation of the Carkhuff (1969a) model.

The earliest study to generalize the interpersonal effects to other areas of human development was done by Aspy (1969). He selected six third grade teachers and 120 students to test the hypothesis that student cognitive growth is related to the teacher's level of empathy, positive regard, and congruence. The teacher's interaction with the students in reading groups was tape recorded one week in March and one week in May. Five subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test were administered to the students in September and again in May of the same academic year. The results supported the hypothesis that there is a significant positive relationship between teacher-offered levels of empathy, positive regard, and congruence, and the cognitive growth of students. Stoffer (1970) replicated these findings and also established
a relationship between teacher-level of interpersonal functioning and classroom behavior.

Kratochvil, Carkhuff, and Berenson (1969) studied the effects of parent and teacher interpersonal functioning levels on the emotional, physical, and intellectual levels of functioning of fifth grade students. They found that there was a significant relationship between the physical, emotional, and intellectual functioning of the students.

Vitalo (1970) examined the differential effects of people and programs. The research results indicated that the interpersonal functioning level of a helper and a systematic program had a significant effect in verbal conditioning of personal pronoun emissions by students in the study. It was found that conditioning was dependent upon the interpersonal functioning level of the experimenter.

Mickelson (1970) investigated the relationship between the interpersonal functioning level of graduate students in introductory counselor education courses and the information-seeking behavior of 48 eleventh grade students. The graduate students acted as counselors to the high school students. It was found that counselors who functioned at high interpersonal communication levels produced significantly greater amounts of information-seeking behavior in the students than those counselors who functioned at low levels.

There appears to be sufficient evidence to suggest that the interpersonal effects of a helper can be generalized to other areas of human development. The studies reviewed suggest existence of a relationship between the emotional, physical, and intellectual domains of human development.
The second stage in the development of the interpersonal communication skill training model occurred when the dimensions of helper behavior were expanded from the responsive to the initiative dimensions, and when professionals and non-professionals alike began to be systematically trained in the use of these skills. The conditions of a therapeutic or helping relationship were expanded from those of empathy, respect, and genuineness to also include the skills of concreteness, confrontation, and immediacy (Carkhuff, 1969a). Program dimensions also were added to provide problem-solving and program development activities (1972, 1973).

The helping process as conceptualized by Carkhuff (1971, 1972) was developed to include three phases: exploration, understanding, and action. The helper systematically uses appropriate interpersonal skills to respond first to the helpee's feelings and experiences, and later uses initiative skills to facilitate helpee action directed toward resolving his problem.

The last stage in the development of the interpersonal communication skill training model upon which this study was based occurred when application studies were conducted to measure the effectiveness of the model with a variety of helper and helpee populations. It was learned that diverse groups of professionals and non-professionals who could be trained to use interpersonal skills included: psychiatric patients (Pierce & Drasgow, 1969); rehabilitation aids (Crisler, 1969); professional therapists and counselors (Carkhuff, 1969a; Hart, 1973); parents of emotionally disturbed children (Carkhuff & Bierman, 1970); student teachers (Berenson, 1971) correctional

In conclusion, studies indicate that the interpersonal effects of a helper can be generalized to other areas of human development, i.e., physical, emotional, and intellectual. The helping process, which includes the three phases of exploration, understanding, and action, is applicable to a variety of helper and helpee populations. Both professionals and non-professionals can be trained to interact effectively in a helping relationship.

**Longitudinal Effects of Interpersonal Communication Skill Training**

The application studies cited indicate that the interpersonal communication skill training model upon which this study was based can have an immediate positive effect upon the levels of communication by professionals and non-professionals in a helping relationship. A search of the literature does not indicate, however, that studies have been conducted to measure the longitudinal effects of such training.

**Summary**

The purpose of this chapter was to review the foundations of interpersonal communication, the core conditions of a helping relationship, the development of the interpersonal communication skill training model upon which this study was based, and the longitudinal effects of interpersonal communication skill training.

There appears to be sufficient evidence to draw several
conclusions pertinent to this study: (1) helpee change is related to the helper possessing and using the interpersonal skills of empathy, respect, and genuineness, and that such change can be for better or worse, depending upon the level of these core conditions; (2) while the core conditions of empathy, respect, and genuineness are significant process variables in a helping relationship, there is an indication that the relationship also is enhanced by using the additional interpersonal communication skills of concreteness, immediacy, and confrontation; (3) the training model upon which this study was based has wide applicability to include various settings and populations; and (4) the interpersonal communication skill training model upon which this study was based can have an immediate positive effect upon the levels of communication skills, but evidence has not been presented to indicate the effects of such training beyond the period of training.
Chapter 3

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to measure selected immediate and longitudinal (sixty days) effects of an interpersonal communication skill training program administered to selected employees at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women. A quasi-experimental design following the pretest-posttest control group model was used.

This chapter includes a presentation of: (1) sampling procedure, (2) instrumentation, (3) judges, (4) trainer qualifications, (5) training program, (6) hypotheses, (7) data analysis, (8) study sequence, and (9) assumptions.

**Sampling Procedure**

The subjects for this study were twelve correctional officers and eight administrative personnel employed by the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women. Both the experimental and the control group contained six correctional officers and four administrative personnel.

The subjects were selected by the Chief of Security at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women on the basis of their availability. None of the subjects had had previous counselor training or interpersonal communication skill training. The subjects' mean age, level of education, years experience in correctional work, and sex is summarized in Table 2.
Table 2
Mean Age, Education, Years Experience in Corrections
and Sex for the Sample Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years Experience in Corrections</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Correctional Officers (N=6)</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Personnel (N=4)</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Correctional Officers (N=6)</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Personnel (N=4)</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instrumentation**

The "Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning" scale was used to test the major hypotheses of this study. This rating scale presented in Figure 1 (Carkhuff, 1969a:115) has been previously discussed in Chapter 2. Evidence of the relationship of this scale to indexes of helpee change or gain has been supported by numerous empirical studies (Carkhuff, 1969a; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967).

It is difficult to establish standard statistical reliability and validity measures for rating scales because they are inherently different from traditional psychometric instruments. With the former the actual measuring instrument appears to be the raters rather than the rating scales (Klein & Cleary, 1967; Cannon & Carkhuff, 1969). The reliability of the scales is derived directly from the reliability of the raters. The Pearson product moment correlations for interrater and intrarater reliability for previous studies in which the "Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning" scale (Carkhuff, 1969a) was used ranged from .89 to .95 (Cannon & Carkhuff, 1969; Carkhuff, 1969c).

Interrater and intrarater reliability was established in this present study through assessing the responses of the three participating judges to six written stimuli statements and six tape recorded statements immediately after a training session in which they used the "Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning" scale (Carkhuff, 1969a:115). The judges rated the same material two weeks after the initial rating. An analysis of variance was the statistical procedure implemented to establish rater reliability. The inter-class
The facilitator is a person who is living effectively himself and who discloses himself in a genuine and constructive fashion in response to others. He communicates an accurate empathic understanding and a respect for all of the feelings of other persons and guides discussions with those persons into specific feelings and experiences. He communicates confidence in what he is doing and is spontaneous and intense. In addition, while he is open and flexible in his relations with others, in his commitment to the welfare of the other person he is quite capable of active, assertive, and even confronting behavior when it is appropriate.

