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Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to describe the development of the helping skills program entitled: Helping Skills: A Basic Training Program (New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973) which Al Hauer and I have coauthored. Readers interested in a more detailed description of the historical issues involved in the development of the Program should consult Danish (1971).

Who is a Helper

An important issue which one faces when developing a program is who is it for. One cannot define the dimensions of a program without understanding who the helper is and what he does. A helper, as I see it, is an individual who engages in planned, "prepared for", interpersonal help. He is different from the good samaritan who helps another in distress or from the friend who listens to another friend's problem. These are casual, transient helping relationships. The helper has a role; he has a specific function to perform for which he has been trained. A helper is more than a helpful person.

Mental health technicians, human service workers, paraprofessionals, nonprofessionals and professionals all come under the rubric of helpers. The above seem to be political terms designed to denote differences in status based on pay, education, or degree. A more appropriate definition would focus on the function(s) being performed, and how skillful they are in performing these functions. It has been my contention that entirely too much time and effort has been spent discussing the use of various "nonprofessional" helpers and too little time spent on how to train
these types of helpers.

In addition to those individuals whose primary job definition is the delivery of interpersonal help, there are a number of other individuals who, as part of their major function, must be responsive to others' interpersonal needs and communications (e.g., police, nurses, lawyers, physicians, teachers, etc.). It is interesting that few if any of these groups receive systematic training in helping. It often seems as if the attitude toward helping skills in these professions is a matter of "having common sense or not having it" and that it is an ability that cannot be taught or developed. Therefore, if any training is done in helping, it is likely to be in the form of lectures or incidental comments. Thus, there are many different kinds of helpers and if one decides to develop a generic training program, it must be recognized that these helpers may have different backgrounds, prior training, education, and motivation. Considering these diverse tasks and backgrounds of helpers can any generalizations be made about what constitutes help?

What is help?

There are at least three distinct categories of help. The first is relationship building skills. By this I mean those skills which facilitate the development of trust and rapport between helper and helper. Some theories of helping would see these skills as the necessary and sufficient characteristics of helping (Rogers, 1957). In fact, most systematic helping skill programs have focused on these skills (Danish & Hauer, 1973a; Ivey, 1971; Kagan, 1972; Carkhuff, 1969). These relationship skills are prerequisite to other categories of skills which are important for some helpers to have. The relevance of these
additional skills for individual helpers is dependent on the task the helper has. For example, many of these additional skills will be more pertinent for helpers whose primary function is giving interpersonal help than it will be for, let us say, police (Danish & Ferguson, 1973b). I have labelled the categories: problem identification and general helping strategies skills (identifying problems via interview, identifying problems via environmental assessment, referral procedures, crises center procedures, helping people make decisions and assess risks; e.g., Danish & Hauer, 1972, helping people develop new skills) and helping technology (assertive training, systematic desensitization, teaching people to expand their feeling vocabulary, and other specific techniques designed to facilitate "interpersonal growth" and behavior change). Since my own orientation is that of identifying and focusing on changing specific behaviors my program using helping techniques would employ techniques geared in that direction. No program, to my knowledge, has gone beyond the development of relationship building skills in any significant way.

My diversion into the types of help in addition to relationship building skills is meant to expand on the concept that what is help is different for different helping groups and that the helping skills program being discussed here is in no way comprehensive and its product really offers help to the helpee in a fairly circumscribed manner.

The Helping Skills Program: Content and Manner

My purpose to this point has been to present the difficulties and consideration in developing a program. I would now like to focus on the development of the Helping Skills program. There are two means of evaluating programs; the content of the program (the skills taught) and
the manner in which the skills are taught. The Program involves the learning of six specific skills which are seen as among the essential relationship building skills. They are:

Stage I. Understanding Your Needs To Be A Helper

Stage II. Using Effective Nonverbal Behavior

Stage III. Using Effective Verbal Behavior

Stage IV. Using Effective Self Involving Behavior

Stage V. Understanding Others' Communication

Stage VI. Establishing Effective Helping Relationships

All six skills include three components involved in being a helper: (1) an understanding of yourself; (2) some knowledge of helping skills; and (3) experience in applying these skills. What, if any, unique features characterize content of the Program when compared with the relationship building programs of others? The first skill represents a concerted attempt to have the trainee examine the basis for his decision to help. Helpers are people first and training only in response modes ignores the importance of the person who is the helper, has on the helping process.

The second skill emphasizes the role that nonverbal behavior plays in the helping process. Nonverbal behavior includes face and head movements, hand and arm movements, body movements and orientation and verbal quality.

The third and fourth skills involve training in verbal response modes. The response modes include not only the learning of what is generally called 'empathy' but the learning of more leading responses such as questioning, advice giving and influencing responses. Finally self involving responses are taught. We view the learning of these verbal response modes as a different process than that of 'understanding' the
feelings and communication of another (Stage V). It would seem that
difficult skills like responding to the feelings of others commonly re-
ferred to as empathy, needs to be broken down into small manageable
learning components. Thus, the trainee is taught the structure of the
various responses in Stages III and IV with their accuracy or appro-
priateness deemphasized. In Stage V he is taught to be sensitive to
the behavior of others. Finally in Stage VI he is taught the process
of putting all the components together to make structurally sound
responses in an accurate and appropriate manner.

The second means of evaluating programs is to examine the manner
in which the skills are taught. The Helping Skills program described
in this paper is a 25-hour program. Each stage requires approximately
2½ hours except Stage III which involves approximately 8 hours of
training. In addition there is an introductory and termination session.
The program is usually conducted on a one session (2½ hour) per week
basis to maximize generalization and practice.

Each skill is taught in the same manner. The process is:

(1) The skill is defined in behavioral terms.
(2) The rationale for the skill is discussed.
(3) An attainment level is specified.
(4) Models are used to demonstrate both effective and ineffective
examples of the skill.
(5) Opportunities for extensive practice of the skill are given.
(6) Homework is assigned to assist in the generalization process.
(7) An evaluation using behavioral checklists and peer and trainer
feedback is conducted to determine whether the attainment level
has been achieved.
This process is similar to the processes of acquiring other skills (Whiting, 1969) and conforms to effective instructional principles as outlined by Perino (1971) in his examination of Gage (1962) and Gagne (1965).

The Program has two parts; a trainee workbook and leader's manual. In the workbook all the material relative to the learning of the skills is presented. The manual is designed to make the Program essentially self instructional for qualified leaders.

