EFFECTS OF SELF-EXAMINATION UPON APPRAISAL-SEEKING OF LAY COUNSELLORS

by

VICTORIA FRANCES DRADER

B.A., University of Victoria, 1964
M.Ed., McGill University, 1969

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in the Faculty
of
Education

We accept this dissertation as conforming to
the required standard

[redacted]
Dr. Donald W. Knowles

[redacted]
Dr. Rey A. Carr

[redacted]
Dr. Ronald E. Tinney

[redacted]
Dr. Ronald A. Hoppe

[redacted]
Dr. Charles W. Tolman

[redacted]
Dr. Richard McGee

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

November 1978

Supervisor: Dr. Donald W. Knowles

ABSTRACT

In situations where workers have limited training and experience, every opportunity for improvement of performance should be utilized. Despite this need, threat aroused by receiving information about ourselves often leads us to resist input. In order to increase the use of appraisal situations, a means of lowering the threat of the evaluative situation was sought for crisis line counsellors. A process seemingly effective in reducing threat, yet influential in improving task achievement, was identified from field observations and theoretical and research writings. The process identified was a private and structured self-examination of the most recent performance.

Lay counsellors received structured, unstructured or no guidelines about examining their performance on calls at a crisis line. The effects measured were (a) voluntary self-examination, (b) differences in self and supervisory evaluation of performance level, and (c) invitations to supervisors or partners to comment upon a particular performance. Results did not support the hypotheses. A tentative conclusion was made from post hoc data that at times a negative relationship existed between self-examination, whether imposed or voluntary, and some appraisal-seeking behaviors. Possible explanations for the lack of

support for the hypotheses were offered as well as suggestions for further research.

Examining Committee:

[redacted]

Dr. Donald W. Knowles

[redacted]

Dr. Roy A. Carr

[redacted]

Dr. Ronald E. Tinney

[redacted]

Dr. Ronald A. Hoppe

[redacted]

Dr. Charles W. Tolman

[redacted]

Dr. Richard McGee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

LIST OF TABLES

Table

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the members of my supervisory committee for their longstanding critical and supportive assistance. My chairman, Dr. Don Knowles especially demonstrated unceasing patience and encouragement on my long journey to the final draft. Drs. Rey Carr, Ron Hoppe, Ron Tinney and Charles Tolman helped me in many and varying ways to meet the challenges of becoming a researcher. My colleague, Dr. John Dorner, acted as an ex-officio member by providing his skills and support at a crucial time for me.

I see the fruition of this dissertation due also to the influence of three other nurturing communities:

The NEED staff and volunteers whose desire to grow made this dissertation a more meaningful exercise than it might have been. Bobbi Etter's support has been keenly felt. Both she and Neil Solomon were generous in their contributions of time and energy.

The Counselling Psychology section of the University of Victoria, despite very limited facilities, has provided me with both training and education which enable me to function as a competent Counselling Psychologist. Drs. Vance Peavy, Margaret McHugh, Don Knowles, John Dorner, Rey Carr and Marty Acker have offered me excellence of service. I feel honoured to have had the opportunity to study with these

people.

A network of family and friends were there for me when I needed them--as I so often did. Long, hard journeys are made easier by caring companions. Thank you.

To David

for so many reasons

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The shortage of professional helpers at a time of increased demand for helping services has led to the utilization of workers who have less than professional qualifications. In response to this shortage, many helping agencies now use nonprofessionals to carry out direct service for which professionals provide training and supervision (Guerney, 1969).

In situations where helpers have limited training and experience, it seems especially important that they be provided with effective and efficient ways to improve their helping performances. One means of providing opportunities for improvement is the utilization of available appraisals of the most recent performance. Despite the need for feedback, the threat of receiving disconcerting information about ourselves seems to lead to neglect in using available sources of information.

While the importance of assessment of recent performances to improvement of skills has received considerable attention, many writers ignore the influence of threat felt in assessment situations and the defensive manoeuvres which we employ in times of vulnerability. These mechanisms seem

especially influential during situations where we are being evaluated and, consequently, seem to lead to our ignoring or minimizing evaluative information when possible (Lakin, 1972). In deflecting available information about our present level of executing a task, we lower the chances of improving future performance for, without vigilance for present weaknesses, we can only chance upon improvements.

Sources of Appraisal of Performance

At least two sources of appraisal, self and others' observations of the performance, are available to us as performers. We may, through self-observation, determine personal strengths and weaknesses of a performance. As stated above, this close scrutiny will not occur if we try to avoid information about ourselves in order to reduce threat.

Even if self-examination occurs, resultant evaluations often deviate from evaluations based on observations by others (e.g., Crowne & Marlow, 1964; Jansen, Robb, & Bonk, 1973; Klimoski & London, 1974). When persons with differing perceptions are forced to interact, such as during supervisory sessions, the fruitfulness of the assessment procedure may be severely reduced because of our tendency to guard against threat (Lakin, 1972). If our defensiveness could be reduced, observers' perceptions of our performances would become a valuable source of information to us because,

at times, we are not aware of behaviors that others can observe (Carr, 1977; Luft, 1969; Nielsen, 1962).

A major assumption within this study was, then, that the use of available information which may assist in improving performance level is reduced by threat and resulting defensive manoeuvres.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were, first, to identify through field observations and literature, a means by which lay counsellors would increase their appraisal-seeking behaviors. Threat of evaluation was considered to lessen appraisal-seeking behaviors and, in order to increase these behaviors, the influence of threat would have to be reduced. The second purpose was to test the hypothesis that lay counsellors would seek more appraisals of their counselling when they were provided with the identified means of threat reduction.

Contributions of the Study

The development of an effective tool for encouraging appraisal of performance by lowering the threat of a situation seems a useful contribution to the discipline. Specifically, such a tool would be valuable in the areas of counselling and education where performance of practitioners have been criticized at length (by such writers as Bergin & Solomon, 1963; Carkhuff, 1969; Eysenck, 1952;

Friedenberg, 1973; and Hodenfield & Stinnet, 1961).

Shrauger (1975) noted that the large majority of work in how we respond to evaluation comes from the laboratory. His support of field studies on evaluation arose from subjects' lack of involvement and sense of importance when evaluative situations were not naturally occurring. I responded to Shrauger's concern by utilizing subjects who were engaged in an actual, rather than a contrived, situation. More specifically, the particular setting studied here was a telephone crisis line manned by volunteers who had limited training and experience, and, consequently, required assessment procedures in order to provide adequate service to their clients.

A further contribution was the provision by the study of an empirical examination of relationships which had been observed by the staff of the agency from which the sample was drawn. These field observations formed the basis for the hypotheses later tested. This emphasis upon initially utilizing knowledge gained through a clinical rather than an academic approach answers in part the criticism of many practitioners that the knowledge gained from empirical studies has been of little use in the field. The coupling of clinical and academic knowledge offers both the community and the scientific arena the benefits of knowledge gained through the other's medium.

Further, the present study examined, under relatively controlled conditions, the experimental application of a training procedure. Many training programs, although based on firm conceptual grounds, have yet to be tested empirically.

Moreover, the study served to provide some practical knowledge for an existing service. A problem within that agency was identified and attacked, providing the application of scientific principles to a practical concern. The present study bridged "pure" and "applied" approaches to psychology and education by examining various theoretical and empirically-based statements about performance assessment and converting them into specific training practices.

CHAPTER II

RELATED THEORY AND RESEARCH

In the search for a means of increasing appraisal-seeking behaviors of volunteers working in a telephone counselling service, four major areas were investigated. First, the importance of assessment to improvement of performance level was explored. Secondly, it was necessary to determine which counsellor behaviors should serve as assessment criteria. Studies investigating counsellor behaviors which have influenced client change were sought and the criteria are presented below. Third, information about the influence of threat in various evaluation situations was considered and finally, programs which had resulted in reduced threat were examined. Because neither of the latter two areas has been thoroughly researched, it was necessary to draw on similar but indirectly related fields of inquiry.

Once a potential means of reducing threat was identified through the literature and field observations, available information on its influence in reducing threat and in providing direction for change was gathered. And finally, material specific to the area of assessment in telephone counselling was researched and implications for the present study are presented.

Importance of Assessment to Improvement of Performance

One factor which has been demonstrated to be of value in improving performance level is assessment of present performing level. Studies of feedback, or knowledge of results, show it to be the most influential variable controlling performance and learning of motor skills and probably the second most influential (after comprehension) in conceptual learning (Bilodeau & Bilodeau, 1961; Cronbach, 1963). One means of obtaining feedback is through comparison of our present level of performance to specific criteria which have been demonstrated to be effective in reaching the desired goals. Efficient improvement of our present level of performance is virtually impossible without such comparison.

Specifically, the maintenance of effective behaviors, reduction of ineffective behaviors and addition of other effective behaviors to our repertoire are facilitated when we compare our present performance to valid criteria. Both attention to the criteria and comparison of our performances to them can provide detailed information to us as performers (e.g., Krech, Crutchfield, & Livson, 1969, pp. 341-342).

Criteria for Comparison of Performance

Specific counsellor behaviors which produce client change in desired directions have been identified (see Truax

& Carkhuff, 1967, for summaries of these studies). Essentially, the conclusions from these studies demonstrate that constructive change in client feelings and behavior results from interaction with a person who offers certain interpersonal behaviors. These behaviors include:

1. Accurate empathy which is defined as the ability to communicate understanding of the client's current feelings and experiences and their meaning to the client in a tone congruent with the client's current feelings.

2. Warmth which involves a receptive, nondominating attitude demonstrating a commitment to the person. Attentiveness and patience are behaviors included in the general behavior of warmth throughout the literature.

3. Respect for the client as a unique and worthy individual who is capable of constructive action. Several behaviors can be inferred from this category of behaviors. First, the counsellor must not give advice nor moralize to the client. Secondly, clients, not counsellors, should choose which topics of concern they wish to discuss. Clients must also be permitted and encouraged to make their own decisions for future action. Fourth, the counsellor must respond to the client's need to explore current concerns rather than to the counsellor's needs such as curiosity, the need to impress or to be liked.

4. Client exploration of immediate and specific concerns which can require invitations and assistance in

exploration by the counsellor. Neither vague, abstract discussions about life in general nor repetitious story-telling have been found to be of assistance to client change.

5. Facilitative genuineness which involves behaving in ways which are congruent with one's feelings. A counsellor's presentation of a facade or contrived or rehearsed manner have been demonstrated to inhibit client change.

Thus, we have available to us knowledge of helper behaviors which have been demonstrated to be effective in facilitating client change. The behaviors can provide effective criteria to which counsellors can compare their present performing level as a means of gaining direction for improvement.

Influence of Threat in Evaluation

Despite the above mentioned contribution of assessment to improvement of performance, the anticipation of harm to our self-esteem, or psychological threat, reduces the effectiveness of situations which have the potential to generate evaluative information about our performances. Most of us have learned to respond anxiously to these situations because of past experiences which brought us direct or implied criticism, competition, rejection, hostility, guilt and other potential threats to our self-esteem (Lazarus, 1969). More often than not we have received some form of punishment when we or others evaluate our behavior. For

CHAPTER II

RELATED THEORY AND RESEARCH

In the search for a means of increasing appraisal-seeking behaviors of volunteers working in a telephone counselling service, four major areas were investigated. First, the importance of assessment to improvement of performance level was explored. Secondly, it was necessary to determine which counsellor behaviors should serve as assessment criteria. Studies investigating counsellor behaviors which have influenced client change were sought and the criteria are presented below. Third, information about the influence of threat in various evaluation situations was considered and finally, programs which had resulted in reduced threat were examined. Because neither of the latter two areas has been thoroughly researched, it was necessary to draw on similar but indirectly related fields of inquiry.

Once a potential means of reducing threat was identified through the literature and field observations, available information on its influence in reducing threat and in providing direction for change was gathered. And finally, material specific to the area of assessment in telephone counselling was researched and implications for the present study are presented.

undefensive participants, who welcome the chance to learn from others' reactions to them, feel trepidation at actually receiving these reactions. Further, unwilling receivers are highly defensive and scarcely able to perceive, much less absorb, the reactions of others to them.

When others' perceptions are imposed upon us, as in some supervision sessions, we may feel particularly threatened since the supervisor has some power over us. As Maier (1958) pointed out, defensiveness should be an expected reaction to evaluation situations since, to the supervisee, the supervisor often becomes the judge and the supervisee, the defendant. Kay, Meyer and French (1965) found in a field study of appraisal interviews that workers were less likely to improve performance to the degree that they became defensive. Defensiveness was found to be significantly related to the number of critical comments made by the supervisor during the appraisal interview. The workers in this study reported that they would negate the validity of their original defence if they showed improvement in the area criticized.

A variety of defensive mechanisms utilized by supervisees have been noted by counsellor-educators. Submission, helplessness, projection, focussing attention off oneself, and psychological fragility have been observed (Bauman, 1972). Kadushin (1968) noted that supervisees may adopt such roles as "Let's you and I criticize the agency," or

flatterer in an attempt to ward off changes which the supervisor might ask of the trainee. Dellis and Stone (1960), Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) and Mueller and Kell (1972) note that dealing with resistance to receiving threatening information is a primary function of a supervisor in assisting trainees to become competent.