**Level of Functioning**

1. None of these conditions is communicated to any noticeable degree in the person.
2. Some of the conditions are communicated and some are not.
3. All of the conditions are communicated at a minimally facilitative level.
4. All of the conditions are communicated, and some are communicated fully.
5. All of the conditions are fully communicated simultaneously and continually.
correlation measuring the repeatability of the judges was .64 (p < .05) for the written responses and .49 (p < .05) for the tape recorded responses. The intra-class correlation measuring the repeatability of the judges was .35 (p < .05) for the written responses and .29 (p < .05) for the tape recorded responses. The judges interrater and intrarater reliability was significant at the .05 level of significance.

If the actual measuring instrument is the raters rather than the rating scale, it can be concluded that "... the reliability of the raters is a direct measure of concurrent validity for their ratings," and that there is sufficient empirical evidence to suggest that the scale has high concurrent validity (Heffle & Hurst, 1972:65). It also can be concluded that predictive and construct validity has been established. Numerous studies (Banks, Berenson, & Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff, Kratochvil, & Friel, 1968; Hanson, Moore, & Carkhuff, 1968; Piaget, Berenson, & Carkhuff, 1967) have shown that clients or trainees of counselors or trainers functioning at or above level 3.0 on the "Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning" scale (Carkhuff, 1969a) engage in significantly greater self-exploration than clients or trainees of counselors or trainers functioning below level 3.0 on the same scale. It has been established experimentally that there also is a relationship between the counselor's or trainer's level of facilitative interpersonal functioning and the client's or trainee's direction of change (Holder, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1967; Pierce, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1967; Alexik & Carkhuff, 1967; Kratochvil, Aspy, & Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff & Alexik, 1967; Piaget, Berenson, & Carkhuff, 1967; Pagell, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1967; Friel, Kratochvil, & Carkhuff,
The facilitative interpersonal functioning level of the trainer has also been shown to have a direct effect on the trainee's level of functioning (Berenson, Carkhuff, & Myrus, 1966; Martin & Carkhuff, 1968; Carkhuff, 1969d; Carkhuff & Griffin, 1970; Carkhuff, 1971).

The California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956) was used to test minor hypotheses of this study. It is an instrument consisting of eighteen individual scales that provide a comprehensive profile of an individual from the point of view of social interaction. Each scale covers an important segment of interpersonal psychology that is important for social living and social interaction. Scores are reported in standard score form with a mean of fifty and standard deviation of ten.

The Self-acceptance (Sa), Self-control (Sc), and Tolerance (To) scales were used in this study because of the bearing these traits have on interpersonal communication, especially with respect to communicating empathy, respect, and genuineness. The purpose of their use was to determine if the training had a significant effect on the levels of the personality traits, and to determine if there is a relationship between the levels of the traits and the levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness.

The Sa scale identifies individuals who have a comfortable and undisturbed sense of personal worth and are seen by others as being secure and sure of themselves. Males who are high scorers are described as "confident, enterprising, egotistical, imaginative, opportunistic, outgoing, polished, self-confident, self-seeking, sophisticated," while high scoring females are described as "adventurous, argumentative,
bossy, demanding, determined, dominant, outgoing, sarcastic, talkative, witty (Gough, 1968:9)." A high score, however, is not necessarily an optimum score.

That is, on some scales the optimum score will not be the highest score, and an individual with a very high score might be as out of phase with his culture as a person with a very low score. On the Sa scale, for example, a moderate elevation probably points toward a beneficial level of self-satisfaction and internal harmony, but a very high score (standard score of 70 or above) will suggest egotism, manipulative behavior toward others, and even narcissism as a defense against unconscious feelings of self-rejection (Gough, 1968:10).

Males who are low scorers are described as "bitter, commonplace, interests narrow, quitting, reckless, submissive, tense, unintelligent, withdrawn, self-denying," while low scoring females are described as "cautious, conventional, gentle, mild, modest, patient, peaceable, shy, trusting, unassuming (Gough, 1968:10)."

The Sc scale relates to the expression of impulse and management of aggression.

At the high end, the scale was intended to reflect over-control, too much suppression of impulse, and too great an involvement in the dampening and restraint of individuality. At the low end, the scale was intended to reflect under-control, quick and even explosive response to frustration or annoyance, and a tendency to react aggressively to threat or interference. It is clear that the management of impulse and the control of hostility are problems for both high and low scorers: it is only the strategy of control that differs. Thus, a high scorer may be expected to break through his controls now and then, and to behave in a hostile or vengeful manner; and a low scorer may be expected, at times, to seek suppression of impulse and then to behave in a curiously inert or seemingly inappropriate way. The optimum score, one might think, would be near the midpoint of the distribution (a standard score of 49 to 50). However, the optimum will depend on the values of the interpreter. If social stability, reduction of interpersonal friction, harmony, etc., are esteemed, then an optimum standard score would be about 55; if innovation, spontaneity, and zest in confronting and proposing social change are favored, the optimum would be closer to 42 (Gough, 1968:12-13).
Males who are high scorers are described as "considerable, dependable, hard-headed, logical, painstaking, precise, reasonable, reliable, self-controlled, self-denying," while females who are high scorers are described as "calm, conservative, gentle, moderate, modest, patient, peaceable, quiet, reserved, self-controlled (Gough, 1968:13)." Low scoring males are described as "conceited, fault-finding, hasty, headstrong, impulsive, individualistic, self-seeking, spunky, temperamental, unrealistic," and low scoring females as "adventurous, aggressive, arrogant, excitable, impulsive, rebellious, restless, sarcastic, temperamental, uninhibited (Gough, 1968:13)."

The To scale is an indirect assessment of the authoritarian personality of an individual. Male high scorers are described as "forgiving, generous, good-natured, independent, informal, pleasant, reasonable, soft-hearted, thoughtful, unselfish," while females who score high are described as "calm, efficient, insightful, leisurely, logical, mature, responsible, self-controlled, tactful, understanding (Gough, 1968:13)." Low scoring males are described as "affected, cold, egotistical, fussy, hard-hearted, self-centered, shallow, thankless, whiny, fault-finding," and low scoring females are described as "arrogant, autocratic, bitter, defensive, distrustful, hard-headed, infantile, resentful, restless, sarcastic (Gough, 1968:13).

The test-retest reliabilities for the Sa scale range from .67 to .71, from .68 to .86 for the Sc scale, and from .61 to .87 for the To scale. Validity coefficients, which were drawn from cross-validational studies of the inventory, range from .32 to .39 for the
Sa scale, from .21 to .51 for the Sc scale, and from -.46 to .34 for the To scale (Gough, 1957).

**Judges**

Three judges from this geographical region were selected to rate the trainer's and trainee's responses to the stimuli statements (Appendix A) and tape recorded counseling sessions used in this study. The judges were selected on the basis of their knowledge of and training in interpersonal communication skill training (see Appendix B for their vitas).

Approximately two and one-half hours were used to familiarize the raters with the present study, and to practice with the rating scale in an experimental setting. The raters then were presented with responses to six written stimuli statements and six tape recorded statements to establish interrater and intrarater reliability. The results were presented earlier in this chapter.