Summary

I have tried to identify some issues involved in the consideration of a helping skills program and describe the development of a specific program. What follows will be discussions of several applications of the Program, research conducted with the Program and a research paradigm designed to evaluate this helping skill program and other similar programs.
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Applications of the Basic Helping Skills Program for Counselor Training

Arthur M. Horne, Ph.D.
Indiana State University

Part One

Techniques of Counseling is an introductory course in the graduate counseling program at Indiana State University and is usually a first semester course for students going into elementary, secondary, and agency counseling programs as well as college student personnel. The course is designed to be a combined didactic-experiential course with class activities designed to introduce students to the counseling process. A more effective means of teaching basic interviewing skills was sought in 1971 to provide a more clearly defined teaching model for beginning counselors and the Basic Helping Skills Model by Danish and Hauer (Danish and Hauer, 1973) was selected. The Basic Helping Skills Program involves the learning of six specific skills:

Stage I—Understanding Your Needs to be a Helper
Stage II—Using Effective Nonverbal Behavior
Stage III—Using Effective Verbal Behavior

---

Stage IV—Using Effective Self Involving Behavior

Stage V—Understanding Others' Communication

Stage VI—Establishing Effective Helping Relationships

Each skill is taught in the same manner. The process is:

1) The skill is defined in behavioral terms.

2) The rationale for the skill is discussed.

3) An attainment level is specified.

4) Models are used to demonstrate both effective and ineffective examples of the skill.

5) Opportunities for extensive practice of the skill are given.

6) Homework is assigned to assist in the generalization process.

7) An evaluation using behavioral checklists and peer and trainer feedback is conducted to determine whether the attainment level has been achieved.

The Basic Helping Skills Program has now been used for two years.

Following is a description of the Techniques of Counseling course.

Techniques of Counseling is a one semester, three credit hour course which meets for fifteen weeks. The purposes of the course are to:

1) Provide didactic understanding of skills necessary to build a relationship with a counselee, encourage a counselee to disclose his concerns, assist a counselee to translate his concerns into goals or desired behavior.

2) Develop counselor skills in response modes which facilitate the initial phase of counseling as described in 1) above.

3) Provide an introduction to the variety of counseling strategies available to counselors to assist them in moving their counselee toward counselee desired behavior.

4) Develop cognitive understandings of ways to evaluate the effect of counseling.
5) Become knowledgeable about ethical standards and issues in counseling.

The course begins with a class exercise to determine student expectations and a general orientation to the counseling process. In the second session students participate in a Trio Exercise. In the exercise a five to ten minute interview is made and taped with students in groups of three. Each of the trio serves as a counselor, client, and observer and the roles change so that each student can be in each role. Each student makes a typescript for the interview in which he was the counselor. For each client statement the counselor writes two statements, one describing what the client was saying and the other describing what the client was feeling. The student then reviews his counselor responses and rates them on empathy, warmth, and genuineness and re-writes those rated below a level three. The students are given a month to complete the assignment as it takes that length of time to cover the information needed. This assignment immediately puts the student in a situation where he can become involved in the counseling process and develop an awareness of his present skill level.

The Basic Helping Skills Program is introduced in the third session with Stage I, Understanding Your Needs to be a Helper, along with a discussion of the counseling relationship as a mutual involvement in which the feelings and needs of the counselor influence the direction counseling proceeds. Stages II through V are then taught, with Stage VI being omitted since it is summary stage and the material covered in Stage VI come later in the course. To supplement the Basic Helping Skills Program two texts are used, Benjamin's The Helping Interview (Benjamin, 1969) and Delaney and Eisenberg's The Counseling Process.
(Delaney and Eisenberg, 1972). In addition, class hand-outs, role-playing, video-taping by instructors and doctoral students, outside observations, and films are used.

The Basic Helping Skills Program, along with the related exercises and class activities usually takes the first one-third to one-half of the semester, depending upon the progress of a particular class. Less time is required than indicated by Danish and Hauer due to the outside class activities, the additional texts by Benjamin and Delaney and Eisenberg, and previous background of many of the students.

Upon completion of the Basic Helping Skills Program, units on goal identification, counseling strategies and techniques, termination and referral skills, assessing counseling effectiveness, and ethics are presented. For the second half of the course, Krumboltz and Thoreson's Behavioral Counseling (Krumboltz and Thoreson, 1969) is used as the primary text with other readings assigned.

The Basic Helping Skills Program has been very effective in that it has been used in Techniques of Counseling for teaching basic interview skills. Often specific training in these skills is overlooked as being unnecessary in some programs or too obvious in others. We have found, however, that the teaching of these skills is worth the time and effort required and this has been confirmed by students from earlier classes requesting permission to go through the newer Techniques classes, and by increased enrollment in the Techniques classes. In the Fall, 1971, Techniques classes there were forty students and in the Fall, 1973 Techniques classes there are almost one-hundred students, though the number of counseling students has remained fairly constant. The
increase comes from students in other programs—particularly clinical psychology, criminology, nursing, recreation, and elementary education—choosing the course as an elective. In addition, many members of the community—including ministers, nursery school teachers, and housewives—have enrolled in the course to develop skills they see necessary in their various roles. Thus, the course has become a service course to the University and the community.

In Counseling Practicum, a course following Techniques, the Basic Helping Skills Program is often used as a review, particularly Stage I, Understanding Your Needs to be a Helper, for when counseling does not progress, the student is required to examine what within his behavior is contributing to the breakdown. Understanding needs to be supportive, or praising, or nurturant, and so on are examined, including the practicum student's desire not to hurt the client's feelings, to avoid confrontation, or failure to deal with resistance are all dealt with through Stage I effectively and the process usually leads to growth on the part of the student.
Part Two

The Basic Helping Skills Program has been used as a part of the Techniques of Counseling class at Indiana State University since 1971. The course is an introduction to the counseling process for graduate students in elementary and secondary school counseling, agency counseling, college student personnel, and for students in other programs who take the course as an elective. In an effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the Basic Helping Skills Program as a part of the course, students participating in the training program were compared with students not in the Techniques course to determine whether change in counseling behavior would occur as a result of training.