While students of test and school anxiety have been negligent in examining the intrapersonal emotional process (Izard, 1972), several theorists from this area of study have made comments which could support the interpretation of test anxiety as a problem in accepting undesirable information about self. For example, Sarason (1972) noted that undesirable self-perceptions, expectations and fears may highly influence an individual's test anxiety. He stated that research on perceptual and cognitive factors which influence both how information is utilized and interpreted is needed to fill the gaps in knowledge existing at the present time. Hollister (1965) suggested intervention was needed with children to protect them from the impact of psychological stress evoked by evaluation through a process of building their personality strengths and resistances. Phillips, Martin, and Meyers (1972) termed this concept "psychological inoculation" while Caplan (1965) referred to "anticipatory guidance."

It seems clear from the preceding discussion that threat is an influential factor in determining performers'

responses to evaluative situations.

Reduction of Psychological Threat

A process which would lower the anxiety of receiving information about self and so lessen interpersonal conflicts and resistance would be beneficial to many assessment participants, particularly those whose training and experience are limited. The task of formulating such a vehicle was not an easy one in that previous articulation of the problem has been sporadic and incomplete. Further, suggestions of methods to lessen the anxiety of evaluation are even less available.

By integrating semideveloped ideas from several areas, it was possible to develop some testable guidelines for reducing threat of receiving information about self. Two themes became evident in searching the literature: one, that attention directed to specific components of a task can reduce this anxiety and so increase the use of feedback; and two, a self-observing attitude also assists us to become receptive to other input.

Attention to components of performance. First of all, there is evidence that anticipatory anxiety can be reduced and, in turn, that more information about the execution of the performance can be utilized following the performance when attention is directed to the components of the anticipated situation.

Janis (1958) provided evidence of the value of cognitive preparation in lowering anxiety with his work with preoperative hospital patients. Mandler and Watson (1966) were successful in decreasing anxiety with college students through posttask reflection on the task. This reflection was found to allow an unpleasant experience to be integrated into a cognitive plan for later executions, which reduced anxiety about later tasks.

Wine's (1971) results from studies on task anxiety also demonstrated the influence of knowledge of a task's components on reduction of anxiety. She found that subjects who were given instructions in attending to tasks reported less anxiety and increased their level of performance, regardless of initial anxiety level. She concluded that the identification of specific behaviors which make up successful performances can reduce anxiety brought about by lack of attention or lack of knowledge about performance criteria.

As well as experiencing a reduction in anxiety, when performers pay attention to components of the anticipated task, they also seem to make greater use of feedback about their performances. For example, Gage, Runkle and Chatterjee (cited in Salomon, & McDonald, 1970) found that when teachers were provided with specific but negative feedback from their students, they changed their behavior in the direction implied by the negative messages. Walz and Johnson (1963) reported that counsellor-trainees who viewed

and discussed their counselling performance on videotape with classmates became more accepting of others' judgments of their skills and more closely approximated the supervisors' assessments of them than those who did not view and discuss their performance.

Furthermore, when attention is not directed to details of the performance, performers appear to make much less use of available information about their performance and react to the information with more defensive behavior. Salomon and McDonald (1970), for example, reported that teacher-trainees who viewed their videotaped performances with no guidelines or models for analysis neither altered from their preperformance perceptions of themselves nor attended to cues relating to teaching behavior.

Nielsen (1962) found that subjects who had been videotaped during a conflict situation became defensive, evasive and hostile in viewing the videotape when they were not given guidelines or preparation with which to view the videotape. Watts (1973) concluded from his work on video self-confrontation that discussion with a trained critic prior to viewing one's performance on videotape reduced defensive reactions of student-teachers and increased their receptivity to negative information by decreasing the overall threat.

Thus, attention to details of a performance seems to have the effect of reducing threat, and resulting defensive manoeuvres, and in turn of increasing the use of available

information about the performance.

Self-observing attitude. The second theme evident in the literature is less well defined than the one just discussed. However, there is a suggestion within the counselling and psychotherapy literature that a self-observing attitude fosters receptivity to available information. Several writers cited below seem to imply that possession of a self-critical attitude reduces fear of receiving feedback by producing evaluations which we can compare with other input. For example, Schein and Bennis (1965), writing on group counselling, believe that a fear of "surprise attack" often leads us to resist receiving information about ourselves. They postulate that a major force which obstructs hearing and utilizing feedback arises in part from the fear of discovering something within ourselves that may prove unacceptable to us.

Jersild and Lazar (1962) found evidence of this fear when they studied the effects of psychotherapy on 100 teachers. They concluded from their results that the anxiety of gaining new information about oneself soon diminished as self-awareness increased in the therapeutic relationship. The anticipation of the new information rather than the actual reception of it caused the anxiety. Jersild and Lazar suggest that familiarity with oneself brings a lessening of anxiety of others seeing oneself.

Schaeffer and Galinsky (1974), in writing about the process of group therapy, note that lack of readiness to receive information about oneself results in defensiveness. They suggest that group situations are hazardous if they encourage members to seek feedback before they have had a chance to assess their willingness to do so and before they are able to integrate or digest it (p. 286).

Perls, Hefferline and Goodman (1951), in discussing the concept of assimilation of external information about self, suggest that readiness to productively utilize new information about self comes from the possession of some previous self-assessment. Indiscriminate acceptance of others' perceptions results in a confused self-image, according to these Gestalt therapists.

In a similar vein, Lakin (1972) suggested that a means to lessen the threat of others' reactions to our own thoughts and feelings is to encourage the person who seeks information about self, to describe his perception of himself first. This self-evaluation provides some comparative base for the reactions of others (p. 142).

Two observations by the staff of the agency from which the sample was drawn for the present study also suggest the importance of self-critical observations to seeking other information about oneself. Trainers had perceived volunteers considerably more open to examination when they were first given the opportunity to self-examine. When either a

trainer or another volunteer offered positive or negative criticism first, the resultant defensiveness appeared to be higher. Staff also observed that experienced volunteers who consistently sought out both supervisors' and partners' perceptions of their work already had identified many of their weaknesses and strengths on a given call.

To summarize, there is some suggestion within the literature and from field observations that two factors assist performers to make use of available information about their performances. First, the provision of a means of focussing attention on components of a successful performance has been demonstrated to lower defensiveness and allow even negative information to be received. Secondly, the possession of a self-critical attitude assists us to receive threatening information by providing a basis with which to compare other input.

Self-Examination as a Means of Reducing Threat

From the above discussion, I concluded that one means of evaluation which would incorporate the two factors which evidently reduce threat was a form of self-examination. In this study, self-examination refers to the process of scrutinizing specific characteristics of a performance whereas evaluation refers to a summary statement of the general skill level resulting from the examination process. Several researchers cited below offered support for the hypothesis

that a guided self-examination approach would effect a lowering of threat and resulting defensive manoeuvres.

Bassett and Meyer (1968) compared structured self-examination with supervisory appraisal in an industrial setting. Their results indicated that both supervisors and workers found the supervisory interview more satisfying and constructive when preceded by self-examination rather than supervisory examination. The self-examination process produced less defensiveness on the part of the worker as indicated by responses to the question "Which of the supervisor's criticisms are valid?" and by ratings by the experimenter of defensive behaviors during the interviews. Moreover, subsequent appraisals by supervisors of on-the-job performances were significantly higher for workers who had previously engaged in the self-examination process than for workers whose performance had previously been examined by supervisors.

Davis (1975) found that elementary teachers who engaged in a process of self-examination of videotapes of their teaching increased their self-appraisal behaviors and became more willing to view their videotapes with their colleagues. He concluded that practice in self-appraisal lessened the threat of the evaluation process.

In another study, the influence of structured self-examination on anxiety was measured directly. College students who were provided with videotapes of their class

discussions either completed self-examination forms after viewing or only viewed the videotapes. The self-examining group reported significantly less anxiety and contributed more to class discussion in the posttreatment period (Lindquist, 1975).

Self-Examination as an Effective Means of Assessment

The use of any means of evaluation, however nonthreatening, which has little effect on postappraisal behavior is of little value. It would be possible to choose a means of evaluation which indeed lowered the threat felt in the situation but did so by making the process so ineffective that no improvement in postevaluation behaviors occurred.

Importance of guidelines in self-examination. Studies cited earlier (e.g., Salomon & McDonald, 1970; Watts, 1973) have demonstrated the necessity of guidance prior to or during the self-examination process if the process is to have an effect on altering postappraisal behaviors. Carr (1977) provided further demonstration when he compared the effects of specific, general, and no guidelines for self-examination on student teachers' communication skills. Students in the specific guideline condition performed at higher levels, leading Carr to conclude that the specificity of examining criteria had had a motivating effect upon performance.

In another study, Krebs (1974) tested a format of self-examining both cognitive and affective counselling competencies. His counsellor-trainee subjects completed either a structured or unstructured form once a week for 6 weeks after their counselling sessions. The study examined the effect of this program on three counsellor behaviors demonstrated to be essential to client change. The structured self-examination group was rated as more genuine by supervisors than either the control or unstructured groups. However, no difference was reported between groups on empathy or respect for client.

In another study (Altekruse & Brown, 1969), practicum students in the treatment group categorized each response of client and counsellor interaction according to a method called Counsellor Self-Interaction Analysis. Both experimental and control subjects continued to be involved in their "regular practicum experiences" (p. 111). Judges rated pre- and posttreatment tape recordings of counselling sessions using the Counsellor-Client Interaction Analysis which yields a ratio between "indirect" counselling responses (such as reflection, clarification) and "direct" responses (such as advice-giving, demanding). Students who had used the Self-Interaction Analysis to analyze their sessions were found to use significantly more desired (i.e., indirect) responses at the end of the practicum than those who participated only in the regular activities.

Martin (1968) supported the effectiveness of self-examination when he observed that counsellors completing a structured self-examination program, in addition to what he termed traditional counselling supervision, gained significantly in levels of accurate empathy, positive regard, genuineness, and intensity of interpersonal contact as assessed by supervisors. The self-examining students also evaluated their skills closer to their supervisors' evaluations than did the traditionally supervised students.

The importance of guidelines in self-examination programs to change in postassessment behavior has been discussed above. The effects of a second influential variable, privacy, in self-examination procedures is demonstrated below.

Importance of privacy. There is some evidence that the provision of privacy increases willingness to conduct examination of performance. Birney et al. (1969) concluded from their research that individuals who are motivated by a fear of failure seek to avoid information about their ability levels by shunning public display of them.

Scheuler, Gold and Mitzel (cited in Harris, 1969) found that student teachers who had the opportunity to react in private to a videotape recording of their teaching made more progress in teaching skills than did those who received supervisor-made suggestions for improvement. The authors suggested that private viewing of the videotape recording

removed the need for self-protective defensiveness that sometimes prevented a beginning teacher from accepting and constructively using comments and suggestions made by a supervisor.

In another study, counsellor-trainees who twice viewed videotapes of their counselling sessions while their classmates criticized these sessions were compared with trainees who viewed their videotapes privately before watching them with the group, and with trainees who privately viewed their videotapes both times (Torrez, 1974). The trainees who viewed their tapes privately both times significantly increased positive self-ratings while those who viewed their tapes either time in public increased negative self-ratings. However, the private viewers' positive self-raters were often judged as inaccurate by supervisors. An important oversight in this study in view of the literature on structured self-examination was the lack of some form of guidance for the private observation.

Privacy was found to be an important factor in reducing threat of evaluative situations in a study by Cohen (1975) who examined the relationship between conditions of viewing one's teaching on videotape and degree of anxiety and satisfaction with performance. Only solitary viewers did not report anxiety higher than their base level immediately prior to the viewing of tapes. Subjects who viewed the tapes with their peers all reported anxiety ratings higher

than their base ratings prior to viewing. The presence of either an evaluative or facilitative group leader during the viewings did not affect anxiety levels.

There is some suggestion in the literature, then, that private but structured assessment may assist in reducing the threat of evaluation.

Performance Appraisal of Telephone Counsellors

Research into crisis line work has just begun. The one form of performance appraisal mentioned in the literature to date has been experimenter appraisal. Only four variables seem to have been considered: the effectiveness of helpers, the amount of experience on the line, the values of the workers, and the effects of timing of supervision.

Bleach and Claiborn (1974) studied four crisis lines to determine the level of empathy, respect, and genuineness offered callers. Four "problems" were role played to each of the four lines six times, for a total of 96 calls. Workers were rated according to the Truax and Carkhuff (1967) scales on the three core counselling behaviors. The experimenters found no significant relationship between the amount of time worked on the lines and the quality of offered empathy, respect and genuineness. Apparently, experience alone does not lead to change in the core behaviors. This finding is consistent with the thesis of the present study that intense examination of one's skills at

all experience levels is of value.

France (1975) examined calls placed to groups of untrained, newly trained, and veteran workers on one crisis line. Each worker received two calls, one of which agreed with a value held by a worker and a second which opposed the worker's value orientation. In contrast to the Bleach and Claiborn results, France found that newly trained volunteers scored higher than both untrained and experienced volunteers on total scores of empathy, genuineness and respect. Experienced volunteers scored lower on genuineness than did either of the other two groups. These results were found for both types of calls, similar and opposing values. These findings also support the need for close examination of performance, regardless of experience level.