**Trainer Qualifications**

The level of interpersonal communication skill attained by trainees is directly related to the level of communication skill possessed by the trainer (Carkhuff, 1969a; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967). The trainer, who is a female and the Chief of Security at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women, was assigned the responsibility for the training program upon which this study was based. She previously had received 150 hours of interpersonal communication skill training under the supervision of personnel at The Institute of Government, at the University of Georgia. The three judges for the present study rated
the trainer on prepared stimuli statements using the Carkhuff (1969a) "Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning" scale. They rated ten written stimuli statements to which the trainer had responded in writing immediately prior to the beginning of the training program evaluated by this study. They determined her average level of functioning to be 3.0. They also rated the trainer's responses to an inmate in a tape recorded counseling session and, according to the same index, determined her average level of functioning to be 2.7. The judges ratings are presented in Table 3, and indicate that the trainer is qualified to conduct an interpersonal communication skill training program.

Training Program

The forty hour training program at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women was based on the previously mentioned 150 hour training program supervised by personnel at The Institute of Government, at the University of Georgia and the model presented by Carkhuff (1972, 1973. It was a basic correctional counseling program constructed around the premise that all correctional employees who have direct or indirect contact with inmates should possess the highest possible level of interpersonal communication skill. The training program was designed to help correctional employees acquire the necessary interpersonal skills to help inmates help themselves. The trainer set two primary objectives for the trainees: to learn interpersonal communication skills and to implement these learned skills.

There were three basic process dimensions which the training
Table 3
"Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning"
Level of Trainer as Rated by Three Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Written Statements</th>
<th>Tape Recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
program emphasized: helpee (inmate) self-exploration, helpee self-understanding, and helpee self-directed action. Trainees were expected to master the communication skill appropriate for each process dimension. This process model trained helpers to initially respond to the psychological and physical needs of the helpee and, in the later phase, to encourage the helpee to plan and institute responsible, self-directed behavior.

Two methods of training were implemented to attain the program objectives: didactic and experiential. First, the trainer taught the trainees the basic concepts and techniques of being a helper. Second, the trainees had the opportunity to explore their personal attitudes and feelings toward themselves and others and to be in the role of a helper (see Appendix C for the Training Outline).

**Experimental Hypotheses**

For the purposes of statistical analysis, the following null hypotheses were tested:

**Major Hypotheses**

1. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the longitudinal (sixty days) effects of the training program on the ability of the correctional employees to communicate ERG-C.

   2. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program on the ability of the correctional employees to communicate ERG-C.
3. There will be no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the experimental and control groups in the longitudinal (sixty days) effects of the training program on their ability to communicate ERG-C.

4. There will be no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program on their ability to communicate ERG-C.

5. There will be no significant interaction between the type of respondent and training group in their ability to communicate ERG-C.

Minor Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program on the employees' levels of SaScTo-CPI.

2. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the longitudinal (sixty days) effects of the training program on the employees' levels of SaScTo-CPI.

3. There will be no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program on the employees' levels of SaScTo-CPI.

4. There will be no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the experimental and control groups in the longitudinal (sixty days) effects of the training program on the employees' levels of SaScTo-CPI.
5. There will be no significant interaction between the type of respondent and training group in their levels of SaScTo-CPI.

6. There will be no significant correlation within the experimental and control groups between the levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness and self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance immediately after training.

Data Analysis

The research design used in this study was complex; therefore the following explanation is appropriate. It was a three-dimensional, Type III, mixed model as described by Linquist (1953:284). In this study the model was replicated at fixed time intervals, which was an adaptation of Linquist's (1953) random replications of the same model. When data cast in this design is subjected to analysis of variance, the resulting sums of squares include a between-subjects error term. They also result in the analysis of the effects of the time factor. They allow all main effects, simple effects, and interaction effects to be tested with a between-subject error term. They also result in a within-groups error term which can be used to test the main effect of the time factors, the interaction of group by time effects, and the interaction of employee by time effects. These interactions (Group x Time and Employee x Time) are applied to support or reject the major hypotheses of this study.

A least squares analysis of variance procedure was used to determine if the interactions above were significant. The directionality of the difference was tested by using Scheffe's post-hoc test for
difference between means (Hays, 1963). This is the manner by which the major hypotheses were tested. The minor hypotheses were tested by analysis of co-variance where the pre-training scores were used as the co-variable. When the interactions for Group x Time and Employee x Time were significant, the Scheffe test was used to determine the directionality of difference (Hays, 1963). In addition, the significance of the Group x Employee interaction was tested to further substantiate the hypothesis that the differences were due to training rather than employee classification.

**Study Sequence**

There were three phases of the present study: (1) the pre-evaluation phase, (2) the training phase, and (3) the post-evaluation phase. The procedures of the study are presented in chronological order.

The pre-evaluation phase of the study began September 3, 1974, with the selection of a sample of correctional personnel from the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women by the trainer. Ten correctional employees were available for the training (six correctional officers and four administrative personnel). Selection was limited by the number of personnel employed at the institution and the work schedules required by the staff. The employees were contacted by the trainer and informed of their selection to receive forty hours of interpersonal communication skill training beginning September 13, 1974, and ending October 11, 1974. Ten other employees (six correctional officers and four administrative personnel) were contacted and informed that they had been selected as members of a control group to assist in
evaluating selected effects of a training program in which other correctional employees were to participate. They were asked to participate in the present study. Nine of the members selected agreed to participate as subjects in the control group. The trainer then selected another individual. He also agreed to participate in the control group. This completed formation of the experimental and control groups.

The control group subjects were pre-evaluated on an individual basis from September 5, 1974, to September 12, 1974. First, they were presented ten written stimuli statements to assess their current level of interpersonal communication skill (see Appendix A). All of the subjects were given the same instructions: they were asked to respond in writing in the most helpful way possible. Second, the subjects were administered the California Psychological Inventory (1956) immediately after they had responded to the stimuli statements. All of the subjects were informed that the major purpose of the present study was the comparison of the experimental and control groups rather than the comparison of individuals. They were assured that their responses to the stimuli statements and the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956) would be confidential.

The experimental group subjects were pre-evaluated as a group on September 13, 1974, immediately prior to the beginning of the training phase of the study. First, they were presented ten written stimuli statements to assess their current level of interpersonal communication skill (see Appendix A). Second, the experimental group subjects were administered the California Psychological Inventory (1956). They were informed that their responses to the written stimuli
statements would be reviewed by the trainer and that the California Psychological Inventory (1956) results would be available only to the person conducting the present study. In addition, the subjects were informed that the major purpose of the study was the comparison of the experimental and control groups rather than the comparison of individuals.

The trainer was presented with the same ten written stimuli statements as the experimental and the control group subjects to assess her level of interpersonal communication skill (see Appendix A). She also was given the same instructions. This concluded the pre-evaluation phase of the study.

The training phase of the study began September 13, 1974, and was concluded on October 11, 1974. Training was conducted one day a week (eight hours a day) for five weeks during regularly scheduled work hours. The training program was discussed previously in this chapter (see Appendix C for the Training Outline).

The post-evaluation phase of the present study consisted of three segments: (1) selection of client-volunteers, (2) post-evaluation following training, and (3) post-evaluation sixty days following training.