Method

Instruments

Carkhuff's Index of Discrimination. In his book, Helping and Human Relations, Vol. I, Carkhuff (1969, pp. 114-123) presents a series of sixteen expressions of problems by helpees followed by four possible helper responses for each of the expressions. These may be presented to helper trainees in audio or written form; for the present study they were presented in written form. The counseling student is given a form describing gross ratings of facilitative interpersonal functioning and is asked to rate each of the four responses to the
sixteen helpee expressions using the rating scale. The counseling student's ratings are then compared with the ratings of experts that Carkhuff indicates have "demonstrated predictive validity" (Carkhuff, 1969, p. 114). A validity coefficient is not presented. However, a table showing absolute deviations of helper ratings from experts is presented for four populations (see Table 1).

**Affective Sensitivity Scale.** The Affective Sensitivity Scale was designed to measure the ability to detect and describe the immediate affective state of another (Kagan, et. al., 1965; Campbell, 1967; Danish and Kagan, no data) instrument is a video tape situational test containing forty-one scenes involving eleven different clients and counselors. The student chooses from three multiple choice responses the one which he thinks represents what the client is feeling toward the content and also chooses one of three statements which he thinks represents what the client feels toward the counselor.

**Critical Incidents in Counseling.** The Critical Incidents in Counseling video tape consists of thirty-five simulated counselor interview segments, each 30 to 70 seconds in length. (Thayer, Peterson, Carr, and Merz, 1972). Students observe the counselor interview segments and then write responses to client statements. The responses are then scored by a key for appropriate counselor responding behavior.

**Personel Orientation Inventory.** The POI (Shostrum, 1966) is an 150 item inventory designed to provide a "comprehensive measure of
values and behavior seen to be of importance in the development of self-actualization" (Shostrum, 1966, p. 5). To measure the degree to which an individual is self-actualizing, Shostrum presents scales of time competence to measure "present" orientation, Support to measure an individual's mode of reaction as "inner" or "outer" oriented, Self Actualizing Value, Existentiality, Feeling Reactivity, Spontaneity, Self Regard, Self Acceptance, Nature of Man, Synergy, Acceptance of Aggression, and Capacity for Intimate Contact.

Procedure

Students enrolled in Techniques of Counseling (N = 19) completed Carkhuff's Index of Discrimination, Affective Sensitivity Scale, Critical Incidents in Counseling and Personal Orientation Inventory, and an additional class of Techniques students (N = 18) completed the Critical Incidents in Counseling for a total of 37 respondents.

A class in Research in Education completed the Affective Sensitivity Scale (N = 20), and the Critical Incidents in Counseling (N = 27). None of these students were in counseling or psychology.

A group of students (N = 14) in the counseling program who were enrolled in Research in Education, but who had not yet taken Techniques of Counseling completed the Critical Incidents in Counseling measure. The measures were all given the first week of the semester and again the eighth week of the semester after the Techniques class had completed the Basic Helping Skills Program. For the Critical Incidents in Counseling measure, the first fifteen scenes were shown as a pre-test measure and the second fifteen as a post-test measure.
Results

Table one presents Carkhuff's reported deviations in levels of counselor responses to helpee stimulus expressions (Carkhuff, 1969, p. 127). The mean deviations reported by Carkhuff range from a high of 1.5 for out-patients to a low of 0.4 for systematically trained experienced counselors. In Table 2 the pre- to post-test means of students in this study for the Carkhuff scale are shown. Before beginning the Basic Helping Skills Program in Techniques class the mean score was 0.79, similar to what Carkhuff reports for beginning psychology students (see Table 1), but eight weeks later had a mean deviation score of 0.50, midway between experienced counselors not systematically trained and those systematically trained. The change from before to after training in Basic Helping Skills Program was significant at the .05 level.

Table 3 presents means, standard deviations, and t scores on the Critical Incidents in Counseling Measure for three groups, students in Techniques of Counseling (Techniques, N = 37), students in the counseling program who had not yet taken Techniques of Counseling who were enrolled in Research in Education (Research Csrls, N - 14), and students not in the counseling program who were enrolled in Research in Education (Research, N = 27). The change over the eight week period was significant at the .05 level for those participating in the Basic Helping Skills Program, but not for the other two groups.
Table 4 presents the 3 x 2 analysis of variance for the Critical Incidents in Counseling Measure indicating significant differences by treatment group and from pre- to post-treatment, as indicated above in Table 3.

Figure 1 presents an interaction profile for the three groups showing graphically the changes that occurred. As can be seen, all three groups showed positive change, and the students in Techniques of Counseling were higher on the measure at the beginning than students not in counseling enrolled in Research in Education were at the end of treatment.

Table 5 shows the means, degrees of freedom, and t scores for students in Techniques of Counseling (Techniques, N = 19) and non-counseling students in Research in Education (Research, N = 20) on the Affective Sensitivity Scale. The change for Techniques students participating in the Basic Helping Skills Program showed a positive increase significant at the .01 level, while Research students scored lower on the empathy measuring scale, indicating even less awareness of client communication at the end of treatment than they had at the beginning.

The Personal Orientation Inventory was given only to Techniques students, however tables for other groups are available in the
Personal Orientation Inventory Manual (Shostrom, 1966). The Techniques students were similar to Shostrom's self actualized group (N = 29; Shostrom, 1966, p. 26) on the first testing. Following participation in the Basic Helping Skills Program scores increased on all scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory; on seven scales the changes were significant at the .05 level. To some degree this probably is a result of the same items begin used in several scales.

Discussion

On all measures used students in Techniques of Counseling showed impressive gains following completion of participation in the Basic Helping Skills Program and therefore the program shows promise for training counselors, particularly as an introduction to basic counselor interview skills. Similar results have been found in unpublished work by the author with students in teacher education, in religious work, and in working with effective parent training.

However, much further research needs to be conducted with the program, for many other variables influenced the outcome of this study. The Techniques professor was and is enthusiastic about the program and this enthusiasm could have definite impact upon the students. The students were enthusiastic before and during the program, and on several of the scales were considerably higher functioning prior to beginning treatment than subjects not in Techniques class, indicating that a pre-selection process had occurred and therefore growth may be
more reflective of the participants than the program. Also, as described in Part One, other activities occurred simultaneously with the Basic Helping Skills Program, such as in-class discussion of outside readings, observation of films and video-tapes, homework assignments, and even the opportunity to participate as a client in both group and individual counseling (which several students did).