The importance of immediate scrutiny of performance is evidenced in a study of the effects of the timing of supervision given crisis line workers (Doyle, Foreman, & Wales, 1977). Four workers received a preservice training only; four others received supervision 5 days after their shift as well as preservice training. A third group of four workers received immediate on-the-job supervision after their preservice training. Counsellors who were immediately supervised demonstrated more empathy, and problem-solving skills more clearly than either counsellors who were provided with only preservice training or with delayed supervision and preservice training. The delayed

group was found to be no more effective than those not supervised; neither of these two groups demonstrated *any* principles of effective crisis intervention in the experimental interview. As well, the group which experienced immediate supervision scored highest on the self-ratings. The value of immediate examination of performance to client and counsellor seems clear from Doyle's findings.

The consistent message of the studies reviewed and others (e.g., Knickerbocker & McGee, 1973; McGee, 1974; Speer & Schultz, 1975) is the importance of evaluation of services, particularly in view of the lack of available data on crisis lines and the lack of training of those providing direct service on such lines.

Summary

In situations where workers have limited training and experience, every opportunity for improvement of performance should be utilized. Despite this need, threat aroused by receiving information about ourselves often leads us to resist input. A means of lowering the threat of the evaluative situation was sought for crisis line counsellors. A process seemingly effective in reducing threat, yet influential in improving task achievement, was identified from field observations and theoretical and research writings. The process identified was a private and structured self-examination of the most recent performance.

Implications for the Present Study

From the above framework, it was hypothesized that a volunteer who received experience in self-examination would make more active use of assessment possibilities which follow. Specifically, opportunities for feedback such as further self-examination and invitations extended to those who observe performances were expected to be utilized more by volunteers who had engaged in prior self-examination. One way of measuring the degree of use of available information was considered to be closeness of supervisory and self-evaluation. Volunteers were considered to have received and made use of available information to the degree that they appraised their skills similarly to supervisors' evaluation of them. If volunteers defended against threat of evaluation by avoiding examination of their performances they were expected to utilize little of the available information. If, however, they were not needing to defend against potentially harmful information, they were expected to absorb available information and use it when evaluating their performances. Both those who voluntarily self-examined and those who practiced imposed self-examination were expected to self-evaluate their skills closer to supervisory evaluation. Practice in self-examination was assumed to reduce the threat of receiving information about oneself and,as a result, volunteers would evaluate their counselling more frankly.

Literary Hypotheses

Specifically, these hypotheses were formed to test the effects of self-examination on appraisal-seeking about one's performance:

1. Crisis line counsellors who voluntarily self-examine their counselling most are those who make greater use of available assessment opportunities and so will be closer to supervisors in rating their skill level than those who self-examine least.

2. Requiring volunteers to self-examine through an imposed program will assist them to make greater use of available assessment opportunities and so will result in closer self and supervisors' evaluations.

3. In addition, practice in imposed self-examination will produce increased use of other assessment situations, specifically voluntary self-examination.

4. Furthermore, practice in imposed self-examination will result in seeking other persons' perceptions of the performance, specifically partners' and supervisors' observations of calls taken by the counsellor.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The study was carried out in the field setting of a 24-hour telephone counselling service utilizing, as subjects, volunteers to the service whose recruitment and training history was the same as that of all other volunteers in the agency. The study attempted to employ the experimental treatment in as unobtrusive a manner as possible to retain the "natural field setting" of the crisis line service.

Sample

Subjects were drawn from the body of volunteers serving a particular crisis line in Victoria, British Columbia. The total group of volunteers consisted of approximately 75 trained and experienced volunteer lay counsellors who manned the telephones. Each volunteer had a minimum of 30 hours training and 3 months experience. Ages ranged from 19 to 63 years.

Thirty-six subjects were randomly selected from the total group and randomly assigned to one of the three groups. Conditions of structured self-examination, unstructured self-examination, and no treatment were then randomly assigned to each group.

Distributions of subjects according to age, experience at the agency, and duration of the time spent in the study are presented in Table 1. Comparison of the groups according to these demographic variables by analysis of variance, reported in Table 2, supported the conclusion that the group members were equivalent in terms of age, experience on the line, and length of time in the study. Numbers of males and females in each of the three groups are presented in Table 3. A chi-square analysis of this distribution supported the conclusion that each of the groups had similar proportions of males and females (Table 4).

Design

A posttest only, control group design was used following the Campbell and Stanley (1963) guideline that randomization without pretesting is sufficient control of initial group differences. Further, pretesting would have exposed subjects to the dependent variables, thus possibly contaminating the effects of the treatment with practice effects. Table 5 provides an outline of the treatment and measurement procedures. It might be helpful to the reader to study this table at this time. The framework might assist the reader to understand the forms of treatment and measurements as the discussion continues. Briefly, the reader can see from this table that the effects of three conditions of self-examination on appraisal-seeking behaviors were studied. The three

Table 1

Distribution of Subjects on Demographic Variables

Group[a]	Age (years)		Experience (months)		Time in Study (weeks)	
	M	*s*	*M*	*s*	*M*	*s*
Unstructured	31.33	8.11	11.67	8.18	6.50	3.40
Control	29.67	7.99	12.50	9.40	6.17	3.08
Structured	30.67	10.38	13.08	12.78	5.63	1.77
Total Group	30.56	8.54	12.42	9.88	6.10	2.74

[a] n = 12 for each group

Table 2

Analysis of Variance of Demographic Variables

Variable Source	*SS*	*df*	*F*
Age			
Groups	16.89	2	.11
Error	2610.00	33	
Experience			
Groups	12.16	2	.06
Error	3504.59	33	
Time			
Groups	4.68	2	.29
Error	266.23	33	

Note: None of the *F* scores reached significance.

Table 3

Distribution of Sex of Subjects

Group	Male	Female
1. Unstructured	3	9
2. Control	4	8
3. Structured	2	10
Total	9	27

Table 4

Chi Square Associations Between
Sex and Group Placement

Comparison Groups	χ^2
Groups 1 + 2, 3	.17
Groups 1 + 3, 2	.17

Note: Neither of the associations reached significance.

Table 5

Design of Treatment and Measurement

Group	Call						Shift Following 5th Call
	Pre	1	2	3	4	5	
Unstructured self-examination	E	U E	U E	U	U	U	Self-evaluation Observed inviting Self-reported inviting Self-exam indices
No self-examination	E	E	E				Self-evaluation Observed inviting Self-reported inviting Self-exam indices
Structured self-examination	E	S E	S E	S	S	S	Self-evaluation Observed inviting Self-reported inviting Self-exam indices

S -- structured self-examination
U -- unstructured self-examination
E -- evaluations by supervisor

conditions included structured, unstructured, and no self-examination. The appraisal-seeking behaviors included voluntary self-examination, invitations to others to comment upon one's counselling and the difference between self and supervisors' evaluations.

Treatment Procedures

The means chosen to encourage a detailed investigation of skills by the volunteer was a series of questions concerning the presence or absence of effective helping behaviors in the last call taken by the volunteer. These questions would be answered privately in writing by the volunteer immediately after the call was completed for a total of five calls over a minimum of 3 weeks.

Development of treatments. The series of questions to the volunteers about their last call was constructed for this study. Two supervisors at the agency and I independently listed every specific skill or attitude important in telephone counselling that we could find in the literature. We submitted specific helper behaviors which had been demonstrated as essential to client change (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967) and behaviors which have been interpreted into specific behaviors from general conditions found to be essential to client change (e.g., Danish & Hauer, 1973; Fowler & McGee, 1973). Submissions were listed and then edited by the supervisors and me to remove both repetitious and nonspecific

goals. From the resulting list, each of us chose the 20 items which were most important and clearly expressed. Thirteen items were agreed upon by all three of us and so used in the treatment procedure.

One further step unforeseen in the planning was required. Because the form as composed of these skills read as a highly academic and imposing document, I imagined that few volunteers would respond positively to such a document. Using the skills mentioned in each item, I translated each to more informal phrasing and grouped the items into general areas. The two supervisors then checked the form to see that each item still contained the essence of the previously worded item (see Appendix A for the final form).

This structured self-examination program was designed to lead volunteers to consider the degree to which they had achieved the behaviors necessary to effective counselling discussed in Chapter II. Briefly, these behaviors include demonstration of accurate empathy, respect, immediacy, specificity, warmth, and genuineness. The program also provided one opportunity for volunteers to explore their perceptions of the general quality of the call.

A placebo treatment, referred to as "unstructured self-examination," was provided to a second group by giving them a page with the instructions, "Please write, in some detail, an analysis of your call. You might include how you feel about the call and/or how you imagine the caller feels about

the call." Thus, writers could choose whether to focus attention upon the caller, self, or both and choose how much time and energy they wished to spend on the examination. No particular cues were provided to focus attention upon the volunteer's specific behaviors.

The effects of a third condition, no treatment, were also measured.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were utilized to assess the dependent variables of this study: a questionnaire which yielded three dependent variable measures, an agency form called the "Call Sheet" and observations by trained supervisors. Six measures were extracted from these three instruments: two measures of self-examination, three measures of inviting behaviors and the difference between self and supervisors' evaluations. Table 6 shows the dependent variables extracted from each instrument.

Development of Measures

Evaluation measure. A single form to measure both supervisory and self estimation of a volunteer's skill level was developed as a means of testing the hypothesis that those volunteers who self-examined most would be closest in evaluation of their skills to supervisors' evaluations. The difference in evaluation score was derived by subtracting supervisory evaluation from self-evaluation without regard

Table 6

Derivation of Dependent Variable Scores

Instrument	Measurement Yielded
Questionnaire	Supervisory evaluation minus self-evaluation[a]
	Volunteer-reported invitations to partner
	Volunteer-reported invitations to supervisor
	Private self-examination
Call sheet	Public self-examination
Supervisor's observation	Supervisor-reported invitations from the volunteer

[a]Becomes difference in evaluation score.

to the direction of the difference.

The evaluation questions were constructed by the agency's two supervisors and myself. The first phase of development required the three of us to write statements of "the general functions of a volunteer on a call which are emphasized in our training and supervision." Items drawn from previous brainstorming sessions of volunteers and staff were added to the pool. In all, 36 items were contributed (Appendix B).

Each supervisor and I then independently chose the 10 functions from among the 36 items considered to be the most important. Five similar items were chosen by all of us. These commonly chosen criteria made up the evaluation form. One additional item requesting a general evaluation was added by the experimenter (see Appendix C for the final evaluation form). Pooling all available items from several sources and choosing the commonly selected items ensured sampling representativeness.

Each criterion was phrased in question form with a 5-point Likert-type scale upon which the respondent was to reply.

The above method of constructing the evaluation scale was considered one means of demonstrating content validity of the scale. A second means of establishing content validity was provided upon completion of the scale when the two supervisors and I considered whether the scale included

the most important functions of crisis-line workers. Each of us agreed that, in our eyes, the scale provided an adequate index of essential crisis-line counselling behaviors.

Reliability of the self-evaluation scale was assessed prior to the main experiment by considering responses from two groups of volunteers (n = 10, n = 11) who did not participate in the main study. The first group had completed the initial training program but had less than 3 months experience on the lines. Retesting of the first group after 4 to 10 days (depending upon the member's next shift) provided a reliability coefficient of r = .84 (p < .01). The self-evaluation scale was administered to the second group who had almost completed the initial training program but had no telephone counselling experience. Retesting one week later provided scores which correlated moderately (r = .70, p < .01) with initial scores. Differences in these test-retest correlation coefficients may have been due to the changes experienced by the second group who were tested while they were in the midst of initial training program. Dramatic changes in new volunteers' skill and confidence levels during the beginning training sessions have been observed by staff. In view of this observation, reliability, as indicated by test-retest, was judged to be adequate for this measure.

The internal consistency of the scale, based on the initial test scores of both pilot groups (n = 21), was

indicated by a split half correlation (corrected for length by Spearman-Brown's factor) of .83. This correlation was considered to reflect adequate internal consistency.

The reliability of the evaluation measure as completed by supervisors was assessed prior to the main experiment. Both supervisors listened to members of the first pilot group on two consecutive shifts. Confederate calls were placed to those volunteers who had not received a call one-half an hour prior to the end of either shift so that all subjects could be evaluated. Table 7 provides the inter-supervisor reliability coefficients of the pilot work. It was concluded that there was a high degree of agreement both between raters and between rating sessions.

Validity of the evaluation form was sought solely by constructing each item to elicit the evaluator's opinion of one skill are which was emphasized during the initial training period. The supervisors and I were satisfied that each item identified only one skill area required of volunteers. We were satisfied also that volunteers were familiar with each item because volunteers in training are required to articulate and demonstrate the core counselling skills before being permitted to take calls.

Self-examination indices. Two measures of the amount of self-examination that volunteers engaged in during the measurement shift were utilized to test the hypotheses that those who self-examine most are those who are closest to

Table 7

Correlations Between Supervisory Evaluations on Pilot Study Data

	Supervisor 1		Supervisor 2	
	First Evaluation	Second Evaluation	First Evaluation	Second Evaluation
Supervisor 1				
First evaluation	1.	.82*	.88*	.87*
Second evaluation		1.	.86*	.84*
Supervisor 2				
First evaluation			1.	.79*
Second evaluation				1.

