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This paper is part of a series of four prepared for presentation at the 1977 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Each of the four presentations is a review of counselor education research. Constance Ripstra-Kennedy and Wayne Rowe have prepared a review of the "characteristics of effective counselor trainees and the selection of trainees." Bob B. Winborn and Avraham Scherman have reviewed "practicum and supervision." Mark A. Hector and myself have addressed our review to "outcomes in counselor training (excluding practicum and supervision)." My paper reviews the years 1969-1972, while Dr. Hector's covers 1973 to the present.

The journals reviewed for the present project include Counselor Education and Supervision, Journal of Counseling Psychology, Dissertation Abstracts International, Counseling Psychologist, Vocational Guidance Quarterly, Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, Personnel and Guidance Journal, Journal of College Student Personnel, School Counselor, and Elementary School Counselor. Since the journals cited are those which are most directly related to counselor education, it is expected that the large majority of counselor education research will fall within the scope of these reviews.

Focus of the Review

Essentially, my portion of the total set of reviews is focused upon the question: "What do we know about outcomes of counseling training based on the research gathered between 1969 and 1972?" In other words,
"do counselor educators educate?" and "What do their students learn?"

For purposes of this investigation, I will not be willing to accept what may tend to be our initial reaction to the two questions: "Yes, of course," and "Lots of things!" Instead, in the course of the review, I will not only report research findings but also comment upon research methodology that may tend to strengthen or weaken individual conclusions.

The review is organized according to the length of the program (or treatment) that was evaluated. The first section deals with attempts to evaluate the outcomes of total training programs. The second major section concentrates on course-length programs. The final portion of the review focuses upon short term counselor training treatments.

Evaluation of Total Programs

Surely, if counselor education is achieving its purpose, there must be numerous articles substantiating the effectiveness of such training! Unfortunately, this is not so. During the four year period of my review, only 19 studies sought to evaluate complete programs. Additionally, the research designs are poor, and the findings provide very little in the way of support for counselor education.

Because of the nature of the question (i.e., an evaluation of an entire one to two-year program), the studies described in this section are necessarily poorly designed. A well-designed study requires an appropriate control group for comparison with the treatment group. The best manner to create such a situation is to assign subjects from the same population to experimental and control groups on a random basis. Clearly, as counselor educators, we can neither ethically nor feasibly assign students at random to a year of counselor training or to a year of some
alternative activity. The basic starting point for research on causes and effects (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) --two initially equivalent groups-- cannot be present in any of the evaluations of total programs. Consequently, all of what follows in this section must be interpreted cautiously and with more than a little skepticism.

The most prevalent studies in this section are pretest-posttest evaluations of trainees during NDEA or EPDA Counseling Institutes. The results indicate that students tend to decrease their Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale scores during an institute (Pennscott & Brown, 1972) and to increase their understanding of content and their nurturance score on the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule (Pietrofesa & Van Hoose, 1971). In terms of values (Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values), attitudes (Porter Test of Counselor Attitudes), and facilitative functioning, however, trainees change very little and return to their pre-institute starting points very shortly after program completion (Pietrofesa & Van Hoose, 1971; Rochester, 1970; Pennscott & Brown, 1972; Soule, 1972).

Additional relationships addressed in this series of institute studies (Rochester, 1972; Rochester & Cottingham, 1969; Rochester & Hopke, 1969) were severely clouded by repetitive statistical testing which will likely produce significant differences by chance alone.

Another manner of researching program effectiveness is through a follow-up study by questionnaire. Jones, Corle, and Orebaugh (1969) and O'Dell (1971) surveyed counseling graduates in order to evaluate their training programs. Neither study is "research" in its strictest sense (i.e., a study of the relationships between two or more variables), but the surveys are, nonetheless, rather interesting. Jones et.al., (1969) found only 61% of the respondees were employed as counselors. Practicum
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rated highly as a most "helpful" course in both surveys. Any conclusions from such data are highly tenuous since the response rates to the questionnaires were relatively poor (61% for Jones, et.al., 1969, and 73% for O'Dell, 1969). When only a small percentage of samples are returned the researcher must anticipate inevitable criticism as to the representativeness of those subjects who were sufficiently motivated to respond.