The present study was only a first step. There is no evidence there will be a carry-over to actual counseling practice, for none of the measures assessed that. There is no comparison with other training programs available to counselor educators, and finally it is not known whether the present form of the Basic Helping Skills Program is the most effective and efficient following guidelines set forth by authorities in educational training programs. Keeping these shortcomings in mind, the program does seem to have strong points which would support its use in counselor education programs and related training programs.
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Table 1
Carkhuff's Reported Deviations in Levels of Counselor Responses to Helpee Stimulus Expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclass philosophy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer helpers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior psychology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lay personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay teachers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay counselors</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nct systematically trained)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(systematically trained)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**Deviations in Levels of Counselor Responses to Helpee Stimulus Expressions by Techniques of Counseling Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Techniques of counseling students - pre measure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques of counseling students - post measure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`t` test of differences between the means, $t = 1.83$

$df = 17$

$p < .05$
### Table 3

Pre and Post Test Means and Standard Deviations, and t Tests on Critical Incidents in Counseling for Counselors and Non-Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6.756</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.770*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Cslrs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.285</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.5654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

### Table 4

ANOVA Table for Critical Incidents in Counseling for Counselors and Non-Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>166.917</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.459</td>
<td>9.086*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within</td>
<td>688.907</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>52.184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.184</td>
<td>15.628*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>78.852</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.426</td>
<td>11.807*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Figure 1
Interaction Profile for Counselors and Non-Counselors on Critical Incidents in Counseling
Table 5
Pre and Post Test Means and t Tests on the Affective Sensitivity Scale for Counselors and Research Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Post $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .01$
Table 6
Personal Orientation Inventory Means and t Tests for Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pre $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Post $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time competence</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner directed</td>
<td>95.68</td>
<td>99.47</td>
<td>2.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualizing value</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>2.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self regard</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self acceptance</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of man</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>3.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>4.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of aggression</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>2.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for intimate</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 19$  df = 17

* < .05
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I. **Past Research on Helping Skills: A Basic Training Program**

Because of the relative newness of the *Helping Skills* program, little research has been done on it to date. The first study was by Perino (1971) and examined the relative effectiveness of four methods of training, one of which was a very early edition of the *Helping Skills* program. His results indicated that all four methods were significantly more effective than a no treatment control group and that the *Helping Skills* program was relatively more effective than the others.

A second study was an investigation of the *Helping Skills* program as a "training as treatment" procedure. Scott (1972) modified the program so as to become a "self help" procedure and used students enrolled in a "Development Skills" course as subjects. Like Perino, Scott found that comparative treatments were effective in comparison to a control group.

A third study, recently completed by Wennell (1973) examined the effectiveness with which subjects could learn to use non-verbal behavior (Stage II of the *Helping Skills* program). Using a 5 point rating scale for eighteen different dimensions she found that trained subjects differed significantly from controls on the effectiveness of their non-verbal behavior.

All of these studies are available from the authors and will not be discussed in detail here. What will be discussed at length is a recent study by the author which indicates the basic design that has been decided upon as the most valuable way to evaluate the effectiveness of the *Helping Skills* program. First, the design calls for investigating each of the skills to insure that each, individually and collectively, is teachable. And second, it suggests systematically examining the specific instructional procedures employed so as to eliminate those techniques which are unnecessary for the program to be successful.
II. The Effects of An Orientation Session and Feedback Training on the Learning of a Basic Helping Skill.

INTRODUCTION

Although much has been written in recent years about the shortage of manpower in the mental health field, little systematic work has been done to ascertain what skills helpers need to be trained in or what skills they need to possess before undergoing training. The most noted approach to identifying the qualities or skills of helpers has been the work initiated by Truax and Carkhuff (1967). These authors emphasized the importance of the "core conditions" of empathic understanding, positive regard, genuineness, and concreteness. There has been considerable research which indicates that these conditions are important in help-giving (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Michelson and Stevic, 1971; Truax, 1966; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967).

Following the identification of the core conditions, Truax and Carkhuff (1967) and Carkhuff (1969) concentrated on the methodology with which to train people in the conditions. The resulting procedure combines "didactic" and "experiential" methods and focuses on shaping the trainee's verbal responses in role-playing situations. The training emphasizes identifying the conditions in models, role-playing the conditions, and implementing them with actual helpees.

Carkhuff (1969) summarized several research studies which provide support for their training methodology. However, the same research seems to indicate that for trainees to become highly skilled in the core conditions, they need to be at least "minimally" skilled to begin with. His findings have shown that beginning trainees who are low in the core conditions do not reach very high levels with training, even though that training may involve over 30 hours of trainer contact.

These results seem to indicate that the facilitative core conditions may be teachable only to those who need them least, the ones who already
possess them. While these findings support the case for using helper's level of facilitativeness as a selection criterion, they tend to cloud the issue of the training's effectiveness. According to Bard (1972), selection criteria bias attempts to objectively evaluate training methodologies. He states that an effective training program is one that can train people regardless of current skill level.

The present study evolved from the basic need to evaluate the Helping Skills training program. Following the lead of Carkhuff's (1969) and Ivey's (1971) work, this study was designed to ascertain whether the Helping Skills program was an effective way to train helpers. In addition, the study also attempted to investigate the relative necessity of two possible screening procedures for the training's success. That is, are an orientation session and training in giving feedback necessary for subsequent Helping Skills training to be effective as Danish and Hauer (1973b) propose?

METHOD

Sample

Interviewers

The trainees in this study were eighty (80) undergraduate students enrolled in either of two advanced psychology classes at The Ohio State University. Fifty four (54) of the trainees were female and twenty six (26) were male. Their mean age was 22.43 and their mean number of quarters in college was 9.92. Each trainee was randomly assigned to one of the ten experimental groups as depicted in Figure 1.
### FIGURE 1

**Summary of Interview and Treatment Schedules of the Experimental and Control Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PRETRAINING INTERVIEW</th>
<th>TRAINING SESSIONS</th>
<th>POSTTRAINING INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Orientation Session  
B = Feedback Training  
C = Self Involving Behavior Training

**Interviewees**

One hundred and sixty (160) introductory psychology students at The Ohio State University constituted the interviewee pool. Subjects volunteered for participation after reading the following brief description of the study: "Interpersonal Interviewing Skills: You will be asked to interact with another student who is learning to become an interviewer on the subject of 'what impact attending The Ohio State University has had on your friendships, attitudes, values, and goals'." The mean age of the eighty four (84) females and seventy six (76) males was 19.01 and their mean number of quarters in college was 3.30.
Procedure

Interviews

Each trainee held two twenty-minute interviews, one the week before and one the week after training. Both interviews were with different subjects so that each was of the initial interview nature. The interviews began with a restatement of the discussion topic and the direction to continue until interrupted. All interviews were audio-tape recorded.