Note: n = 10

*(of critical value) < .01

supervisors in evaluating their skills and that those who practice imposed self-examination will voluntarily self-examine more. One index of self-examination was derived from an agency procedure of writing up calls on the call sheet. Each call is recorded by including statistical information plus a general description of the call (see Appendix D). The form is structured to seek "Caller's concern," "Your ways of helping," "Comments" and "Referrals." Complete call sheets are kept in the phone room so that volunteers have access to each other's write-ups. Thus, this index is referred to as the public measurement of self-examination.

This accessibility by volunteers and staff may have reduced the evidence of self-examination offered by volunteers. Consequently, a second index (viewed only by the volunteer and myself) was developed to produce evidence of self-examination which had occurred during the shift but was not demonstrated on the call sheet. This index was provided by question eight of the questionnaire (Appendix C), which reads, "on this shift did you think about the caller or your handling of the call when the call(s) were finished? If so, would you please describe *specifically* what you thought about or did." The question was phrased in general terms to avoid providing cues to those subjects who had not self-examined during the shift.

Both of these indices of self-examination, call sheets and question eight, were constructed as open-ended measures in order to allow respondents sufficient latitude in which to report their behavior. More structured questions may have imposed undesired restrictions upon the subjects' responses, particularly in the direction of inadvertently providing clues to "correct" responses.

Reliability studies of responses to question eight and the call sheets were conducted by having the same two groups of inexperienced volunteers who served in the reliability study of the evaluation scale complete the two self-examination indices after role-playing experiences. It was expected that volunteers would demonstrate a consistent level of self-examination, regardless of the content of calls. In line with the discussion presented earlier, volunteers were expected to exhibit this consistent pattern of self-examining behavior which was expected to vary from volunteer to volunteer. Comments about their performances were counted as self-examination if the comments were specific and self-referent. Neither general comments such as "helped" or "listened" nor caller-referent comments such as "he was desperate" or "caller solved own problem" were scored as self-examination comments.

The first group, retested 4 to 10 days later on shift, provided a reliability measure for question eight of the questionnaire of $r = .82$, $p < .05$. The second, retested one

week later in training, provided a reliability coefficient of $r = .70$, $p < .05$.

The call sheets, the second self-examination measure, produced reliability coefficients (computed in the same manner as the first measure) of $r = .84$, $p < .05$, from the first group and $r = .76$, $p < .05$ from the second. These results support the expectation of consistency of self-examination over time, regardless of the content of the call.

In summary, two indices of the amount of self-examination engaged in during the measurement shift were utilized: the agency's format for gathering data on calls (public index) and a question which was completed at the end of the measurement shift (private index).

Observed inviting measure. In order to test volunteers' willingness to seek either their partners' or their supervisors' opinions about their counselling skills, volunteers were provided with a specific opportunity to invite discussion. Both the supervisors' and the volunteers' decisions about whether the volunteer had invited another was sought in order to compare perceptions of inviting behaviors.

Supervisors' observations of inviting behavior were gathered by arranging that a supervisor enter the phone room during the measurement shift. The randomly assigned supervisor asked the subject, after examining the call sheets, "How was that call with [...] for you?", referring to a specific call write-up. The supervisor mentally noted the

responses which followed the question.

The supervisor remained in the phone room for 10 minutes, whether the subject interacted with the supervisor and/or the partner on shift or not. If the subject was on a call, the supervisor remained close and available to be invited to listen on the monitoring phone. At the end of the 10-minute period, the supervisor made an excuse and left the room in order to enter his or her decision about whether the volunteer had invited and a verbatim description of the interchanges during the 10 minutes.

For the purposes of this study, invitations were considered to have been made when a volunteer motioned or verbally invited the supervisor or partner to listen to the call, wrote a note or made a verbal comment about his or her handling of the call or responded to the supervisor's question of "How was that call for you?" with questions or comments about the volunteer's own behavior or feelings. Examples of the latter which were scored as inviting responses were "I'm really worried about that call; I don't think I helped much," and "I think we explored her feelings about her husband's drinking well." Further examples are found in Appendix F. Responses scored as noninviting were superficial comments such as "Fine" or "Okay" or nonverbal cues that the subject did not want to discuss his or her handling of the call. Nonverbal cues included returning to reading, to writing, or to talking with the partner about

things other than the handling of the call.

The reliability of judgement of inviting behavior was assessed by having the two supervisors practice their observing inviting behavior with volunteers from the first pilot group and with two other volunteers who had less than three months' experience on the lines. The phi coefficients gained from test-retest of the decision by the supervisor whether the volunteer invited or not on two consecutive shifts are found in Table 8. A comparison of inviting behavior over time was expected to reflect tendencies of volunteers to invite, regardless of the content of calls. Fisher's exact test applied to the data produced similar results. These low relationship frequencies are due in part to the lack of stability found in small samples. However, they may suggest that inviting behavior is not a behavior pattern which occurs regardless of the situation. The frequencies may also be due in part to the influence of supervisor personality on volunteer willingness to invite. In order to reduce this influence, supervisors were randomly assigned to observe volunteers in the main study.

As a final step in the development of this measure, supervisors were asked to consider whether the descriptions of inviting behaviors served as adequate criteria with which to judge a volunteer's behavior. Both supervisors agreed that the descriptions were adequate in the trial runs.

Table 8

Phi Coefficients of Inviting Behavior
Observations on Pilot Study Data

	Supervisor 1		Supervisor 2	
	First Evaluation	Second Evaluation	First Evaluation	Second Evaluation
Supervisor 1				
First evaluation	1.	.66**	.22	.66**
Second evaluation		1.	.20	.60*
Supervisor 2				
First evaluation			1.	.60*
Second evaluation				1.

Note: $n = 10$

**(of critical value) < .05

*(of critical value) < .10

Self-reported inviting measure. Self-reported invitations were measured through question seven of the questionnaire. It inquired whether volunteers perceived that they had invited (a) a supervisor or (b) a partner to listen to or talk about calls taken during the measurement shift.

A coefficient of reliability over time was computed on the number of self-reported invitations on each of two consecutive shifts of members of the trained but inexperienced pilot group. The levels of consistency ($\Phi = .72$, $p < .05$ on item a and $\Phi = .70$, $p < .05$ on item b) demonstrated support for the assumption of the study that inviting behaviors are relatively stable behavior patterns.

Derivation of Dependent Variable Scores

Specifically, then, six dependent variable measures were collected:

1. Differences in evaluation: the difference between the mean of the two supervisors' two sets of evaluations of the volunteer's skills and the volunteer's responses to the same scale, regardless of the direction of the difference.

2. Public self-examination: a ratio derived from the number of specific self-observations made on a call sheet compared to the number of calls taken during the shift.

3. Private self-examination: a ratio derived from the number of specific self-observations made in response to question eight of the questionnaire compared to the number

of calls taken.

4. Invitations to partner: a decision by the volunteer whether the partner had been invited to listen or to talk about calls taken by the volunteer.

5. Invitations to supervisor: a decision by the volunteer whether the attending supervisor had been invited to listen or to talk about calls taken by the volunteer. The latter two decisions were reported on the questionnaire.

6. Observed inviting: a decision by the two supervisors and me whether each volunteer had invited the attending supervisor or partner to listen or to talk about their calls(s) based on evidence gathered by the attending supervisor.

Operational Hypotheses

The following operational hypotheses were formed to test the effects of self-examination upon information-seeking about one's performance:

1. There are significant negative correlations between each of the two self-examining indices and the difference in evaluation score.

2. The difference in evaluation score is less for volunteers who practice structured self-examination (group 3) than for volunteers who practice unstructured self-examination (group 1) or no self-examination (group 2). There is no significant difference between group 1 and 2 scores.

3. A greater number of self-examination responses, both private and public, are reported by group 3 volunteers than are reported by group 1 and 2 volunteers. There is no significant difference between group 1 and 2 scores.

4. A greater number of observed and self-reported invitations to the partner and the supervisor are exhibited by volunteers in group 3 than by volunteers in groups 1 and 2. There is no significant difference between group 1 and 2 scores.

For the purposes of testing statistical significance, the alpha error level of $p < .05$ was established.

Data Collection

Experimental procedure. It might be helpful for the reader to review Table 5 (p. 33) before reading further. In reading the table one can see that prior to the experimental period, both supervisors independently rated these volunteers with whom they had worked within the past month. They also listened to volunteers with whom they had not worked recently, without the volunteers' knowledge that they were being evaluated. Then, either one shift prior to the treatment period or during the first two experimental shifts, each supervisor listened again to all subjects in order to rate them on the questionnaire. They did not talk with subjects at this time; to ensure this, the supervisors left the phone room before the calls were completed. Upon

leaving the phone room, each supervisor completed an evaluation form without the volunteer's knowledge. Table 9 provides correlations between the supervisors' evaluation of subjects on both evaluation times. The level of agreement between supervisors and times indicated that volunteers performed at a fairly consistent level from one call to another.

At the beginning of the first shift of the experimental period, each subject in both the structured and unstructured groups was met by the experimenter and asked to participate in a study "to try to find ways of helping volunteers to become better counsellors." Volunteers were told that their involvement would require completing approximately two forms each shift and an anonymous questionnaire later. If volunteers agreed to participate, they were asked to complete either the structured or unstructured treatment form, according to their grouping based on the earlier random assignment, after their first two calls 10 minutes in length or over for each of the next several shifts. They were asked to take as much time as was needed to complete the form thoroughly and that they could do what they liked with the form other than discussing it with anyone at the crisis line or bringing it into the phone room. The importance of not talking about the procedure was stressed. Further, they were asked to indicate when they had completed a form by underlining the word "Time" on the call sheet for the

Table 9

Correlations Between Supervisory Evaluations

	Supervisor 1		Supervisor 2	
	First Evaluation	Second Evaluation	First Evaluation	Second Evaluation
Supervisor 1				
First evaluation	1.	.83*	.72*	.78*
Second evaluation		1.	.71*	.79*
Supervisor 2				
First evaluation			1.	.91*
Second evaluation				1.

Note: $n = 36$

*(of critical value) < .01

appropriate call write-up. This procedure was needed both as a check that volunteers had remembered to complete the forms and as a count of the number of calls self-examined. At this introduction, volunteers were shown where their forms were kept, what the forms consisted of, and asked if they understood what was asked of them.

Later, subjects were reminded to complete forms for each shift by notes in their mailboxes. When four calls had been self-examined, subjects were asked by note to self-examine only one more call.

At the end of the measurement shift, the supervisor asked the volunteer to complete the questionnaire in private. Subjects were told that their responses were keyed to numbers as a way of ensuring anonymity and only the experimenter would see the questionnaire. They were asked to take time to complete the questionnaire and to answer honestly.

When all subjects had completed the experimental procedure, each of the volunteers in the structured and unstructured groups was interviewed. At this time, I asked questions to determine what, if any, demand characteristics were operating (Orne, 1969). Specifically, I asked what volunteers thought the experiment was about, what they imagined I wanted to find and how they imagined other volunteers had reacted to the experiment.

I also asked when they normally asked others to listen or talk about their calls, how they self-examined and when,

and what difference it would have made to them had their completed self-examination forms been available to other volunteers or just to supervisors. I asked them to describe the caller(s) they talked with during the measurement shift to determine whether those who had been called by confederate callers were suspicious of the nature of their calls. (The procedure describing the use of confederate callers is described in the following section.) At the end of each interview, I informed volunteers of the hypotheses of the study and helped them talk about their feelings about the experiment. Appendix E contains a complete list of questions asked during the postexperimental interview.

Special problems of measurement. In preliminary work for this study, I found that approximately 1/6 of the shifts at the agency did not receive any calls over 10 minutes in length. In order to keep the experimental procedure standard, it was necessary that all volunteers receive a call of moderate length during the designated measurement shift. Eight people with counselling experience were asked to provide realistic calls over 10 minutes in length. These confederate callers were asked to use a life situation that they were currently experiencing as topics for their calls. Prior to the beginning of the experiment, each confederate had discussed with me what he or she might say.

Forty-five minutes before the end of the shift, one of two randomly assigned supervisors entered the room and

examined the call sheets for the current shift to determine whether the subject had received a call which had lasted over 10 minutes in length. The supervisor then left the room after commenting, "Oh, good, Mrs. N's calls are down today" so that volunteers would not wonder why the supervisor had entered the room. If the volunteer had received a call over 10 minutes in length, the supervisor waited for 15 minutes and re-entered the phone room to ask the subject, again after examining the call sheets, "How was that call with [...] for you?", referring to a specific call write-up.

If, upon the first entry to the phone room during the measurement shift, the supervisor found that the volunteer had not received a call over 10 minutes in length, the supervisor placed a call to me so that I could call a confederate. The confederate then placed a call to the volunteer's number and talked about a concern for at least 10 minutes. The supervisor re-entered the phone room 30 minutes before the end of the shift to ask the invitation-seeking question.

Ten confederate calls were needed. The distribution of confederate calls is presented in Table 10. Since the calls were equally distributed between groups (see Table 11), it is possible to draw conclusions based upon data gathered from both confederate and authentic calls.