The selection of inmates to be helpees (client-volunteers) of the subjects in the experimental and the control group began on October 4, 1974. A notice was posted on the dormitory bulletin board soliciting volunteers to participate in the study. Four days later thirty inmates had signed the notice. These inmates were oriented to the purpose of the study on October 8, 1974, by the investigator. They were instructed
that they were to present a current personal problem to one of the
correctional employees involved in the study. It was made explicit
that the client-volunteers would have no choice as to the person to
whom their problem would be presented. A general discussion was held
to answer other questions about their participation. Following the dis-
cussion, the inmates were given an opportunity to withdraw their previous
commitment to participate. All of the thirty inmates agreed to partici-
pate in the study. The twenty-one client-volunteers used in the present
study were randomly selected from the thirty inmates who had volunteered
to participate.

The first post-evaluation segment of the study began on October
11, 1974, immediately after the training phase. The experimental group
subjects were administered seven different written stimuli statements
(see Appendix A) and the California Psychological Inventory (Gough,
1956) as posttest measures. They were given the same instructions as
provided during the pretest phase of the study. These subjects then
were introduced to client-volunteers who presented personal problems.
The client-volunteers and the experimental group subjects were paired
according to a randomized assignment procedure. The experimental
group subjects were instructed to respond to the client-volunteers in
the most helpful way possible. They were informed that their conversa-
tion would be tape recorded and evaluated by three judges at a later
date. The post-evaluation of the experimental group subjects was
concluded on October 11, 1974.

The control group subjects were evaluated from October 11, 1974,
to October 15, 1974. These subjects were given the same posttest
measures as the experimental group subjects. They also were assigned a client-volunteer according to a randomized assignment procedure. The instructions to the control group subjects were the same as those given to the experimental group subjects.

The trainer was introduced to a client-volunteer who presented a personal problem on October 11, 1974. She was evaluated under the same conditions and was given the same instructions as the experimental and the control group subjects.

The second post-evaluation segment of the study began sixty days following the conclusion of the training phase. It was conducted from December 10, 1974, to December 14, 1974. The experimental and the control group subjects were evaluated on an individual basis. They were administered the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956), and were introduced to client-volunteers. The client-volunteers were paired with the subjects on the basis of a randomized assignment procedure. The instructions given to the subjects were the same as in the previously detailed post-evaluation segment. The trainer was not evaluated during this segment of the study. This concluded the post-evaluation phase of the study.

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions were made concerning this study:

1. The trainer who had completed 150 hours of interpersonal communication skill training was qualified to teach the skills previously mentioned in this study.

2. The judges ratings constitute evidence of the degree to
which the interpersonal communication skills of empathy, respect, and genuineness were attained by the correctional employees in this study.

3. The instruments used in this study yield reliable and valid measures for testing the hypotheses.
Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The data presented and analyzed for the major hypotheses consisted of the following: (1) the judges' mean ratings of the experimental and control groups' written and tape recorded responses on the scale of ERG-C; (2) the mean ratings for the experimental and control groups' tape recorded responses on the scale of ERG-C immediately before training and sixty days after training; (3) the mean ratings for the experimental and control groups' written responses on the scale of ERG-C immediately before training and immediately after training; (4) the mean ratings for the correctional officers' and administrative personnel's tape recorded responses on the scale of ERG-C immediately after training and sixty days after training; and (5) the mean ratings for the correctional officers' and administrative personnel's written responses on the scale of ERG-C immediately before training and immediately after training.

The data presented and analyzed for the minor hypotheses consisted of the following: (1) the experimental and control groups' mean difference scores on the SaScTo-CPI scales immediately after training and sixty days after training; (2) the correctional officers' and administrative personnel's mean difference scores on the SaScTo-CPI scales immediately after training and sixty days after training; (3) the correlations among the average ratings of the written responses on the scale of ERG-C, the average ratings of the tape recorded
responses on the scale of ERG-C and the experimental and control groups' scores on the SaScTo-CPI scales immediately after training.

**Analysis**

After presentation of the judges' mean ratings, the following outline was used to present the results of the analysis of each hypothesis:

1. Statement of the hypothesis.
2. Data used in the analysis.
3. Results of the analysis.

Table 4 shows the judges' mean ratings of the experimental and control groups' written and tape recorded responses on the scale of ERG-C. This is the raw data used in the analysis of variance to test the major hypotheses.

**Major Hypotheses**

1. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the longitudinal (sixty days) effects of the training program on the ability of the correctional employees to communicate ERG-C.

Table 5 (page 50) shows that the interaction for Group x Time was significant. The Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) for differences between means (Table 6, page 51) demonstrated that the difference was in favor of the experimental group. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The rejection of the null hypothesis on the basis of the two statistical tests means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was supported.
### Table 4

Judges' Mean Ratings of Experimental and Control Groups' Written and Tape Recorded Responses on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Mean Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.644**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
Table 5

Analysis of Variance of Ratings of Experimental and Control Group's Tape Recorded Responses on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.556</td>
<td>35.556</td>
<td>194.188**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Group x Employee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.389</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>2.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.050</td>
<td>4.050</td>
<td>41.411**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>12.781**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>4.601*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>4.601*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.611</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

**p < .01
Table 6

Mean Ratings and Difference Between Mean Ratings of Experimental and Control Groups' Tape Recorded Responses on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness Immediately After Training and Sixty Days After Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.486</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

Time 1 = Immediately after training
Time 2 = Sixty days after training
2. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program on the ability of the correctional employees to communicate ERG-C.

Table 5 (page 50) and Table 7 (page 53) show that the interaction for Group x Time was significant. The Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) for differences between means (Table 6, page 51, and Table 8, page 54) demonstrated that the difference was in favor of the experimental group. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The rejection of the null hypothesis on the basis of the two statistical tests means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was accepted.

3. There will be no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the experimental and control groups in the longitudinal (sixty days) effects of the training program on their ability to communicate ERG-C.

While Table 5 (page 50) shows that the Employee x Time interaction was significant, application of the Scheffe (Hays, 1963) test for differences between means (Table 9, page 55) demonstrated that the difference was not due to the difference in employee classification. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. The acceptance of the null hypothesis on the basis of the two statistical tests means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

4. There will be no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program on their ability to communicate ERG-C.

While Table 5 (page 50) shows that the Employee x Time interaction was significant, application of the Scheffe (Hays, 1963) test for differences between means (Table 9, page 55) to the tape recorded mean ratings demonstrated that the difference was not due to the difference
Table 7

Analysis of Variance of Ratings of Experimental and Control Groups' Written Responses on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.448</td>
<td>4.224</td>
<td>69.133**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.232</td>
<td>95.232</td>
<td>1,558.625**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.685</td>
<td>7.685</td>
<td>125.777**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.301</td>
<td>4.301</td>
<td>70.393**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Group x Employee</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.768</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>4.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.869</td>
<td>150.869</td>
<td>964.024**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102.287</td>
<td>102.287</td>
<td>653.588**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>19.493**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>18.869**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>151.530</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
Table 8
Mean Ratings and Difference Between Mean Ratings of Experimental and Control Groups' Written Responses on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness Immediately Before Training and Immediately After Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>2.635</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.406**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

Time 1 = Immediately before training
Time 2 = Immediately after training
Table 9

Mean Ratings and Difference Between Mean Ratings of Employee's Tape Recorded Responses on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness Immediately After Training and Sixty Days After Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correctional Officers</td>
<td>Administrative Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time 1 = Immediately after training
Time 2 = Sixty days after training
in employee classification. Therefore, the null hypothesis applied to the tape recorded responses was accepted. The acceptance of the null hypothesis on the basis of the two statistical tests means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

Table 7 (page 53) shows that the Employee x Time interaction was significant. The Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) for differences between means (Table 10, page 57) demonstrated that the difference was significant in favor of the administrative personnel. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The rejection of the null hypothesis on the basis of the two statistical tests means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was accepted.