Training Treatments

As noted in Figure 1, it was decided to treat the Helping Skills training ("self involving behavior") as well as the orientation session and feedback training as independent variables. This led to the basic 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design employed. However, the order in which the pre-training treatments were received was also of interest so the design was expanded to ten cells.

The primary independent variable was the "self involving behavior" training (Danish and Hauer, 1973a) which was selected as the helping skill to be taught. Considerable research (Cozby, 1973) seems to indicate that the ability of a helper to self-disclose or "self involve" himself with a helpee is an important helping skill. As such, it was included by Danish and Hauer in their program and was selected for use in this study. Figure 1 indicates which groups received this training.

The second independent variable was an orientation session designed to give the trainees some knowledge about helper training in general and the Helping Skills program in specific. It has been proposed by many learning theorists that orienting stimuli influence subsequent learning (Ausubel, 1968; Gagne, 1965). While the research has not supported this notion completely, Danish and Hauer (1973b) suggested that trainers should make an attempt to prepare and motivate their trainees by orienting them to the training program.
The third independent variable was a procedure designed to train trainees to give effective feedback to each other. Many authors, especially in the field of counselor training, have stated that one of the most important variables in effective learning is feedback (Benne, Bradford, and Lippitt, 1964; Boyd, 1973; Carkhuff, 1969; Ivey, 1971). Because of this importance, Danish and Hauer (1973b) suggested that trainers should attempt to insure the trainees’ possession of feedback skills before proceeding on to the Helping Skills training. A specific procedure for teaching the skill was developed for this study.

**Dependent Measures**

The dependent variable in this study was the amount of self involving behavior or self-disclosure that each trainee was able to display in the interviews. Since it has been suggested that the therapeutic value of a helper's disclosure is as a model for the helpee's disclosures, criteria were needed which assessed the self involving behavior of both the interviewer and the interviewee.

A review of the literature suggested that "self referent statements" could be viewed as examples of self involving behavior and were thus selected (Janofsky, 1971; Salzinger and Pisoni, 1960). Self referent statements were defined as those responses which begin with the words "I" or "we" and are followed by the communication of information about the person to another. This class of responses was then divided into those which communicate affective information and those which do not (non-affective). Being interested in the responses that the interviewer made as well as those he elicited from the interviewee, the specific dependent measures were:

1) The number of affective self referent statements made by the interviewer.

2) The number of non-affective self referent statements made by the interviewer.
3) The number of affective self referent statements made by the interviewee.

4) The number of non-affective self referent statements made the interviewee.

**Hypotheses**

The following specific hypotheses were tested:

1) The order in which trainees receive the orientation session and feedback training prior to receiving the self involving behavior training will have no effect on the completeness of their learning to self involve as measured by the number of interviewer and interviewee self referent statements.

2) Trainees receiving the self involving behavior training will display more self involving behavior in their interviews than those who do not receive such training.

3) Trainees subjected to the orientation session prior to the self involving behavior training will display more self involving behavior in their interviews than those who do not receive the treatment.

4) Trainees receiving feedback training prior to the self involving behavior training will display more self involving behavior in their interviews than those who do not receive the treatment.

5) Trainees receiving the orientation session and the feedback training prior to the self involving behavior training will display more self involving behavior in their interviews than those who do not receive both treatments.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The data for analysis was obtained by sampling two three-minute segments from each interview, one each from the middle and final thirds.
of the interviews. These samples were then transcribed into written
dialogue and given to two judges for scoring. The inter-rater
reliabilities of the judges for the four dependent measures all exceeded
0.997.

To begin with, a multivariate analysis of variance was performed
on the data obtained from the pre-training interviews. On the basis
that none of the groups differed significantly from each other the
hypotheses were tested on the post-training data.

Table 1 indicates the t-tests that were performed to test the
hypothesis regarding the effect that order of treatment presentation
would have. The results indicated that order had no effect so the groups
which received the same treatments in reversed order were combined for
the further analyses. This reduced the number of cells from ten to eight.
TABLE 1

Comparison of Means for Groups Receiving Same Treatments in Reversed Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE *</th>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IrNASRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IrASRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IeNASRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IeASRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL IrSRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL IeSRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.88</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.38</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56.38</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* IrNASRS = Interviewer Non-Affective Self Referent Statements; IrASRS = Interviewer Affective Self Referent Statements; IeNASRS = Interviewee Non-Affective Self Referent Statements; IeASRS = Interviewee Affective Self Referent Statements; TOTAL IrSRS = Total Interviewer Self Referent Statements; TOTAL IeSRS = Total Interviewee Self Referent Statements; and TOTAL = All Self Referent Statements.
Table 2 presents the univariate analyses of variance for the seven sets of criterion scores which have relevance for the other experimental hypotheses. The second hypothesis was tested by examining the F values on the seven measures for Treatment C, the self involving behavior training. The analyses indicated that the trainees who received the training did not make more self referent statements but did elicit significantly more from their interviewees.

### TABLE 2
Univariate Analyses of Variance of the Self Referent Statement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE **</th>
<th>irNASRS</th>
<th>IrASRS</th>
<th>IenASRS</th>
<th>IeASRS</th>
<th>Total IrSRS</th>
<th>Total IeSRS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>9.66*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.71*</td>
<td>3.22*</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6.41*</td>
<td>13.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( P < .05 \)

** ** A = Orientation Session; B = Feedback Training; and C = Self Involving Behavior Training

The third hypothesis was also examined via the analyses shown in Table 2. A significant effect was found for the orientation session on one of the seven variables, Interviewers' Affective Self Referent Statements. However, no effect was found for the interaction of the
orientation session with the self involving behavior training.

For the fourth hypothesis, again Table 2 shows the relevant results. The data indicated no significant results for the feedback training or the interaction of that treatment with the self involving behavior training.

The fifth hypothesis also did not receive support. The data in Table 2 indicated that those trainees who received both the orientation session and the feedback training prior to the self involving behavior training did not differ significantly from those who did not.