Associations between confederate and real callers and dependent variables are presented in Table 12. No signifi-

Table 10

Distribution of Confederate Callers

Group	Confederate	Authentic
1. Unstructured	2	18
2. Control	4	15
3. Structured	4	12
Total	10	45

Table 11

Chi Square Associations Between Confederate Callers and Group Placement

Comparison Groups	χ^2
Groups 1 + 2, 3	.21
Groups 1 + 3, 2	2.68

Note: Neither of the associations reached significance.

Table 12

Association Between Confederate or Authentic Callers and Dependent Variables

Variable	Confederate		Authentic		r_{pbi}
	M	*s*	*M*	*s*	
Evaluation differences	32.89	20.67	31.31	25.58	.04
Private self-examination	5.85	4.90	2.41	1.87	.62*
Public self-examination	2.82	1.33	1.76	1.09	.50*
			Φ		
Observed inviting			.23		
Invitations to supervisor			.03		
Invitations to partner			.40		

*(of critical value) < .01

cant correlations were found between confederate callers and four of the six dependent variables. However, both self-examination indices correlated significantly to the use of confederate callers. As well, a significant difference was found between the amount of self-examination produced with authentic and confederate callers (t = 2.96, p = .006 on the questionnaire and t = 2.32, p = .03 on the call sheets). Comments on both the call sheets and the questionnaire provide some indication of possible reasons for the observed increase of self-examination with confederate callers. On these instruments, several volunteers mentioned how much they enjoyed their discussions with the confederate callers. "Good call," "Sensitive caller--I enjoyed," "What a neat guy" were examples of comments made. Seemingly, more self-observations were offered when the experience was positive. Confederate callers appeared willing to explore their situations, perhaps more so than authentic callers. Thus, the efforts of the volunteers were rewarded. However, the influence of a positive experience upon voluntary self-examination does not augur well for the use of self-examination at any time. Close scrutiny of negative experiences may also be necessary in assessing the development of one's skills.

Scoring responses. Scoring of the difference in evaluation was achieved by computing the mean of the four supervisory evaluations (each of two trials of two super-

visors) and subtracting the volunteer's evaluation from this mean score. The absolute score was used as the difference in evaluation.

Scoring of the self-examination indices was provided by three trainer-supervisors not involved in the study who were aware of neither the names of the subjects nor their experimental condition. Each judge was instructed to count the number of specific self-observations written in response to question eight on the questionnaire and on the call sheets. To ensure that only specific responses were scored, I compared examples of specific and general responses for the judges during a training session. Judges were instructed not to score general comments such as "helped caller talk about what was bothering him" or "talked over with partner." Three practice responses were scored by the judges and then discussed with me. Samples of responses to question eight of the questionnaire (private index) scored by the judges are presented in Appendix G. Correlations between the three judges' scorings are presented in Table 13. The high degree of interjudge reliability demonstrated adequate consistency. Sample responses to the call sheets are presented in Appendix D.

The final step in obtaining the self-examination scores was to compute a proportional score by dividing the means of the three judges' scores by the number of calls taken by the volunteer during that shift, thus permitting comparison

Table 13

Correlations Between Judges' Scores
on Self-Examination Indices

	Private				Public			
Judge	1	2	3	*M*	1	2	3	*M*
1	1.	.92*	.94*	.97*	1.	.94*	.94*	.98*
2		1.	.91*	.95*		1.	.90*	.96*
3			1.	.97*			1.	.96*

*(of critical value) < .01

among volunteers who received differing numbers of calls. For example, several volunteers self-examined the only call they received while another examined one of the two calls he received. Unless a proportional index were used, those receiving fewer opportunities for self-examination would be penalized by the scoring system.

The measure entitled "observed inviting" was a decision as to whether the volunteer invited either the partner or supervisor during the supervisor's time in the phone room. When all subjects had completed the experiment, each supervisor reported subjects' responses to the question "How was that call with [...] for you?" to the other supervisor and me without mentioning the volunteer's name. The other supervisor and I wrote our decisions about whether the subject had invited. In cases of disagreement about whether a response represented an invitation, the majority carried.

The other two measures of inviting of behaviors, volunteers' perceptions of whether they had invited their partner or their supervisor, were reported by the volunteer on the questionnaire completed at the end of the measurement shift.

In summary, measurement of the willingness to invite others to discuss one's calls, amount of voluntary self-examination and proximity of self to supervisors' evaluation under three conditions of self-examination were collected from volunteers under three conditions of self-examination.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Volunteer crisis line workers who practiced structured self-examination were expected to continue to seek information about their counselling performances. These increases in information search were considered to be indicated by increased voluntary self-examination, increased seeking of others' comments about their skills, and less discrepancy between self and supervisory evaluations.

In general, no support was found for these hypotheses. No relationship was found between the amount of voluntary self-examination and difference in evaluation. In fact, the results suggest that those who voluntarily self-examine evaluate themselves higher, rather than more accurately. Further, the program of structured self-examination of performance had little consistent influence on inviting behavior, differences in self and supervisory evaluation, or amount of voluntary self-examination.

However, several results provide tentative information about information-seeking behaviors. First, there is some evidence that guided self-examination, as practiced within the study, did not reduce the threat of evaluation. In addition, contrary to the hypotheses of this study, there

is some tentative evidence that under some conditions, self-examination reduces, rather than encourages, the use of other means of appraisal of performance. Finally, guided self-examination did not improve the general skill level of voluntary written self-examination which remained mostly cursory and superficial.

Specific discussion about the results follows.

Hypothesis One

The hypothesized relationship between the amount of voluntary self-examination and closeness of self to supervisory evaluations was formulated partly from staff observations which indicated that crisis line workers who voluntarily self-examined most seemed to be closest in informal evaluation of their skills to supervisors' evaluation of those skills. These observations were supported by research findings which suggested that intensive self-examination affected closer evaluation to supervisor evaluation (e.g., Carr, 1977; Martin, 1968).

As discussed earlier, the hypothesis was tested by analyzing the relationships between two self-examination indices and the difference of evaluation score. The private self-examination index was produced at the end of the experimental period when subjects were asked to describe on a questionnaire what, if anything, they thought about the caller or their handling of the call when each call was

completed. The public index was provided on an agency form for reporting calls.

The number of self-observations on both indices were scored by three judges, as described earlier (see Table 14 for means and standard deviations).

Evaluations were obtained from volunteers and supervisors on a Likert-type scale. The range of evaluation scores of volunteer, supervisor, and difference in evaluations are presented in Table 15. The reader will recall that lower scores indicated poorer evaluations.

The difference in evaluation score was compared to each of the two self-examination indices by computing Pearson Product-Moment correlations.

Neither self-examination index related significantly to self-supervisory differences in evaluation (Table 16). Control group scores only were first examined to provide information about the relationship between the two variables in an untreated group. Analysis of control group scores alone would ascertain whether the hypothesized relationship existed prior to treatment. It was possible that the treatment interrupted a natural relationship and analysis of total group scores alone would not reflect this interruption.

Total group scores were also examined in order to test a larger sample on the chance that no changes in the difference in evaluation scores were produced. Neither control group nor total group self-examination scores correlated

Table 14

Self-Examination Scores of Experimental and Comparison Groups

Group[a]	Measure			
	Private		Public	
	M	*s*	*M*	*s*
1. Unstructured	4.12	2.44	1.96	1.50
2. Control	3.28	4.95	2.17	1.55
3. Structured	2.42	1.83	1.93	.59
Total Group	3.27	3.29	2.02	1.24

[a] $n = 12$ for each group.

Table 15

Ranges of Evaluation Scores

Source of Evaluation	Possible Range	Actual Range
Self	60 - 300	188.0 - 290
Supervisors	60 - 300	155.5 - 255
Differences in evaluation	0 - 240	.5 - 85

Table 16

Correlations Between Self-Examination Indices and Differences in Evaluation

Group	*n*	Measure	
		Private	Public
Control	12	-.07	-.08
Total group	36	-.05	.08

Note: None of the correlations reached significance.

significantly with the differences in evaluation. Thus, the hypothesis concerning willingness to self-examine being related to closeness of self to supervisory evaluations was not supported.

It is interesting to note that the variances of the self-examination scores from group to group were not statistically similar. The control group scores on the private index varied significantly more (homogeneity of variance χ^2 test = 11.35, $p < .01$) than the other two group scores. This difference is due, at least in part, to one extreme score of a control group subject.

At the same time, treatment group scores on the call sheets were significantly more clustered about the mean ($\chi^2 = 9.58$, $p < .01$) than either of the other two group scores. This finding might reflect a condition in which all members of the treatment group were aware of more issues about their handling of their calls but also had resolved more for themselves through the treatment process. If this situation existed at the time of the measurement shift, treatment group scores would vary less than other group member scores. With the exclusion of the one extreme score of a control group member, a similar finding is evident on the call sheets.

Hypothesis Two

Practice in structured self-examination was considered a potential means of bringing self-evaluation closer to

supervisory evaluation. Previous studies (specifically Carr, 1978; Martin, 1968; Torrez, 1974; Watts, 1973) had demonstrated that various models of self-examination had altered the discrepancy between self and supervisory evaluations. Practice in a guided format of self-examination was assumed to reduce the threat of receiving information about one's performance. Thus, subjects were expected to evaluate their behavior more frankly and would, as a result, produce assessments closer to those of supervisors. As well, the provision of specific criteria would assist both evaluators to evaluate on concrete and similar grounds.

Distribution of difference in evaluation scores was positively skewed for each of the groups (Appendix H). Only 19% of the 36 subjects differed from the supervisors by 60 or more points (out of a possible 240 points) while 81% evaluated themselves within 45 points of the supervisors' evaluations. This finding disputes one observation made early in discussions about information-seeking behavior by the staff of the agency from which the sample was drawn. The staff had imagined that a larger proportion of volunteers were at greater variance from the supervisors. In other words, the problem was not as severe as it had been believed to be. It is possible that this unexpected similarity between volunteers' and supervisors' evaluations allowed little room for any change to be produced as a result of the treatment.

Comparisons of the difference in evaluation scores for each group (see Table 17) were examined through analysis of variance (Table 18) which indicated that the treatment group did not differ significantly from the others in self-supervisory differences.

Data regarding this hypothesis may lack reliability and validity in view of volunteer reports during the debriefing sessions. Volunteers gave a wide variety of answers in response to the question about what they compared their present level of counselling to when they completed the questionnaire. Some compared their present skill level to the general competence they perceived at the agency, some compared it to their ideal self, and others compared it to their skill level when they began as a volunteer. In contrast, supervisors consistently evaluated volunteers according to the standard that the agency aims for during training and supervision. These different comparison standards may well have affected the reliability and validity of the instrument.

The lack of difference between groups could also be accounted for if the volunteers in the structured self-examination program improved their performing level and self-evaluated accordingly. Thus, their evaluation scores would have differed from supervisors who had evaluated each volunteer prior to the inception of the treatment. Differences in self and supervisors' scores would result then

Table 17

Comparison of Difference in Evaluation Scores

Group[a]	*M*	*s*
Unstructured	33.28	26.48
Control	29.25	19.98
Structured	32.60	29.11
Total group	31.71	24.46

[a] n = 12 for each group

Table 18

Analysis of Variance of Difference in Evaluation Scores

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*F*
Groups	111.53	2	.09
Error	21422.87	33	

because of the improvement taking place during this time span. Thus, the differences in evaluation scores of members of the treatment group may have been similar to the scores of volunteers in the other two groups but for a different reason: the latter may have continued to self-evaluate inaccurately while the former began to evaluate more accurately. However, this alternate explanation lacks support in view of the lack of difference between groups on the self-evaluation scores alone ($F = .77$; $p > .45$). Had some improvement occurred as a result of the treatment, the self-evaluation scores of the treatment group would have been higher than the scores of control group subjects. Therefore, this possibility was not supported by the data.

In any case, the second hypothesis, as tested, was not supported by the results. Self-examination of performance did not reduce the difference between self and supervisor evaluations.

Hypothesis Three

Imposed self-examination was hypothesized to cause an increase in voluntary self-examination, as indicated by the call sheets and the experimental questionnaire. Self-appraisal was expected to lower the feelings of threat about the examination process after a period of practice which in turn would provide opportunities for rewards from examination through improvement of performance. When the threat of the

process decreased and the rewards were experienced, an increase in the amount of voluntary self-examination was anticipated.

An analysis of variance was utilized to examine the differences between the means of the group scores of both private and public indices of self-examination. No significant differences were found between groups on either index (Table 19). Imposed practice in self-examination as provided in this study did not improve the amount of voluntary self-examination.

Hypothesis Four

The effect of practice in structured self-examination on increase in inviting others' comments on one's performance was also tested. Previous research had shown that structured self-appraisal of one's performance decreased threat and increased participation in information-seeking about one's performance (Davis, 1974; Lindquist, 1975). In order to test this hypothesis in the present study, volunteers were provided with both a structured format for self-examination and opportunities to invite others' examination or discussion about their performance.