5. There will be no significant interaction between the type of respondent and training group in their ability to communicate ERG-C.

Table 5 (page 50) shows that the Group x Employee interaction was not significant. Therefore, the Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) was not applied, and the null hypothesis, applied to the tape recorded responses, was accepted. Acceptance of the null hypothesis on the basis of the analysis of variance means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

While Table 7 (page 53) shows that the Group x Employee interaction was significant, application of the Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) for differences between means (Table 11, page 58) demonstrated that the difference was not due to employee classification. Therefore, the null hypothesis, applied to the written responses, was accepted. The acceptance of the null hypothesis on the basis of the two statistical
### Table 10

Mean Ratings and Difference Between Mean Ratings of Employees' Written Responses on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness Immediately Before Training and Immediately After Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Corr. Officers</th>
<th>Admin. Personnel</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.295**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

Time 1 = Immediately Before Training
Time 2 = Immediately After Training
**Table 11**

**Mean Ratings and Difference Between Mean Ratings of Written Responses by Group and Employee Classification on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Employee Classification</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Correctional Officers</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Administrative Personnel</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Correctional Officers</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Administrative Personnel</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tests means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

**Minor Hypotheses**

1. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program on the employees' levels of SaScTo-CPI.

   Tables 12, 13, and 14 show that the SaScTo-CPI Group x Time interactions were not significant. Therefore, the Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) was not used, and the null hypothesis was accepted. The acceptance of the null hypothesis on the basis of the analysis of covariance means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

2. There will be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the longitudinal (sixty days) effects of the training program on the employees' levels of SaScTo-CPI.

   Tables 12, 13, and 14 show that the SaScTo-CPI Group x Time interactions were not significant. Therefore, the Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) was not used, and the null hypothesis was accepted. The acceptance of the null hypothesis on the basis of the analysis of covariance means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

3. There will be no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program on the personnel's levels of SaScTo-CPI.

   Tables 12, 13, and 14 show that the SaScTo-CPI Employee x Time interactions were not significant. Therefore, the Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) was not used, and the null hypothesis was accepted. The acceptance
Table 12

Analysis of Covariance of Self-Acceptance Scores on the California Psychological Inventory for the Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>624.094</td>
<td>624.094</td>
<td>8.566*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.773</td>
<td>1.773</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108.732</td>
<td>108.732</td>
<td>1.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.042</td>
<td>176.042</td>
<td>2.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Group x Employee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,092.780</td>
<td>72.852</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,092.780</td>
<td>72.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.204</td>
<td>39.204</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.704</td>
<td>5.704</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.504</td>
<td>42.504</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127.604</td>
<td>127.604</td>
<td>2.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,006.792</td>
<td>62.925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Table 13
Analysis of Covariance of Self-Control Scores on the California Psychological Inventory for the Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144.404</td>
<td>144.404</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122.539</td>
<td>122.539</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143.249</td>
<td>143.249</td>
<td>1.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.666</td>
<td>32.666</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Group x Employee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,787.696</td>
<td>119.179</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,787.696</td>
<td>119.179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.204</td>
<td>44.204</td>
<td>2.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.337</td>
<td>51.337</td>
<td>2.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.704</td>
<td>28.704</td>
<td>1.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.838</td>
<td>40.838</td>
<td>2.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>311.958</td>
<td>19.497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Analysis of Covariance of Tolerance Scores on the California Psychological Inventory for the Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.344</td>
<td>12.344</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.336</td>
<td>37.336</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>934.439</td>
<td>934.439</td>
<td>6.594*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.041</td>
<td>22.041</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Group x Employee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,125.544</td>
<td>141.703</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,125.543</td>
<td>141.703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.438</td>
<td>8.438</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.538</td>
<td>13.538</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Employee x Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.038</td>
<td>90.038</td>
<td>2.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>549.875</td>
<td>34.367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
of the null hypothesis on the basis of the analysis of covariance means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

4. There will be no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the experimental and control groups in the longitudinal (sixty days) effects of the training program on the personnel's levels of SaScTo-CPI.

Tables 12, 13, and 14 show that the SaScTo-CPI Employee x Time interactions were not significant. Therefore, the Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) was not used, and the null hypothesis was accepted. The acceptance of the null hypothesis on the basis of the analysis of covariance means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

5. There will be no significant interaction between the type of respondent and training group in their levels of SaScTo-CPI.

Tables 12 and 13 show that the SaSc-CPI Group x Employee interactions were not significant. Therefore, the Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) was not used. While Table 14 shows that the To-CFI Group x Employee interaction was significant, the Scheffe test (Hays, 1963) for differences between means (Table 15) demonstrated that there was not a significant interaction between the type of respondent and training group. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. The acceptance of the null hypothesis on the basis of the two statistical tests means that the predictive hypothesis as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.

6. There will be no significant correlation within the experimental and control groups between the levels of ERG-C and SaScTo-CPI immediately after training.

Table 16 shows that there was a significant negative correlation between ERG-C as measured by the tape recorded responses and Sa-CPI. Therefore, the null hypothesis applied to the latter was rejected.
Table 15

Mean Change and Difference Between Mean Change of Tolerance Scores on the California Psychological Inventory by Group and Employee Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Employee Classification</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Correctional Officers</td>
<td>-0.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Administrative Personnel</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>7.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Correctional Officers</td>
<td>10.861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Administrative Personnel</td>
<td>-2.074</td>
<td>12.935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Correlations Among Average Rating of Tape Recorded Responses and Average Rating of Written Responses on the Scale of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness and Self-Acceptance, Self-Control, and Tolerance Immediately After Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARW</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-.468*</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>-.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARW</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
The rejection of the null hypothesis means that the predictive hypothesis as it pertains to ERG-C and Sa-CPI as stated in Chapter 1 was accepted. The null hypothesis applied to ERG-C and ScTo-CPI was accepted. This means that the predictive hypothesis as it pertains to ERG-C and ScTo-CPI as stated in Chapter 1 was rejected.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

Conclusions

Discussion of the Major Hypotheses

As noted in Chapter 2, there has been an absence of studies measuring the longitudinal effects of interpersonal communication skill training. Therefore the most significant finding in this present study was the difference between the experimental and control groups sixty days after the conclusion of the training program. The findings presented in Chapter 4 show that the interpersonal communication skill training program had a significant, positive, longitudinal (sixty days) effect upon the experimental group. The effects of the training program endured over the period of time studied. Moreover, computation of the difference between the mean ratings for the experimental and control groups immediately after training and sixty days after training shows that the experimental group improved in their ability to communicate ERG-C during this period of time. Additionally, improvement occurred without further training or reinforcement from the trainer or other members of the staff. Continued use of these interpersonal communication skills had a positive effect on the user's level of the same skills.

The findings reported in Chapter 4 also indicate that there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the immediate effects of the training program upon the correctional
employees' ability to communicate ERG-C. The evidence lends further support to the positive immediate effects reported by the studies cited in Chapter 2.