The results of this investigation lend support to the basic notion that the Helping Skills program is an effective way to teach basic counseling skills. Frequency counts of the affective and non-affective self references elicited by interviewers in brief interviews indicate that trainees can be taught to personally involve themselves with interviewees. It was not found, however, that trained interviewers made more self referent statements than untrained interviewers. As a matter of fact, Table 3 shows the significant negative relationships between interviewer and interviewee self referent statements that were found in this study. This result makes questionable the hypothesis that it is the helper's modeling of self-disclosure that elicits disclosures from helpees.
The second goal of this research was to begin the process of identifying the conditions and/or experiences which are (un)necessary for learning via the Helping Skills format. This led to the hypotheses regarding the effects of the pre-training treatments. These hypotheses were not accepted. That is, having received an orientation session and/or feedback training did not increase the completeness of the trainees' subsequent acquisition of the helping skill.

In conclusion, both goals of the present study appear to have been at least partially fulfilled. There is strong reason to believe that the Helping Skills program is effective and that at least two conditions seem relatively unnecessary for it to be. In terms of Bard's (1972) criterion mentioned earlier, these results encourage the further use of the Helping Skills program for the training of counselors and other helpers.
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STRATEGIES FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR NONPROFESSIONAL HUMAN SERVICE WORKERS

Anthony R. D'Augelli
The Pennsylvania State University

As is the case with any innovative approach to the provision of human services, evaluative research runs a poor second to current practice in the use of nonprofessional human service workers. Hobbs' (1964) third revolution is nearly ten years old and the proliferation of roles for nonprofessionals in human service organizations has been truly remarkable (Coven, Gardner, & Zax, 1967; Guerney, 1969; Sobey, 1970). A more recent development in this area is systematic instruction or training in human relations or helping skills for these nonprofessionals. Among such training programs are those developed by Carkhuff (1969), Danish and Hauer (1973), and Ivey (1968). Although programmatic ventures by their very nature invite evaluative efforts, there have been few studies of these or other, less structured methods for providing nonprofessionals with effective skills. Moreover, the studies presently available reveal both methodological and conceptual weaknesses. Among these are studies comparing groups receiving one particular training approach with groups receiving no meaningful training but not to groups receiving other kinds of training (e.g., Berenson, Carkhuff, & Myrus, 1966; Carkhuff & Truax, 1969).

Furthermore, some evaluation methodologies are based on the simplistic assumption that only one dimension of helping behavior need be examined (Thoresen, 1969). Ratings of verbal responsiveness such as “accurate empathy,” questionable enough on construct validity grounds (Chinsky & Rappaport, 1970; Rappaport & Chinsky, 1972), simply do not sample adequately the multiplicity of skills necessary to interpersonal helping. In terms of the broader issue of selection versus training (i.e., is it better to carefully pick helpers or carefully train them?) the few studies addressing themselves to the issue at all (e.g., Goodman, 1972; Rappaport, Chinsky, & Cohen, 1971) evaluate the impact of selection only. Clearly, the use of nonprofessionals will continue to increase; the design and evaluation of training programs for these helpers are the responsibility of the mental health professional.

The purpose of this paper is to present a model outlining several distinct strategies for the comprehensive evaluation of systematic training in helping for nonprofessionals. The questions addressed by this model are:

1) What is the relative importance of selection versus training?
2) What are critical dimensions of effective training?
3) Are effectively trained nonprofessionals actually helpful to others?

The design represented in Figure 1 is intended to provide some answer to the question of the differential usefulness of selection and training. Selection is defined here in terms of present level of interpersonal skillfulness, that is, those personal qualities and behavioral capabilities
that are assumed to reflect future trainability and/or competence in helping. Whether selection is based upon an informal process such as an unstructured interview or upon a carefully delineated performance task, the question remains as to the importance of the selection process. Should the first applicants who fill any other qualifications be chosen with the expectation that training will insure their competence, or, to the other extreme, can selection be the 'training'? Since future interpersonal behavior is the performance of interest, selection based on behaviorally-oriented procedures should, in principle, be used (Chinsky & Rappaport, 1970; D'Augelli, 1973; Goodman, 1969, 1972). Such selection should provide greater predictive power than traditional personality testing.

Figure 1 is divided into four operational stages representing points in the potential nonprofessional's journey through the selection and training process. Assessment will be used here and later to designate the point at which the effect of training will be judged in terms of the goals of the training program. If the program is intended to teach 'unconditional positive regard,' then assessment should focus on how well each trainee can employ this response. Evaluation is defined as checking whether or not such a trainee has an impact on a helpee. The four groups in the design consist of one group which receives the entire preparatory-evaluation process including selection, and three control groups. (The groups were chosen to maximize the information received without increasing the number of groups beyond feasibility. Other comparison groups could be added.)

Group A undergoes the entire selection process and is deemed acceptable by predetermined criteria. After completing training, this group is assessed and is considered 'trained.' The evaluation is then conducted.
Group E is involved in selection, is chosen, and receives no training. A comparison between Groups A and E at the evaluation stage reveals the impact of training on selected trainees. If Group A surpasses Group B in effectiveness, then training should be continued. If not, then selection might best be emphasized. Alternatively, redesign of the training program might be undertaken.

For Group C no selection is done. Group C is involved in training, and when compared to Group A reveals what differential effects training has on selected or unselected trainees. Therefore, the critical comparison for which this group is designed occurs at assessment: a comparison with Group A in terms of the number or percentage of trainees who are judged competent. A significantly greater number in Group A would suggest that selection is important.

Group D undergoes no selection nor training. In many ways this is the critical comparison group. For if this group does not do less well than the other groups, particularly Group A, then the entire selection and training structure may be operating for no actual purpose. Also, if Group C surpasses Group A, Group C helpers might be contrasted to Group D at evaluation. (Comparison to Group D makes no sense, unless one assumes that training will have a significant detrimental effect.) At this point, selection will have been ruled out, and the incremental role of training on unselected applicants is at issue.