As previously discussed, three measures were utilized to examine this hypothesis: observations by a supervisor of the volunteer's inviting, volunteer-reported invitations to a supervisor, and volunteer-reported invitations to a

Table 19

Analysis of Variance of Self-Examination Scores

Source	*SS*	*df*	*F*
Public			
Groups	.42	2	.12
Error	55.27	33	
Private			
Groups	17.49	2	.77
Error	372.46	33	

Note: Neither *F* score reached significance.

partner. Table 20 presents the distribution of inviting behaviors. Chi square analyses were computed to determine the association between groups and frequency of inviting behaviors. The analyses (reported with Yates correction for continuity) were applied to the data which were regrouped from a 3 x 2 to a 2 x 2 contingency table because of expected frequencies under five.

No support for the hypothesis was found. As reported in Table 21, the proportion of volunteers in the experimental group who invited supervisors or partners to listen or talk about their calls was similar to that of volunteers in the control group and the unstructured group. The one chi square which approached significance (volunteer reports of invitations to a supervisor, groups 1 and 2 compared with 3) did not meet an appropriate significance level even when computed without Yates correction ($\chi^2 = 2.73$, $p = .10$).

Discussions during the debriefing sessions indicated that decisions to invite comment on one's performance were based on several reasons. Some volunteers reported that they invited only when they decided that they needed help in handling a call. Others invited those who had invited them. However, most said that they invited when they trusted the other to give sensitive feedback. This last observation supports my assumption that felt threat affects volunteers' seeking information about themselves. Further, these reports suggest that the program did not reduce the fear of

Table 20

Contingency Tables of Inviting Behavior Scores

Group	Observed Inviting		Invitations to Supervisor		Invitations to Partner	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Unstructured	9	3	7	5	7	5
2. Control	8	4	8	4	8	4
3. Structured	7	5	4	8	6	6
Groups 1 & 2	17	7	15	9	15	9
Group 3	7	5	4	8	6	6
Groups 1 & 3	16	8	11	13	13	11
Group 2	8	4	8	4	8	4

Table 21

Chi Square Associations Between Groups and Inviting Behaviors

	Observed Inviting	Invitations to Supervisor	Invitations to Partner
Groups 1 & 2, 3	.14	1.69	.13
Groups 1 & 3, 2	.14	.68	.13

Note: None of the associations reached significance.

receiving "insensitive" feedback.

Relationships Among Dependent Variables

The relationships between those dependent variables which yielded interval scale data were examined by computing Pearson Product Moment correlations (Table 22). Three dependent variables of nominal data were correlated using point biserial coefficients to compare nominal to interval data. While five significant relationships were found, it is important to note that these relationships could have occurred by chance when so many correlations were tabulated.

A small, but statistically significant, negative relationship ($r = -.34$, $p < .05$) was found between the number of calls taken during the measurement shift by the subject and the amount of public self-examination. No volunteer was busy on the phone for longer than 2 hours and 40 minutes of a 4-hour shift, so it would appear that each volunteer had time to self-examine. It would seem unlikely, then, that this relationship could be attributed to lack of time.

While there may have been sufficient absolute time to self-examine further, volunteers may have *experienced* little time between calls. Many calls leave volunteers drained because both topics and skills involved in calls demand high emotional investment. Those volunteers who counselled longest are likely to have been more exhausted and thus less likely to self-examine during their shift. A similar

Table 22

Correlations Between Dependent and Demographic Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Pearson Product-Moment Coefficients								
1. Age	--	.33*	-.10	.01	-.14	-.16	.15	-.02
2. Experience		--	.22	-.12	.07	-.06	-.08	.12
3. Time in study			--	-.21	.13	.06	-.05	-.08
4. Self-evaluation				--	-.09	.92**	-.18	-.03
5. Difference in evaluation					--	-.05	.08	-.02
6. Private self-examination						--	.34*	-.13
7. Public self-examination							--	-.34*
8. Number of calls								--
Point Biserial Coefficients								
9. Observed inviting	-.26	-.29	-.14	.00	.05	.19	.00	-.12
10. Invitations to supervisor	-.22	-.15	-.21	-.21	-.16	.12	.02	.17
11. Invitations to partner	-.11	-.18	.09	-.03	.22	-.27	-.24	.09

Variable	9	10	11
Phi Coefficients			
9. Observed inviting	--	.51*	.24
10. Invitations to supervisor		--	.33*
11. Invitations to partner			--

**(of critical value) < .01
*(of critical value) < .05

relationship was not observed between the number of calls and amount of private self-examination produced which was obtained after the shift when volunteers were not required to invest further energy in other calls.

Of particular interest was the modest but significant relationship found between reports by volunteers and those by supervisors of occasions when volunteers invited comment from supervisors (r = .51, p < .01). In examining the occasions when decisions differed, we can see that of the eight volunteers who disagreed with the supervisors' perception of their inviting behavior, six said that they did not invite when supervisors said they did. Supervisors may have wanted to be invited and so interpreted cues incorrectly or they may have picked up cues that volunteers were not aware that they were sending. Some volunteers noted during the debriefing sessions that they had not outrightly asked the supervisor to listen or comment on their call and so may have held different criteria about what constituted invitations.

A weak correlation (r = .34, p < .05) was found between the two self-examination indices. This relationship suggests that while they may have measured some similar aspects of the self-examination process, the two indices measured independent aspects as well.

A weak correlation was also found between volunteer-reported invitations to the supervisor and volunteer-reported

invitations to a partner (r = .33, p = .06). However, no significant differences exist across groups between the two types of invitations (χ^2 = .022). A different basis for inviting individuals filling the two roles appears to exist. Further investigation of volunteers' feelings about peer versus supervisory invitations might provide information helpful in increasing appraisal-seeking behaviors.

Post Hoc Data

In a post hoc examination of the data, a high positive relationship was found between private self-examination and level of self-evaluation (r = .92, p < .01). If the relationship did not occur by chance, this finding contradicts the hypothesis that those who self-examine most have more realistic evaluations of their performance. Rather, those who volunteered more private self-examination thought, accurately or not, most highly of their skills.

Two contradictory explanations for this finding are possible. One, attention paid to one's performance without other feedback or models, often results in views of one's work that are higher than those given by supervisors (e.g., Solamon & McDonald, 1970; Torrez, 1974). Since two-thirds of the subjects evaluated without the benefit of earlier guidance, this possibility exists in examining the data without regard for treatment grouping.

A second possible explanation is that guided attention to criteria that have been demonstrated to improve performance will in fact effect an improvement of performance as has been found in several studies cited earlier. However, no differences in self-evaluation scores were found between groups ($F = .77$, $p > .45$). Therefore, this possibility is not supported by the data.

Two other sets of data not directly pertinent to the hypotheses were also gathered on the questionnaire. One was reports by volunteers of the frequency of self-examination engaged in during their last four shifts; and a second was reports by the volunteers of the number of times partners were invited to listen or comment on calls over the last four shifts. These two scores were related negatively ($r = -.46$, $p = .004$). As well, the frequency of self-examination reported by the volunteers related negatively to two other indices of appraisal-seeking. The amount of self-examining that volunteers reported they had done during their last four shifts correlated negatively to inviting behaviors observed by supervisors ($r = -.30$, $p = .08$) and to reports by volunteers of times they invited supervisors ($r = -.31$, $p = .06$).

Further, the relationship between actual and perceived self-examination was not consistent. Volunteers who perceived that they had self-examined over the last four shifts did little actual self-examination during the measurement

shift (questionnaire index, r = .33, p = .05; call sheet index, r = .15, p = .37).

Thus, a pattern is evident in considering these findings. The findings include the negative relationship between perceived self-examination and frequency of invitations, the weak relationship between perceived and actual self-examination, and the high positive relationship between the amount of private self-examination and self-evaluation. When these three findings are considered together, it might be hypothesized that the use of self-examination at times decreases volunteers' use of opportunities to gain other appraisals. Further testing is indicated by these results.

The skill of self-examination remained poorly mastered despite the treatment. Several findings indicated superficial and cursory use of the skill. First, the weak relationship between perceived and actual self-examination and secondly, the low level of self-examination demonstrated on both self-examination indices and in the debriefing sessions suggest that the skill level remained low. For example, the most frequent self-observations on the call sheets were general comments about "helping" or "listened" or decisions about "handled call okay." This use of self-examination lacks the necessary specificity which provides direction for future improvement. More productive use of these criteria would involve specific observations about the use of such behaviors as listening and reflecting feelings:

"Were my reflections accurate? For example, did the caller feel relieved or was he angry? Were my reflections well received? Did they lead to further exploration of a caller's difficulty? Was my listening fully attentive? Did I miss specific feelings or aspects of the situation which might be important to the caller?" This qualitative difference in self-examination has not been mentioned in earlier studies.

This lack of skill in self-examination may be due in part to the fact that any training in self-examination, however informal, at the agency had been in oral self-examination involving either a partner or a supervisor to assist the volunteer in the process. It may be that had subjects been scored on the amount of oral self-examination given in response to the supervisor's question of "How was that call for you?", different data would have resulted. In fact, one member of the treatment group spontaneously mentioned during the debriefing interview that had someone asked her to talk about a call, she probably would have said a lot more than she wrote. Facilitative interaction may be a necessary ingredient to increased appraisal-seeking.

The lack of skill evidenced may also have been produced because of the way the question was phrased. Care was taken in formulating the question to avoid giving clues to what type of response was desired (i.e., self-examining statement). Consequently, the question became general and appeared to generate general replies. It is possible too, that the

skill of examining one's performance demands a level of sophistication not possessed by volunteers serving only 4 hours a week despite a short-term treatment aimed at improving the level.

Despite the statistical results, volunteers in both the structured and unstructured groups stated that they found the treatment beneficial. With one exception, members of the structured group reported that they gained a greater sense of the degree of adequacy of their performance. These comments were variously phrased: "got much more awareness of my skills," "brought calls down to specifics--I could see where my skills were and improve," "brought to mind things about the call that I hadn't thought about," "was able to differentiate between my better calls--I never used to think of them after I'd finished except to think about the callers," "made me look closer; I didn't change what I did on that call but tried to on next."

The unstructured self-examiners also found the process beneficial, but for different reasons. The quiet time to think about a call seemed to be the most common value found. Specifically what was gained from this time was not clear from the discussions. Some examples of remarks made by unstructured self-examiners were: "I became more aware of my own feelings during a call," "I thought about if I was using the 4 hours here profitably," "it clarified my thoughts," "I really liked the privacy and writing out my thought about

the call," "I thought more about call."

Obviously, these comments could have been made as a result of demand characteristics operating during the interviews. Regardless of the perceived benefits of the self-examination by volunteers, there is no evidence to support its use as a means to increase information-seeking behavior.

Possible Explanations of Results

There are several possible reasons for the lack of support for the hypotheses. The most obvious is that practice in self-examination does not alter information-seeking behavior. However, at this stage of investigation, it would be premature to cease to investigate the possibility that self-examination affects appraisal-seeking behaviors because of reasons discussed later.

A second possible explanation of results concerns the power of the chosen treatment; the length and frequency of practice with the treatment may not have been sufficient to affect volunteers' general evaluation of their performing level or their information seeking about performance. Individual self-evaluations and openness to other evaluations may be more durable and complex characteristics than could be effected by such a time-limited treatment. Wylie (1961) has noted the imperviousness of some aspects of the self-concept; evaluation of one's performance may be of such durable quality.

Possible uncontrolled variables. Another source of possible explanations for the results lies in the influence of uncontrolled variables. Several converging operations were established in order to reduce the influence of such variables. One, a second control group was established to assess possible influences created by a Hawthorne effect and to compare the effects of structured to unstructured self-examination. Two, supervisors were randomly assigned to measurement shifts to equalize the effects of any one supervisor on the outcome. Three, pretesting which would have influenced the results by giving prior exposure to the dependent variables was eliminated from the design.

Despite these attempts and others described earlier to control influential but unmeasured variables, some appear to have operated. From postexperimental interviews held with members of the two self-examining groups, it appears that one demand characteristic was influential. Eight of the 24 subjects interviewed spontaneously mentioned that they felt pressure to complete the forms quickly in order to return to the phone room. They were uncomfortable with their partners not knowing what they were doing out of the room and not being available to support that partner on calls. This discomfort may very well have influenced their process of self-examination. With this felt pressure, volunteers may have hurried their self-examination and in so doing, not learned the skill. The results would then reflect no

difference between groups. An important oversight in the procedure, then, was not informing the volunteer body that some volunteers would be leaving the phone room at various times to complete a task for the trainers.

Individual differences in the ways that we accept and process information were not controlled and randomization may not have equalized groups on these variables. For example, individual predisposition to handling self-knowledge, to relating to people in authority, or to peers were not measured nor even identified. Other differences such as trust level of individuals or locus of control beliefs may have affected individual processing of the treatment to a degree which was not equalized by randomization.

Another uncontrolled variable which became apparent during the postexperimental interviews, the use of varying standards in making evaluation decisions, has been previously discussed. These differing standards offer a possible explanation for the lack of support of results found for hypotheses 1 and 2.

And finally, as with all studies utilizing a relatively small sample size, the representativeness of group membership may have been limited and so these and other unknown variables may have contaminated the results.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study are applicable to populations of screened and trained crisis line workers. Generalization

of results to workers in other volunteer agencies, however, should be tentative since motivations for volunteering one's services to this kind of agency may provide a very different population to those of other agencies.