The findings also show that there was no significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in both the longitudinal (sixty days) and immediate effects of the training program upon their ability to communicate ERG-C. While the mean ratings for the written responses indicate a significant difference between the two employee classifications, the findings possibly are contaminated by judge number two's significantly higher rating of the subjects' responses to the stimuli statements. Moreover, the mean ratings for the tape recorded responses show that there was no significant difference between the two employee classifications immediately after training and sixty days after training.

Finally, the findings also indicate that there was no significant interaction between the type of respondent and training group in their ability to communicate ERG-C. The evidence lends further support to the above conclusion. It appears that the correctional officers and administrative personnel were equally capable of applying the interpersonal communication skills of ERG-C.

Discussion of the Minor Hypotheses

The findings reported in Chapter 4 show that there was no significant difference both immediately after training and sixty days after training between the experimental and control groups' attitudes of SaScTo-CPI. This lends further support to the previously reported stability of the SaScTo-CPI scales.
The findings reported in Chapter 4 also show that there was no significant difference both immediately after training and sixty days after training between the correctional officers' and administrative personnel's attitudes of SaScTo-CPI. The evidence further indicates that there was no significant interaction between the type of respondent and training group in their levels of these same attitudes. This also lends further support to the previously reported stability of the SaScTo-CPI scales.

Finally, the findings reported in Chapter 4 show that there was a significant negative correlation within the experimental and control groups between the subjects' levels of ERG-C as measured by the tape recorded responses and Sa-CPI immediately after training. This indicates that the subjects' level of Sa-CPI decreased as their level of ERG-C increased. This could mean that the subjects' increased awareness of the importance of these interpersonal communication skills caused them to question themselves and their ability to use the skills in counseling relationships.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are proposed on the basis of the findings of the present study:

1. Training in the interpersonal communication skills of empathy, respect, and genuineness should be made an integral part of the overall training program conducted by the Louisiana Department of Corrections.

2. The Training Division of the Louisiana Department of Corrections should test the effects of the training model presented in
the present study against the effects of other models.

3. Since it has been demonstrated that different employee classifications did benefit significantly from the training they received, all employees who have contact with inmates or former inmates should be trained in the use of the interpersonal communication skills of empathy, respect, and genuineness.

4. Since it has been demonstrated that the employees who received interpersonal communication skill training improved over time in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness without additional training or other means of reinforcement, the trainer and other members of the staff should actively reinforce the importance of the trainees utilizing the same skills in their relationships with inmates and former inmates. The chief way this can be accomplished is by means of additional periodic training.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess empirically the effects of a modified interpersonal communication skill training program upon specific attitudes and behaviors of selected correctional employees at the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women. The primary objective was to determine through the use of an appropriate rating scale the longitudinal (sixty days) and immediate effects of the training program upon the correctional employees' ability to communicate ERC-C. The secondary objective was to examine the effects of the training program upon the employees' levels of SaScTo-CPI.

The increasing need for better trained correctional employees
and the lack of application studies testing the longitudinal effects of interpersonal communication skill training were the main considerations in conducting this study. Numerous studies indicate that the interpersonal communication skill training model upon which this study was based can have an immediate positive effect upon the levels of ERG-C communicated by professionals and non-professionals in a helping relationship.

The literature reveals that correctional employees can have a major impact on inmates. Moreover, their impact clearly can be for better or worse. It appears that the number of professionals--i.e., psychologists, psychiatrists, and counselors--is inadequate to maximize the rehabilitation efforts of correctional officers. Additionally, the Louisiana Department of Corrections is currently confronted with both the need to expand its physical facilities and counseling services to more humanely meet the needs of their rising prison population. Manpower and financial limitations point to the need for greater correctional employee involvement in the rehabilitation process. This study was conducted to test the feasibility of using correctional employees to counsel with inmates.

The subjects for this study were twelve correctional officers and eight administrative personnel employed by the Louisiana Correctional Institute For Women. Both the experimental and the control group contained six correctional officers and four administrative personnel. The subjects were selected by the Chief of Security on the basis of their availability.

The "Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning"
rating scale (Carkhuff, 1969a:115) was used to test the major hypotheses of this study. The California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956) was used to test the minor hypotheses.

There were three phases of the present study: the pre-evaluation phase, the training phase, and the post-evaluation phase. The pre-evaluation phase consisted of presenting the subjects with ten written stimuli statements, to which they responded in writing, to determine their pre-training levels of ERG-C. The California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956) was administered to the subjects to determine their pre-training levels of SaScTo-CPI. The training phase consisted of five one day a week (eight hours a day) sessions in which the trainees were taught the interpersonal communication skills of ERG-C. The post-evaluation phase was in two segments: immediately after training and sixty days after training. The subjects were presented with seven written stimuli statements immediately after training to which they responded in writing, and were administered the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956). The subjects then were introduced to client-volunteers who presented them with personal problems. The subjects and client-volunteers were paired according to a randomized assignment procedure, and their conversations were tape recorded. This concluded the first segment of the post-evaluation phase of the study. The second segment of the post-evaluation phase began sixty days after training when the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1956) was administered to the subjects, and they were introduced to client-volunteers who presented them with personal problems. The subjects and client-volunteers were paired according to a randomized
assignment procedure, and their conversations were tape recorded. This concluded the post-evaluation phase of the study.

For the purposes of statistical analysis, the following predictive hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be a significant longitudinal (sixty days) change in the correctional employees' ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness as a result of the interpersonal communication skill training they received. The hypothesis was accepted.

2. There will be a significant immediate change in the correctional employees' ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness as a result of the interpersonal communication skill training they received. The hypothesis was accepted.

3. There will be a significant longitudinal (sixty days) difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel receiving interpersonal communication skill training in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness. The hypothesis was rejected.

4. There will be a significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel immediately after receiving interpersonal communication skill training in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness. The hypothesis was rejected.

5. There will be a significant interaction between the type of respondent and treatment group in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness. The hypothesis was rejected.

6. There will be a significant change in the experimental
groups' levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance immediately after the conclusion of the training program. The hypothesis was rejected.

7. There will be a significant change in the experimental groups' levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance sixty days after the conclusion of the training program. The hypothesis was rejected.

8. There will be a significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the immediate effects of the training program on their levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance. The hypothesis was rejected.

9. There will be a significant difference between the correctional officers and administrative personnel in the sixty day effects of the training program on their levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance. The hypothesis was rejected.

10. There will be a significant interaction between the type of respondent and treatment group in their levels of self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance. The hypothesis was rejected.

11. There will be a significant correlation within the experimental and control groups between the levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness and self-acceptance, self-control, and tolerance immediately after the training program. The hypothesis applied to the scales of Sa-CPI was accepted, while the hypothesis applied to the scales of ScTo-CPI was rejected.
BIBLIOGRAPHY
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Aronson, H., and W. Weintraub. "Patient Changes During Classical Psychoanalysis as a Function of Initial Status and Duration of Treatment." Psychiatric Institute, University of Maryland School of Medicine, 1968. (Mimeographed.)


Bierman, R. "Counseling and Child-Rearing." Canada: University of Waterloo, 1968. (Mimeographed.)


"Helper Communication as a Function of Helpree Affect and Content," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16 (1969), 126-131. (c)


Harris, A. A. "A Comparative Study of Results in Neurotic Patients Treated by Two Different Methods," *Journal of Mental Science*, 100 (1954), 718-721.


APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

STIMULI STATEMENTS
Stimuli Statements

1. This is what make the brothers really feel good to know that we can unite; because the white men have been overpowering the world for so long. Now it's time for the brothers to make a move . . . and a move . . . and move it now!

Your response: ________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2. I'm pissed off about one of the jive guards here, you know. I say, he's very funky, you know, especially among black inmates, you know. He's on the prejudiced side, you know. He haven't never got off line with me, which, if he ever do, I'm gonna try to end it right there, you know. I might get some more time, but I don't like the way he treat blacks. He's just down on blacks.

Your response: ________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________


3. What I want to say is about the warden and the guards here. I don't care what it is you ask them—you come down these steps needing a pair of pants, or a shirt, or socks, or whatever it is to go out in the cold every morning. It don't matter what it is you ask him for, he always puts you off. You have to come down here ten or twelve times and ask him, and just keep bugging him before he will give you something.

Your response: _______________________________________________________________

4. What I want to talk about is the warden. It's something bad the way he treat prisoners in the chain gang, you know. What I don't dig about him—every time you be serious, he want to joke about it. I don't like his feeling about no prisoner, no black or either white.

Your response: _______________________________________________________________
5. I'd like to discuss something about the blacks and the whites here at this camp. Far as the black man is concerned, he's just another man to me. I mean, regardless of his color, and I'll be friends with any of them. It don't matter who they are or what their color is, black or white. But they's a few upstairs that's prejudiced, you know, against the white man; and I don't dig it, you know. But far as the black man's concerned, they're all right, as long as they don't try to push me; and I'll be friends with anybody just as long as they'll be friends with me. And, it don't matter where it's black, white, green or purple . . . I hate a smart mother fucker!

Your response: _______________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

6. The reason I got the time I did, because the jive sucker that I was hustlin' with at the present time, he got hot with me because I was going with his ole' lady, you know. So when the rollers bust him down, you understand, he pulled me in the case, you know; so that's why I'm in right now. And I'm very pissed off about it; and someday I might be able to do something about it.

Your response: _______________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
7. The damn judge up there, that son of a bitch needs to be put in Milledgeville himself. He don't know... he started off in the 10th grade. He starts from 10 on up. That's all the damn time you get... 10 year! 10 year!

Your response:

8. The guys have counted me in on a rumble. We are gonna sit-down in the line tomorrow. I don't want to be in no buck... I've got me about 6 months before I get out of this place, and I ain't gonna screw it up by getting off in no wreck. The only problem is if they get wind of you guys having any warning, they are gonna know that I tipped you off. If that happens, I'm dead. So, it looks like I have two choices, lose my good time--or my life.

Your response:
9. Man you talk about your losers. You're looking at the world's best. There ain't nothing I do that comes out right. You know what my rap is? Possession of Pot. Two lousy ounces and ten lousy years. It's been that way all my life. What do I have to look forward to now? On top of all the other trouble I've been into all my life, now I have to go through the rest of my life as an ex-con.

Your response:


10. So you are my parole officer. This is just great. A watch dog. I know that when I came up, I had to go along with what they said to get out. But I'm telling you like it is. I'm not going to stand for that guard shit. I'll come to you and do my report, but I'm out now and I'm gonna do what I just damn well please.

Your response:


I got this-uh-letter in the mail ya' know from my mother and-uh-it that that-uh-two of my best friends had-uh-killed themselves—one shot himself with a shotgun and-uh-one hung himself in jail and which-uh-I don't know quite how to handle that. Cause like I grew up with these people an they mean something to me--and in one letter that's just alot for one person to take and one thing that I've learned since I've been here is if-uh-I can't figure out how to handle something by myself to go to somebody else and maybe they can-uh-well sympathize with me--show me the right road or whatever--and-uh-I don't know if you as a counselor would-uh-have anything to say about that-uh-my friends dying and everything but-uh-like I said since I've been taught to-uh-go to somebody else when my problems are too heavy for me--then that's what I'm here for and I don't know if you have anything to say or not--don't expect it and really don't care but I am here and want to acknowledge the fact that-uh-I am expressing this thing--the things on my mind and I don't know how to handle it.

Your response:
2. Yea man since I been here I done really got this trade together--I know I can weld man 'cause I've been in this thing close 'ta three years an I'm at the top of it now an' the only way I can go from here is down an' I believe by the time I leave jack--I believe I got the whole thing.

Your response:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. Uh two months ago my brother went in the hospital for an operation an' I put in-uh-several requests-ah-for someone-uh-to talk to me about it ya know to see whether I would be able to go home for a couple of days-uh-to see how he was doing while he was in the hospital an' about two months later-uh-the request-uh-was answered-uh-an he was out of the hospital about two weeks-uh-what should I do in this type of situation when I can't get help when I need it.

Your response:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
4. Ok, when I first came—uh—they appointed you my counselor. Ok, you told me—I told you the trade that I wanted to take in turn you told me the trade I should take. After I told you that I didn't want the trade—you put me down. What should I do about that!

Your response: ________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

5. Uh, uh, I—I wanna ask you why did you give my case to someone else that was just starting in being a counselor an' I, I've been here for nine months and I just found out that you were my counselor. Will you tell me why—why did you let a new man handle my case an' I've been here for nine months an' I just got to know you.

Your response: ________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

6. Ah you my counselor and I came to you with a problem with the guards ya know— I do everything I can to get along with them, I do my work, I do as they say do an' yet they're on my case. Ya know I want you to talk to 'um an' try and get them off my case cause you know I
can't take no more I'm doing everything I can to get along an' get my trade together an' get my act together so when I get in that world I can be together an' make something out of myself.

Your response:______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

7. I asked to be transferred to-ah-another camp so I could be closer to home cause my people live in Alabama, an' my wife's not able to come all the way up here an' I'm of age and the warden from that camp was writing to accept me but the people up here gave me a big run around an when I went, I went to talk to em' like yea! I could go an' then after they got me in there for the interview they just flat put me down. What am I suppose to do about seeing my people while I'm up here?

Your response:______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
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Assistant Professor of Education (Counseling and Guidance Services), College of Education, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1972-1975.
Assistant Director, Institute For Human Development, and Assistant Professor of Psychology, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona, 1975 to present.

IV. PUBLICATIONS

Articles:


Monographs:
"Survey - Madison County, Georgia - A Study Designed to Aid the Unemployment and Underemployed." Economic Development Administration, U. S. Department of Commerce. SREB Project, 1968, with J. S. Lewis.