The identification of factors underlying effective training technology is the purpose of the second strategy. Factors found to contribute to learning (e.g., Gage, 1963; Gagne, 1965) can be assessed in terms of their salience in a given training program. Variables such as active trainee response, presence of positive reinforcement, cueing, practice,
knowledge of results, modeling, etc., can indeed be used to distinguish between programs on an informal basis. Yet what is called for are studies in which various dimensions presumed relevant are experimentally manipulated. Laboratory analogue studies are important here, and provide important basic knowledge which can be used to enhance a given program or design a new one. An example of such a study is shown in Part 1 of Figure 2. This study could have as its goal the training of a specific skill, say, verbal responsiveness. Many training programs, if not all, concern themselves at some level with responses to helpee affect. Using the design in Figure 2, the investigator is attempting to find out how two variables, each independently considered relevant to learning such material, interact to promote the learning of responsiveness to affect. On an intuitive basis, modeling certainly would be important in training and consideration of different types of models would add valuable information to the design of a program. (It may be that filmed models are not as effective as having the trainer himself demonstrate.) Instructions, the other hypothetical variable, would also appear to be related to learning such a skill, but what kind of instructions are the most effective remains an empirical question. Of course, such designs yield valuable findings in their interaction effects (D'Augelli & Chinsky, in press). These and similar variables have been considered in somewhat different contexts (e.g., D'Augelli & Chinsky, in press; Doster, 1972; Rappaport, Gross, & Lepper, 1973; Whalen, 1969); it is suggested here, however, that their specific role in training programs be experimentally derived.
It should be noted that the kinds of studies discussed here make initial presumptions about relevant variables. Some variables, such as those discussed above, come to mind quickly. The leader variable, found to be so important in encounter groups (Lieberman, Yalom, & Miles, 1972), is another such variable surely operative in training. There are other variables which are less obvious, and an intriguing variable, the "entertainment value" of the training (Serber, 1972), has yet to be considered.

The second part of this strategy entails the consolidation of findings from studies such as conducted in Part 1. The goal here is a comparative study in which major dimensions are contrasted; it would be crucial here to highlight the most potent aspect of each major variable. The relative importance of these factors could then be found. Part 2 of Figure 2 shows a model study for the variables under consideration.

The third strategy has the ambitious goal of evaluating both the learning occurring with training as well as the impact of trained helpers on clients or helpees. Natarazzo (1971) has correctly noted how the critical impact of training on those "helped" has been often overlooked. Given the methodological problems involved in specifying positive outcome, this is hardly surprising. Yet, a dual approach is suggested: a training program must be scrutinized not only in terms of its production of "effective" (by its own terms) "graduates," but also in terms of these certified helpers' effect on others. Figure 3 presents a strategy designed to address these issues. Several training groups are contrasted with control groups in Part 1 and the effect of trained...
helpers is examined in Part 2. In Part 1 several different training approaches are compared at specified intervals or steps using measures derived from all programs to test whether or not the skills or behaviors delineated have indeed been learned. Test A is derived from Program A, Test X from Program X. At the end of Step 1, all participants receive all measures, even those from other training programs. At the same time at each stage some overall measure of effectiveness is given which would cut across the training approaches. This is represented here by one potential procedure designed by Goodman (1969, 1972) called the Group Assessment of Interpersonal Traits or GAIT. A simulation technique in which eight participants attempt to understand each other's stated personal concerns, this procedure can be employed to obtain ratings of interpersonal skills from audiotapes or videotapes and several sets of rating can result (D'Augelli, 1973). One could judge, then, how successful each program is at accomplishing its own goals as well as how trainees improve in general ways. Control Group 1 serves as a means for comparison with the training groups. A final assessment of skills, perhaps on the GAIT, can be used to judge general outcome. This study can be employed to test the separate learning competencies at each stage of training and also to check the incremental impact of each stage. The heuristic output of such a study would make its scope worthwhile. Further, use of measures from several theoretical perspectives would certainly further future conceptualizing about helping.

Part 2 of this strategy employs only those from a training program who have been assessed as trained effectively by their own program's definition of success (perhaps on Test An or Xn) and at the final general
assessment. This group of helpers is then compared with untrained individuals in Control Group 2 in terms of impact on clients or "help". Control Group 3 is included to examine the reactive effects of testing (Campbell & Stanley, 1966).

Many difficult issues must be resolved before attempting this last strategy. Definition of outcome in Part 1 at each step is needed with measures of specific competency attainment level and general effectiveness. Much work has to be done on measures per se. On a methodological level, behavioral assessment of skills focusing on actual performance is preferable for evaluating trainees, and simulations of real helping situations would give measures greater external validity. Although the specification of what "help" consists of is troublesome, multiple measures, objective and self-report, should be included. Indeed, it may well be that subjective reports of client are more important during the initial helping relationship when it is critical that the client view the helper as interested, sincere, and competent, whereas objective indices of client behavior change might best be used to evaluate later phases of the relationship. Nonetheless, it is clear that delineation of outcome is a central problem facing evaluative studies in this area.

Several evaluation strategies have been outlined here. In many ways all three are "ideal" studies in which resolution of perennial complexities in this area has been assumed. Although it is therefore unlikely that these strategies will be implemented in their present form in the immediate future, it is hoped that they will facilitate concerted conceptualization and empirical inquiry in an area likely to be increasingly important to the mental health field. Research in
other areas, particularly education and psychotherapy, has suggested many leads to pursue in the design and evaluation of systematic training in helping. Approaches to evaluation such as those proposed here provide a structure within which these leads can be ordered.
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Figure 1

Selection vs. Training
Figure 2

Dimension Identification

Part 1

MODEL (Variable A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed</th>
<th>Live</th>
<th>Filmed</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2

VARIABLE X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
<th>$nox$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$y_1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Instructions

Best Model

No Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Best Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training Process and Outcome

Part 1

Training A
- Step 1
  - Tests Al-X1
    - GAIT
- Step 2
  - Tests A2-X2
    - GAIT
- Step n
  - Tests An-Xn
    - GAIT

Training X
- Step 1
  - Tests Al-X1
    - GAIT
- Step n
  - Tests An-Xn
    - GAIT

Control 1
Control 2
Control 3
- Time 1
  - Tests Al-X1
    - GAIT
- Time n
  - Tests An-Xn
    - GAIT
Training Process and Outcome

Part 1

Step 1 -> Step 2

Tests A1-X1: GAIT

Tests A2-X2: GAIT

Step n

Tests An-Xn: GAIT

EVALUATION OF HELP

ASSESSMENT

Part 2

Step 1 -> Step n

Tests A1-X1: GAIT

Tests An-Xn: GAIT

Time 1

Tests A1-X1: GAIT

Tests An-Xn: GAIT

Time n
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The most difficult task of the Director of Training at a hotline walk-in center is the planning and implementation of a comprehensive training program for staff members. Such a program must prepare the staff to handle the multitude of situations they are confronted with regularly. At a drug crisis center, knowledge of basic pharmacology and techniques in drug crisis intervention are two of the most important parts of such a training program. However, since virtually no crisis center can predict that all cases will be of the drug information or emergency type, it is necessary that the staff of the center be trained in the basic art of helping as well as in the specific knowledge and skills described above.