A second limitation of this study was the lack of control of variables which had the potential to intervene in the treatment's effects mentioned above. It is possible that some variables which were neither measured nor isolated influenced individual responses to the treatment. It would have been virtually impossible to design a program which accounted for all of the knowledge about human behavior applicable to the setting of this study, or of any field setting.

Another difficulty with field-setting research such as the present study is instrumentation. Few well validated measuring tools exist to deal with problems often encountered in the field. Construction of new tools or utilization of naturally-occurring behaviors as measurements was necessary. The time required to provide validation studies for the instrumentation in this study was considered prohibitive and as a result this study lacks information on validity.

I believe that despite such drawbacks, continued attempts to provide guidelines for those working in the field would be a worthwhile endeavor of researchers. When practitioners who seek guidance from research literature are consistently informed that accumulated research provides

little that is clearly applicable, we must respond to this need in our research.

Several aspects of the program required the cooperation of the subjects. Some volunteers in the structured group may have indicated that they completed the appropriate form, when in fact they did not. No specific monitoring of this possibility was provided, however no evidence that volunteers did not cooperate was observed.

A second aspect of the cooperation necessary to the study was confidentiality. Subjects from different groups may have discussed the different forms. My plea for confidentiality in the initial briefing session was intended to prevent this effect but no firm controls were possible in this setting. However, no suggestion that discussions about the two different forms took place was evidenced.

Pilot groups presented another weakness within the study. For practical reasons of volunteer accessibility and time, the pilot groups were drawn from a slightly different population than the actual subjects. The pilot subjects were neither experienced nor randomly selected. I was unwilling to ask a randomly selected group to meet twice for a reliability study when already volunteers were often asked to fill many other agency functions in addition to their shift on the phones. It is possible then that the reliability of the measures would be different for actual subjects than those reported.

A further limitation within the study was obtaining supervisory and volunteer evaluations at different times. Supervisors evaluated volunteers once during the month prior to the inception of the study and once during the shift prior to the inception or the first shift of the study. Volunteers did not evaluate themselves until the measurement shift which occurred on an average of 6.1 weeks after the beginning (s.d. = 2.74). It was necessary for volunteers to evaluate themselves at this time in order to measure the effects of the treatment on self-evaluation. It was crucial that supervisors not evaluate at this time so that they would be free to observe inviting behaviors.

Suggestions for Further Research

Several directions might be taken as a result of both the experience of conducting the research and its results. The study might be replicated with several revisions. A larger sample size, and more practice in self-examination over a longer period of time where all volunteers were aware that some would be out of the room for parts of the shift are possible revisions.

The completed forms might be shown to supervisors who would act solely as facilitators for volunteer examination of skills. Nine volunteers had stated during the post-experimental interviews that they would have worked harder on the forms had they submitted them to the staff.

The question posed to produce evidence of self-examination might request the evidence in a more specific way, for example: "What did you like about how you handled the call(s)?" and "What did you not like?" While this form would possibly generate demand responses where none had occurred spontaneously during the shift of duty, the specificity of the responses could be used as an appropriate index for skill of self-examination.

Specific standards with which to measure one's general performing level should be included in the instructions to the evaluation questionnaire. The standard might read: "Compare yourself to the level that we try to attain through training and supervision."

Further investigation should be undertaken to ascertain under what, if any, conditions self-examination reduces other appraisal-seeking behaviors as was tentatively suggested from the results of the auxiliary data.

In view of some volunteers' disclosures that they make decisions to seek others' appraisals of their performance based upon their feelings of trust toward the other individual involved, an important direction for further research is in testing the effect of felt trust on information-seeking behavior. Various means to increase the trust experienced by both participants should be found if such a relationship exists.

Support for this direction of research is seen in the considerable improvement in information-seeking behaviors in volunteers observed by members of the training staff between the completion of the experiment and this writing. Three variables may account for this observed change and are considered worthy of further investigation. First, senior volunteers have been trained as "support" people who utilize relationship-building skills with new volunteers as well as with callers. These volunteers provide psychological support to the new volunteers on their first, usually anxiety-filled shift. Supervisors are now noticing an increase in new volunteers' information-seeking, perhaps because of the rapport felt between the support volunteer and the new volunteer. A second factor which may account for some of the observed change is a new component of initial training. Two practice sessions in which pairs of volunteers practice self-examination of role-plays using a checklist of skills have been added to the initial training program. And third, supervisors have emphasized more and more, volunteer exploration of calls and skills rather than supervisory criticism during supervisory sessions. As was true for the initial observations, these should be studied under controlled conditions.

Investigation of the influence of resistance and threat in evaluative situations should continue. Means to increase

appraisal-seeking behaviors need to be found particularly where performers' training and experience are limited.

REFERENCES

Altekruse, M. W. & Brown, D. F. Counseling behavior change through self-analysis. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1969, *8*, 108-112.

Bassett, G. & Meyer, H. Performance appraisal based on self-review. *Personnel Psychology*, 1968, *21*, 421-428.

Bauman, W. F. Games counselor trainees play: Dealing with trainess' resistance. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1972, *11*, 251-256.

Bergin, A. & Solomon, S. Personality and performance correlates of empathic understanding in psychotherapy. *American Psychologist*, 1963, *18*, 393.

Bilodeau, E. A. & Bilodeau, I. McD. Motor-skills learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 1961, *12*, 243-280.

Birney, R. C., Burdick, H., & Teevan, R. C. *Fear of Failure*. New York: Van Nostrand, 1969.

Bleach, G. & Claiborn, W. Initial evaluation of hot-line telephone crisis centers. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 1974, *10*, 387-394.

Campbell, D. & Stanley, J. *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Caplan, G. Opportunities for school psychologists in the primary prevention of mental disorders in children. In N. Lambert (Ed.), *The protection and promotion of mental health in schools*. Mental Health Monograph 5, U.S. Printing Office, 1965, pp. 9-22.

Carkhuff, R. R. *Helping and human relations* (2 vols.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Carr, R. The effects of specific guidelines on accuracy of student self-evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 1977, *2*, 65-79.

Cohen, M. S. The influence of trait anxiety on state anxiety reactions to video self-confrontation. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, *35*, 5111A.

Cronbach, L. J. *Educational psychology.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. *The approval motive.* New York: Wiley, 1964.

Danish, S. J. & Hauer, A. L. *Helping skills: A basic training program.* New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973.

Davis, R. E. The effects of video-tape self-appraisal on teaching behavior and attitudes of classroom teachers. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1975, *35,*4294A

Dellis, N. P. & Stone, H. K. (Eds.). *The training of psychotherapists: A multidisciplinary approach.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1960.

Doyle, W. W., Foreman, M. E., & Wales, E. The effects of supervision in the training of non-professional crisis intervention counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1977, *24,* 72-78.

Ekstein, R. & Wallerstein, R. *The teaching and learning of psychotherapy.* New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Eysenck, H. J. The effects of psychotherapy: An evaluation. *Journal of Consulting Psychology,* 1952, *16,* 319-324.

Fowler, D. E. & McGee, R. C. Assessing the performance of telephone crisis workers: The development of a technical effectiveness scale. In D. Lester & G. Brockopp (Eds.), *Crisis intervention and counseling by telephone.* Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1973, pp. 287-297.

France, O. K. Effects of caller value orientation and of worker training and experience on the functioning of lay volunteer crisis line workers. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1975, *36,* 3035B.

Friedenberg, E. Critique of current practice. In D. McCarthy (Ed.), *New perspectives in teacher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Guerney, G. G. *Psychotherapeutic agents: New roles for nonprofessionals, parents and teachers.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Harris, A. The effective teacher of reading. *Reading Teacher,* 1969, *23,* 195-204.

Hodenfoeld, G. K. & Stinnett, T. M. *The education of teachers.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

Hollister, W. G. The concept of stress in preventative interventions and ego-strength building in the schools. In N. Lambert (Ed.), *The protection and promotion of mental health in schools.* Mental Health Monograph 5, U.S. Printing Office, 1965, pp. 30-35.

Izard, C. E. Comments on Drs. Phillips, Martin, and Meyers' paper. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research.* New York: Academic Press, 1972, pp. 465-468.

Janis, J. L. *Psychological stress.* New York: Wiley, 1958.

Jansen, D. G., Robb, G. G., & Bonk, E. C. Peer ratings and self-ratings on twelve bipolar items and practicum counsellors ranked high and low in competence by their peers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1973, *20,* 419-424.

Jersild, A. T. & Lazar, E. A. *The meaning of psychotherapy in the teacher's life and work.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Kadushin, A. Games people play in supervision. *Social Work,* 1968, *13,* 23-32.

Kay, E., Meyer, H., & French, J. Effects of threat in a performance appraisal interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 1965, *49,* 311-317.

Klimoski, R., & London, M. Role of the rater in performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 1974, *59,* 445-451.

Knickerbocker, D. A. & McGee, R. K. Clinical effectiveness of non-professional workers in a crisis intervention center. In D. Lester & G. Brockopp (Eds.), *Crisis intervention and telephone counseling.* Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1973, pp. 298-309.

Krebs, C. E. A taxonomic competency-based instrument for self-supervision in counselor education training. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1974, *34,* 6385.

Krech, D., Crutchfield, R., & Livson, N. *Elements of psychology.* New York: Knopf, 1969.

Lakin, M. *Interpersonal encounter: Theory and practice in sensitivity training.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Lindquist, D. S. Videotape feedback and self-regulatory processes in the modification of classroom speech anxiety and classroom discussion behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1975, *35,* 3587B.

Luft, J. *Of human interaction.* Palo Alto, Calif.: National Press Books, 1969.

Maier, N. *The appraisal interview: Objectives, methods, and skills.* New York: Wiley, 1958.

Mandler, G. & Watson, D. L. Anxiety and interruption of behavior. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Anxiety and behavior.* New York: Academic Press, 1966, pp. 263-288.

Martin, D. B. *A method of self-evaluation for counselor education.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Research, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.

McGee, R. K. *Crisis intervention in the community.* Baltimore: University Park Press, 1974.

Mueller, W. J. & Kell, B. L. *Coping with conflict: Supervising counsellors and psychotherapists.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.

Nielsen, G. *Studies in self-confrontation.* Copenhagen: Scandinavian University Books, 1962.

Orne, M. T. Demand characteristics and the concept of quasi-controls. In R. Rosenthal & R. L. Rosnow (Eds.), *Artifacts in behavioral research.* New York: Academic Press, 1969, pp. 143-179.

Perls, F., Hefferline, R., & Goodman, P. *Gestalt therapy.* New York: Dell, 1951.

Phillips, B. N., Martin, R., & Meyers, J. Interventions in relation to anxiety in school. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research.* New York: Academic Press, 1972, pp. 410-464.

Salomon, G. & McDonald, F. J. Pretest and posttest reactions to self-viewing one's teaching performance on video-tape. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1970, *61,* 280-286.

Sarason, I. Experimental approaches to test anxiety. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research.* New York: Academic Press, 1972, pp. 383-403.

Schaeffer, J. & Galinsky, D. *Models of group therapy and sensitivity training.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Shrauger, J. S. Responses to evaluation as a function of initial self-perceptions. *Psychological Bulletin,* 1975, *82,* 581-596.

Speer, D. & Schultz, M. An instrument for assessing caller-reported benefits of calls to a telephone crisis service. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 1975, *43,* 102.

Torrez, M. E. Differential effects of videotape feedback on counselor trainee's self-concept. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1975, 34, 3894A.

Truax, C. B. & Carkhuff, R. R. *Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice.* Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Walz, G. R. & Johnston, J. A. Counselors look at themselves on videotape. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1963, *10,* 232-236.

Watts, M. Behavior modeling and self devaluation with video confrontation. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1973, *64,* 212-215.

Wine, J. Test anxiety and direction of attention. *Psychological Bulletin,* 1971, *76,* 92-104.

Wylie, R. *The self concept: A critical survey of pertinent research literature.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

APPENDIX A

TREATMENT FORM: SELF-EXAMINING YOUR CALL

1. What were the qualities of your voice on the call? Your choice of words? What aspects of you as a person came across to the caller?

2. What responses did you make, if any, that were more to satisfy your own needs than helpful to the caller? (e.g., of curiosity, to solve problems, to present an image of yourself)

3. Were you able to keep the focus on the caller rather than on you or on people in the caller's life? Were you able to keep it in the present?

   How specific were you able to help the caller be? About what?

4. In what ways did you invite and encourage the caller to talk?

   In what ways did you help the caller explore and clarify feelings, choices, conflicts?

   Any feelings or concerns that as you think back, you ignored or minimized?

5. How completely were you able to explore resources and alternatives with the caller?

   How appropriate do they seem now?

6. What might you do differently on a similar call another time? What are you pleased about with this call? How are you feeling now?