"Career Education: A Report on a State-Funded In-Service Education Project Conducted by the College of Education and the School of Vocational Education." Bureau of Educational Materials and Research, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Research Report Volume 4, No. 4, April, 1974, with C. R. Blackmon and V. E. Daigle.
LAURABETH HICKS

I. GENERAL

A. Personal Data

B. Professional Organizations

American Education Research Association
American Personnel and Guidance Association
American Psychological Association
American School Counselors Association
Association for Counselor Education and Supervision
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Louisiana Education Association
Louisiana Personnel and Guidance Association
Louisiana Psychological Association
National Education Association
National Vocational Guidance Association
Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision
Southwest Institute for Personal and Organizational Development

C. Committees

Chairman, American Personnel and Guidance Association Film Festival, 1970
Member, American Personnel and Guidance Association
Reorganization Task Force
Member, American Personnel and Guidance Association By-Laws Coordinator, American Personnel and Guidance Association
National Convention, 1974
Chairperson, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Commission for Women
Member, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Commission on Standards and Accreditation
Chairperson, Louisiana Education Association, Interpersonal Relations in Human Relations
President, Louisiana Personnel and Guidance Association
Member, American Psychological Association Ad Hoc Committee on Human Rights and Social Issues
Member, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Working Group on Humanistic Education
Chairperson (1971), Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Commission on Human Rights
Member, Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Commission on Human Rights

II. EDUCATION

B.A. - Prairie View A & M College, Prairie View, Texas (1942)
(Home Economics)
M.A. - University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota (1954)  
(Counseling and Guidance and Curriculum and Instruction)

Ph.D. - University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota (1968)  
(Counseling, Guidance and Student Personnel Work)

III. WORK EXPERIENCE

School Counselor, Port Arthur Independent School, Port Arthur,  
Texas, 1949-1964  
School Counselor, Southern University Laboratory School, Baton  
Rouge, Louisiana, 1964-1966  
School Counselor, University of Minnesota Laboratory School,  
Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1966-1968  
Professor (Counselor Education), Southern University, Baton  
Rouge, Louisiana, 1968 to Present

IV. PUBLICATIONS

Articles:

"Status of Women in ACES," Association for Counselor Education  
and Supervision, March, 1974, with Mary Alice Guttman.

"Increasing the Competencies of Teachers and Counselors with  
Systematic Interpersonal Skills Training," (in Press), with Todd  
Holder.

"Physical Fitness and Teaching," (in Press), with Todd Holder.
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Born January 8, 1931

B. Professional Organizations

American Personnel and Guidance Association
American School Counselors Association
American Vocational Associations
Association for Counselor Education and Supervision
Louisiana Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Louisiana Personnel and Guidance Association
Louisiana School Counselor's Association
Louisiana School Supervisor's Association
Louisiana Teachers Association
National Vocational Guidance Association
Phi Delta Kappa

C. Committees

II. EDUCATION

B.S. - Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (1957) (Social Studies, Health and Safety Education)

M.Ed. - Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (1960) (Guidance and Counseling)

III. WORK EXPERIENCE

U.S. Navy (1950-1954)
Assistant Supervisor of Safety Education, Louisiana State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (1961-1965)
Director, Guidance Services, Louisiana State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (1969-1972)
Sales Consultant and Trainer, Eastern Psychological, Educational and Community Services (1972 to Present)(Received Human Achievement, Educational Achievement, and Career Achievement Skills Training With Robert R. Carkhuff, David and Bernie Berensen, and Ted Friel)
Counselor, Lutcher Boy's High School, Lutcher, Louisiana (1973-1974)
Instructor, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, Louisiana (Psychology and Counseling) (1974 to Present)
Owner, Business Providing Personal Development Programs, Sales and Distribution of Motivational, Self-Help, and Inspirational Materials (1972 to Present)
Part-Owner, Real Estate Corporation (1972 to Present)

IV. PUBLICATIONS
APPENDIX C

TRAINING OUTLINE
Training Outline

I. Session One - September 13, 1974

A. Pre-Training Assessment
   1. Response to Ten Written Stimuli Statements
   2. California Psychological Inventory (1956)

B. Orientation - Development of Helping Model

C. Discuss Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication
   1. Attending to Helpee
      a. Physically
      b. Psychologically
   2. Listening and Discriminating

D. Homework - Read "Barriers and Gateways to Communication," Rogers (1964)

II. Session Two - September 20, 1974

A. Discuss Reading Assignment

B. Discuss Empathy Dimension
   1. Make Interchangeable Responses to Helpee's Feelings
      a. Develop Empathy Vocabulary
      b. Practice Interchangeable Responses - Pair Trainees to Form Helper-Helpee Relationships (Role Playing)
      c. Group Critique of Trainees' Responses
   2. Make Interchangeable Responses to Helpee's Word Meaning
      a. Practice Interchangeable Responses - Pair Trainees to Form Helper-Helpee Relationships (Role Playing)
      b. Group Critique of Trainees' Responses
C. Discuss Respect Dimension

1. Practice Interchangeable Responses - Pair Trainees to Form Helper-Helpee Relationships (Role Playing)

2. Group Critique of Trainees' Responses

D. Read The Art of Helping, Carkhuff (1972) in Session

III. Session Three - September 27, 1974

A. Complete Reading of The Art of Helping, Carkhuff (1972) and Discuss

B. Discuss Concreteness Dimension

1. Discrimination Exercise

2. Group Discussion on Discrimination

3. Practice Interchangeable Responses - Pair Trainees to Form Helper-Helpee Relationships (Role Playing)

4. Group Critique of Trainees' Responses

5. Tape Record Helper-Helpee Relationship With Inmate

6. Group Critique of Trainees' Tape Recorded Responses to Inmate

C. Discuss Genuineness Dimension

1. Practice Interchangeable Responses - Pair Trainees to Form Helper-Helpee Relationships (Role Playing)

2. Group Critique of Trainees' Responses

D. Homework - Read "Is Help Helpful," Gibb (1964)

IV. Session Four - October 3, 1974

A. Discuss Reading Assignment

B. Discuss Immediacy Dimension
1. Practice Interchangeable Responses - Pair Trainees to Form Helper-Helpee Relationships (Role Playing)

2. Group Critique of Trainees' Responses

C. Discuss Confrontation Dimension

1. Practice Interchangeable Responses - Pair Trainees to Form Helper-Helpee Relationships (Role Playing)

2. Group Critique of Trainees' Responses

D. Video Taping

1. Practice Interchangeable Responses - Pair Trainees to Form Helper-Helpee Relationships (Role Playing)

2. Group Interaction

V. Session Five - October 11, 1974

A. Discuss Problem Solving Dimension

1. Stating the Problem

2. Developing Goals

3. Determining Course of Action

4. Assessing Value of Alternatives

5. Summing of Pluses and Minuses

6. Choosing Solution

7. Practice Problem Solving in Group Setting

B. Post-Training Assessment

1. Respond to Seven Written Stimuli Statements

2. California Psychological Inventory (1956)

3. Tape Record Helper-Helpee Relationship With Inmate
VITA

Keith Alan Mills was born in South Haven, Michigan, October 12, 1936. He attended elementary school there, and was graduated from South Haven High School in 1955. In October of that same year he entered active duty in the U. S. Navy. After being honorably discharged from the U. S. Navy in 1957, he was an accounting clerk with Gulf States Utilities Company, Beaumont, Texas, and a part-time student at Lamar State University, Beaumont, Texas. He resigned his full-time accounting position in 1960 to complete his undergraduate work, and received his Bachelor of Arts degree from that institution in January, 1963. He entered Bexley Hall, the Divinity School of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, in September, 1963, and graduated from there in May, 1966.

His vocation as a priest in the Episcopal Church began immediately upon graduation by serving three churches in East Texas. He moved to Baton Rouge, Louisiana in June, 1966, to serve as a priest in the Church, and in September, 1966, he entered Louisiana State University as a part-time student. He received the Masters of Education degree from the same university in January, 1971. In May, 1972, Colgate Rochester/Bexley Hall/Crozer Theological Seminary, Rochester, New York, conferred upon him the Master of Divinity degree. In November, 1973, he resigned his full-time duties in the Church to continue his graduate education. At that time he became the Protestant Chaplain of the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women, where he is presently employed.
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