The use of Danish and Hauer's *Helping Skills Program* will be presented here as a solution to the problem of how to best train paraprofessionals at a drug crisis center to be effective helpers in situations besides the drug overdose.

This paper will first describe the center at which this skill program is utilized, and then discuss its use there. Finally, adaptations made in the program to heighten its effectiveness with drug crisis interventionists will also be discussed briefly.

**ABOUT THE CENTER**

On Drugs, Inc. was founded as a volunteer, home-phone based organization by several students at the Pennsylvania State University in 1970. The goal of the originators was to establish a totally confidential, non-judgmental hotline to which young people could address questions, problems, misconceptions, and even crisis situations related to drug use and abuse. Chartered as a student organization by Penn State University, the handful of college student-aged On Drugs volunteers soon found that the publicity of the organization brought them many calls of both an informational and a crisis nature,
especially between late evening and early morning hours. As the weekly caseload began to climb, the volunteers at On Drugs found themselves unable to provide an effective and dependable service without maintaining a centralized location with twenty-four hour open telephone lines and a systematically trained staff. Thus, through a grant received from Pennsylvania's Governor's Justice Commission, a cash allocation from the Office of Student Affairs at Penn State, plus several thousands of dollars of in-kind services from professional psychologists and psychiatrists, On Drugs established itself as a non-profit corporation in August of 1972. With available funds, headquarters for the drug center were set up in the town of State College, within walking distance of the University. By minimally financing five hotline staff members, five administrative staff members (also trained to work on the hotline) and a part-time secretary, On Drugs was able to open its services of drug crisis intervention and information on a twenty-four hour a day, seven day a week basis. On Drugs was also able to expand into the areas of referral assistance, short-term counseling, and drug education in order to offer assistance to not only the college student community but to the Borough of State College and eventually to the entire Centre County as well.

USE OF THE HELPING SKILLS PROGRAM

The transition of On Drugs from a small, arbitrarily-run student organization to a large, government-funded county agency called for many changes in the structure and functioning of On Drugs. One of the largest areas reflecting this change was the need for staff training, since On Drugs could no longer afford to minimally train its staff in the accustomed, casual manner, while operating on a twenty-four hour basis with an increase of services. A many faceted training program was needed; one which could
train the staff to handle drug-related emergencies as well as the myriad of other situations which a drop-in hotline center should be prepared to encounter. Teaching the staff techniques of drug crisis intervention and supplying them with pertinent pharmacological knowledge was certainly a basic part of the training program. However, staff members also needed training in how to be effective helpers in situations other than the drug crisis, since that was only one of the services to be provided.

The Helping Skills Program by Danish and Hauer appeared to be a solution to the problem of how best to train the staff. The six stages of the Program emphasize skills which would be most helpful to the staff, especially when handling the crisis counseling and referral cases facing them daily. While all staff members were chosen, in part, for their ability to relate empathically with clients in a simulated crisis situation, the Helping Skills Program seemed to offer a more definite approach to helping through its systematic presentation of skills essential to the helper role.

Impressed with the potential that the Helping Skills Program had to offer to their own training program, the staff at On Drugs participated in the Program which was run during three eight-hour Saturday sessions spaced three weeks apart from one another. Between each session (during which two stages were taught), members of On Drugs staff met in dyads with four psychological consultants to evaluate their skill level.

RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM

By the completion of the Helping Skills Program, several changes were noticable in the participants. One of the most obvious was in the group's cohesiveness. At the start of the training program, a clear line of demarcation existed between new and old members of the agency. Through the twenty four hours of training plus the outside practice and skill assessment,
the two groups merged smoothly into one extremely cohesive group, a quality which contributes greatly to the overall effectiveness of the agency. Another interesting change was in the members' attitudes toward Stage 1. At the start of the Program, some of the experienced members of the agency were rather suspicious and somewhat reluctant to analyze their needs and motivations for working at On Drugs. While they did agree to participate in this stage, it wasn't until the end of the training program that the staff realized that helpers must be fully aware of what they derive from the helping situation, in order to prevent their needs from interfering with their effectiveness.

The non-verbal and verbal skill levels of the On Drugs members were also enhanced by the Helping Skills Program. The program provided the staff at On Drugs with verbal skills in particular which make it impossible to be condescending when dealing with peer clients. The verbal response training also prepared members to listen more empathically to clients as well as to more effectively help them probe into their problems. This increase in skill level was quite observable to the staff members themselves. Several members expressed an increased self-confidence in their dealings with clients, primarily due to their increased sophistication with the verbal helping skills.

ONGOING TRAINING PLANS WITH THE HELPING SKILLS PROGRAM

After the initial use of the Helping Skills Program at the On Drugs Center, the role of training leader was transferred from Dr. Danish to this author. With the experience of the first training program behind me, I would like to briefly discuss some of the minor adaptations through which the Helping Skills Program will go when used again for training purposes at the crisis center. Because of the intensity of the Helping Skills Program,
it was found to be too long to run for more than three to four hours at one time. Thus, the next time the Program is taught, it will be held over a four week period, with two to three hour sessions held twice weekly.

Since it is likely that the needs and motivations of staff members change over time, it is important that the staff at On Drugs go through a refresher session of examining their needs and motivations for working, at least three times per year. In order to maintain cohesion between incumbent and trainee members of the agency, such refresher sessions of Stage I will be held in conjunction with the teaching of this stage for the first time, to new trainees.

The homework assigned in each stage of the Program will also be adapted to fit the needs of the On Drugs members. Since members do have time commitments outside of the On Drugs Center, only those parts of the homework deemed crucial to their effective learning of the skills will be included. Assessment of skill levels will continue to be a function of the psychological consultants to the agency. This cuts down on the amount of time spent on assessment in group sessions, and also allows members to observe more closely the skills and styles of professional counselors.

As outlined above, the Helping Skills Program has become an integral part of the training program at On Drugs, Inc. It provides drug crisis interventionists at the agency with a broad range of skills essential for dealing effectively with helping in a multitude of situations, and contributes to the overall cohesiveness within the agency.