APPENDIX B

ORIGINAL POOL OF SELF-EVALUATIVE ITEMS

1. To focus on the caller and not on the situations or people surrounding him.
2. Accept not minimize the caller's feelings.
3. Respond to the caller as an individual.
4. Not to solve problems but to help the caller understand his situation.
5. Accept the caller's lifestyle and values.
6. Provide honest feedback about how the caller is coming across.
7. Help the caller explore his concerns.
8. Let the caller know you tried to understand him/her and cared for him/her.
10. Listen not only for content but also for feelings.
11. Stay with the caller, not diverting to other people in caller's life.
12. Be non-directive.
13. Help the caller look at alternatives.
14. To show the caller that we understand him; not necessarily agree with him.
15. To provide resource information.
16. To listen.
17. To care for the caller.
18. Help the caller clarify his feelings.
19. Give the caller lots of time.
20. To explore the caller's needs, not fulfil our own.

21. Help the caller be as specific as possible.

22. To provide accurate feedback to the caller so that he may hear what he is saying.

23. To listen to the caller.

24. To be honest with the caller and self.

25. To make effective referrals.

26. To be available to anyone.

27. To convey to the caller that he is important.

28. To establish a relationship which allows for exploration.

29. To suspend personal judgement.

30. To demonstrate acceptance and respect for the caller.

31. To convey acceptance of and respect for the caller.

32. To explore the caller's feelings and situation.

33. To help explore alternatives with the caller.

34. To continually invite further exploration.

35. To allow the caller to discuss what he would like to.

36. To understand the caller's feeling and situation and to communicate that understanding.

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION, SELF-EXAMINATION AND INVITING BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

We are trying a new way of helping volunteers to continue to become better phone counsellors. This form is part of the experiment. Please be honest when you answer. Mark anywhere on the line.

Number_____

On the whole, how would you rate your

1. handling of calls, in general, at NEED?

I'm worried	not too good	okay	pretty good	I'm pleased

2. letting the caller know that you accept and respect him/her?

I'm worried	not too good	okay	pretty good	I'm pleased

3. conveying your understanding of the caller's situation and feelings?

I'm worried	not too good	okay	pretty good	I'm pleased

4. allowing and encouraging the caller to talk about what is of importance to him/her?

I'm worried	not too good	okay	pretty good	I'm pleased

5. inviting and assisting the caller to further explore his feelings and concerns?

I'm worried	not too good	okay	pretty good	I'm pleased

6. helping the caller look at alternatives?

I'm worried	not too good	okay	pretty good	I'm pleased

7. Did you invite your partner to listen or talk about your handling of your call(s) on this shift?

yes no

Did you invite a supervisor to listen or talk about your handling of your call(s) on this shift?

yes no

8. Did you think about the caller or your handling of the call when the call(s) were finished? If so, would you please describe *specifically* and in detail what you thought about or did.

9. Over your last 4 shifts, how often did you invite your partner to listen or to talk about how you handled your calls?

none of the times partner was available	few	about half	most	every time partner was available

10. Over your last 4 shifts, how often did you examine the ways you handled your calls (aside from any forms you may have been asked to complete)?

none of my calls	few of my calls	about half	most of my calls	every call

APPENDIX D

CALL SHEET FORMAT AND SAMPLES OF RESPONSES

Time:	Caller's concern:
Name of Caller:	
Age:	Your ways of helping:
Sex:	
Length of Call:	Referrals made:
Volunteer:	

Sample responses made to "Your ways of helping" section: (an asterisk (*) indicates response scored as self-observation).

1. Tried to encourage him to explore feelings* and alternatives* but he wanted advice. It's difficult to talk when you only get "yes" and "no" responses. I couldn't take the call anywhere.* We terminated.

2. Brought it around to where she was at now* and that we had talked for quite a while. She realized that she had gone as far as she could for right now.

3. Asking how she felt,* reflecting,* silences.*

4. Found it extremely hard to empathize with this woman.* Conversation was rambling and she refused to deal with the here and now. Wished instead to set up suppositional situations, etc.

5. Asked him what "depression" was for him.* Don't think we got anywhere.*

6. Could really do no more than listen*--didn't have a chance to say anything.

7. Helped her explore the idea of doing volunteer work.* She thought this was a good idea.

8. Felt really proud of being able to listen to her talk about her problem and not interject my ideals.*

9. I terminated the call. I felt she had talked about all she wanted and could think about it.* Left invitation for her to call back.*

10. Brought out his feelings of helplessness* and tried to help him think of solutions.*

APPENDIX E

POSTEXPERIMENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How was the procedure of filling out this form for you?
2. What do you think the experiment was about?
3. What did you imagine that I wanted to find?
4. How do you imagine that others might have reacted?
5. How did you find filling out the questionnaire that Neil/Bobbi gave you? Let's look at it. How did you find filling out this page? (Experimenter asked about each section.)
6. Would you have done anything differently had I asked to see the forms as you completed them?
7. Would you have done anything differently had the forms been put where the call sheets are so that all volunteers could read them?
8. Do you think that doing this form changed anything?
9. Have you used the form since?
10. Can you describe the callers that you had on that shift that Bobbi/Neil gave you the questionnaire?
11. When do you invite your partner to listen or to talk about your calls?
12. When do you invite a supervisor to listen or talk about your calls?
13. Do you think about how you handled calls? How do you do this?
14. Is there anything else that you can tell me about what you did in the experiment? If you think of anything later, I'd appreciate you letting me know.
15. (After an explanation of the hypotheses) Is there anything else that you would like to ask?

APPENDIX F

SAMPLES OF SUPERVISOR-REPORTED INVITING BEHAVIORS

Responses to "How was that call with [...] for you?

1. Volunteer told story that caller told, then said, "I feel that I helped clear the confusion." (Scored as inviting.)

2. "Fine; she just wanted to talk." (Scored as not inviting.)

3. "I don't know what it is about that guy. It is hard for me to know what he wants. What else can I do?" (Scored as inviting.)

4. "Okay." Volunteer told story of call with no references to his influence nor to anything he did. (Scored as not inviting.)

5. "I felt okay about it. What did you think?" (Scored as inviting.)

6. "I invited him to look at alternatives and I'm feeling good about being me on the call." (Scored as inviting.)

7. Nodded head; returned to reading. (Scored as not inviting.)

8. "I asked what depressed was for him and I followed that until we'd really explored what it was like for him." (Scored as inviting.)

9. "Good! It was a good call." (Scored as not inviting.)

10. "I dunno--kinda boring." (Scored as not inviting.)

11. "You tell me what you thought" (to partner). (Scored as inviting.)

12. "I think I did well as long as we explored feelings but then--well, it didn't seem right when we talked about what she could do. I don't know why not. I didn't tell her what I thought she should do but somehow . . . I dunno. . . . Maybe she really wasn't ready to think about doing something. You know, maybe I should have stuck to help her explore what it was like for her." (Scored as inviting.)

APPENDIX G

SAMPLES OF QUESTIONNAIRE SELF-EXAMINATION RESPONSES

(*indicates one score for specific self-observation)

1. In one call I felt really good about the call in terms of it being complete. It started out as muddled confusion and I was able to help the caller work it through to a concrete, viable solution.

2. --Wondered if I'd been manipulated.*
   --Worried about how I came across to the caller.*
   --Felt like I didn't put enough effort into the call.*
   --Wondered if I helped direct and focus the concern well enough.*

3. I had a very desperate man on a call. His tears and the extent of his distress startled me a bit at first.* Therefore the beginning of the call was rather stilted.* I felt I was able to reflect the desperation fairly soon but I felt uneasy with the intervening time.* It was a good call as he was able to get close to a lot of feelings.

4. Talked over with partner.

5. This is a bad shift for these questions. Only had one call--Mrs. N. I generally feel frustrated talking* with her but feel like I'm better, can accept her more.* Thinking about what I'm doing and feeling to make this so.

6. I thought about what we'd talked about.
   --I wondered if I'd encouraged the caller sufficieintly to expand on what he wanted to talk about.*
   --I wondered if there was anything else he would have liked to mention but didn't feel encouraged to.*
   --Decided that call had gone as far as caller needed it to go.*

7. Yes. I have been lucky on this shift. One caller solved his own problem without much aid. I was thankful but felt I hadn't earned my keep (my own need). I gave the caller a lot of rope because I realized that the solution lay with him and not with me.* The next call seemed perplexing because the caller seemed to be asking for specific suggestions and then rejecting them one by one. My partner indicated that the caller was playing the "yes but" game and everything fell into

place. I began to push the caller into making a decision and I think we got somewhere.* She might have gone on complaining all night but I would not let her.* I think it went somewhere to teaching me to terminate a call, something that I have difficulty with.* I still need a lot of help with calls and I derive tremendous security out of having a partner there. It's just shyness that prevents me from directly seeking a partner's help but I'm working that through.*

8. Thought about the nightmare this girl is living through partly perhaps due to a high-powered imagination--though perhaps I would be equally terrified under same circumstances. Wish I could have offered her some ray of hope for a normal, decent life but couldn't really see one.*

9. Thought about things I didn't do, couldn't do, wished I had done, wished I had done better. This happens occasionally and only after the call sheet is written up. Perhaps this is my way of accepting the results of the calls as they are, and not how they could have been. Also a way of accepting myself as I am and my abilities as they are.

10. Of course! They usually say I've helped a lot. But I'm feeling I've only helped them for that call. Sure would be nice if I could help them forever. Things that bothered me was feelings of partners that I'm being used.* I'll have to work on that.

11. Yes, after one call I relayed the subject of it to the other volunteer. I expressed anger at the person who had made this call.* I reflected on my feelings of anger and found this quite justifiable.*

12. I thought about the things we had talked about and tried to recollect what had been said to see if I had invited him to explore his feelings.* He wanted an answer now and didn't want to explore any alternatives on a long range basis. He said he didn't want to go drinking or watch TV but those seemed to be his only alternatives. He said he might call back after a few drinks if he was in bad shape. I invited him to shoot the breeze now and explained that he didn't need a crisis to call but he declined. I haven't really thought about him since the call because I think he knew there were no immediate answers and just called on the off chance that I might know of something happening. My partner listened in and said she felt good about the call.

APPENDIX H

RAW DATA

	Identification	Differences in Evaluation	Call Sheet Self-Examination	Questionnaire Self-Examination	Observed Inviting	Invitations to Supervisor	Invitations to Partner
U	101	31.0	0.5	6.0	no	no	no
N	102	15.5	2.0	8.33	yes	yes	yes
S	103	39.0	4.67	3.67	yes	yes	yes
T	104	3.5	1.0	3.0	yes	yes	yes
R	105	0.5	1.0	2.33	yes	yes	yes
U	106	85.0	2.0	7.0	yes	no	yes
C	107	43.0	1.0	0.0	yes	no	yes
T	108	36.5	3.67	4.33	yes	yes	yes
U	109	26.0	1.83	3.83	yes	yes	no
R	110	3.0	1.5	2.0	yes	no	no
E	111	43.8	4.33	2.33	no	no	no
D	112	72.5	0.0	6.67	no	yes	no
	201	63.5	2.33	0.0	yes	yes	yes
	202	19.0	0.0	2.33	no	no	no
C	203	45.0	1.5	1.0	yes	yes	yes
O	204	18.5	0.67	2.0	yes	yes	yes
N	205	24.5	5.67	18.33	no	yes	no
T	206	23.0	2.67	2.33	no	yes	yes
R	207	10.5	2.33	2.33	yes	no	no
O	208	64.5	1.0	1.83	no	no	yes
L	209	24.0	2.0	3.0	yes	yes	yes
	210	11.5	1.0	0.83	yes	no	yes
	211	5.0	2.89	0.0	yes	yes	no
	212	42.0	4.0	5.33	yes	yes	yes
	301	79.0	2.0	0.78	yes	no	no
S	302	14.5	1.83	4.33	no	no	yes
T	303	80.0	2.67	1.05	yes	yes	yes
R	304	7.5	2.0	2.0	yes	no	no
U	305	25.5	1.67	6.0	yes	yes	no
C	306	2.5	1.33	4.67	yes	yes	yes
T	307	68.2	2.17	0.67	yes	no	yes
U	308	5.0	1.33	3.33	yes	no	yes
R	309	25.0	1.0	3.0	no	no	yes
E	310	45.0	2.0	0.33	no	no	no
D	311	34.0	2.0	1.67	no	no	no
	312	5.0	3.17	1.17	no	yes	no

VITA

Surname: DRADER Given Names: VICTORIA FRANCES

Place of Birth: VANCOUVER, B.C.

Date of Birth: September 7, 1942

Educational Institutions Attended,
with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, VICTORIA, B.C.	1960	to	1964
McGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL, QUEBEC	1966	to	1969
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, VICTORIA, B.C.	1972	to	1978
		to	

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded,
with Dates and Names of Institutions:

B.A.	1964	University of Victoria, Victoria
Class I Diploma: Teacher Training	1967	McGill University, Montreal
M.Ed.	1969	McGill University, Montreal

Honours and Awards:

University of Victoria Scholarships, 1974/75, 1975/76

Publications:

On the line, NEED Press, 1977.

Providing effective workshops for volunteers, National Conference of Crisis Lines, June 1978.

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make *single copies only* for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation

THE EFFECTS OF SELF-EXAMINATION UPON APPRAISAL-SEEKING OF LAY COUNSELLORS.

Author [redacted]

Signature

VICTORIA F. DRADER

Name

Nov 12, 1978

Date