Additional follow-up studies have been designed to test relationships between variables. Scott (1970) found that curriculum changes were associated with improved appraisals, greater employment, and increased identification with national professional organizations. Gottlieb (1972) determined that there were no significant relationships between type of training for elementary school counselors (no formal program, traditional, or NDEA) and their functioning on a preventative or crisis model. Pfeifle (1970, 1971) employed a survey technique with client ratings on the Counselor Evaluation Inventory (CEI) as a criteria. Counselors with practicum were rated higher by their clients than counselors without practicum although number of clients seen, activity of the supervisor, and lecture or group methods were all unrelated to client evaluations. Finally, a study by Engelkes (1970) revealed no evidence of a training effect in either the satisfaction reports of clients or on-the-job supervisors between trained and untrained rehabilitation counselors.

The remaining five research studies in this section compared the counselor education program group to some "presumably" similar control group. Three investigations (Roark, 1969; Kassera & Sease, 1970; Anthony & Carkhuff, 1970) compared students near completion of their masters programs with those who had just begun in the same program. Roark (1969) found more advanced students were more reflective and passively
accepting than beginners. They also made fewer suggestions, asked fewer questions, and explored feelings more seldomly (all measures were from Bales system of rating interactions). Kassera and Sease (1970) tested three levels of trainees (beginners, intermediates, and advanced) on a large group of measures including the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), Rokeach’s Dogmatism Scale, Berger’s Acceptance of Self and Others Scale, and Porter’s test of Counselor Attitudes. With all of the repeated (and dependent) significance testing involved in the analysis, at least one or two tests would be expected to be significant by chance alone. In actuality only four of 26 tests were significant: all of the Porter test of Counselor Attitudes. At best then, the conclusions that can be drawn are that student attitudes are related to their level within the counselor education program. It must be remembered, however, that such attitude changes are relatively transitory (Rochester, 1970).

Anthony and Carkhuff (1970) found fourth semester trainees superior to first semester trainees in attitudes toward the disabled and level of facilitative functioning. Both groups of counselor trainees were superior to "similar" groups of philosophy students. Clearly, the "similarity" of philosophy students and counselor candidates is questionable even without any training for either group of students!

In a somewhat similar example of fallicious reason, Rubacher and Woods (1970) compared two counselor education programs at two separate schools. Not quite so blatant, but suspect for the same reason, is Mayer and Engle’s (1971) study comparing Guidance Institute students with those regularly enrolled. One cannot be too surpised in finding differences comparing an apple to an orange!

In summary, were we to believe that the only real effects of counselor
education were those suggested by the relationships found in these studies evaluating total programs, we would hardly be able to justify our salaries! At best there are very tentative indications that counselor training is associated with temporary changes in counseling attitudes, gains in content knowledge, and reduction in anxiety. There seems to be little evidence that personality scores or overt behaviors are altered substantially.

**Course-length Programs**

Without question, the most impressive compilation of research during the period of this review is that accomplished by Carkhuff and his colleagues (Carkhuff, 1969a, 1969b, 1969c, 1972). Initially, Carkhuff developed a set of operationally defined scales of facilitative conditions: empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, self-disclosure, immediacy, and confrontation (Carkhuff, 1969b). Subsequently, he has detailed a training program, human resources development (HRD) training, which can effectively teach counselors or paraprofessionals facilitative skills. The HRD model employs didactic teaching, discrimination training, modeling, experientially-oriented communications practice, and feedback. This model can be implemented within a time approximating that required for a college course (Carkhuff, 1969b, 1972). Finally, Carkhuff (1969a, 1969b, 1972) has established a strong relationship between counselor facilitative functioning and such client "outcome" characteristics as self-exploration, self-understanding, ratings of client functioning, vocational information-seeking behavior, and student achievement.

Carkhuff's remarkable research productivity has greatly influenced counselor education. One primary impact of Carkhuff is illustrated within the remainder of this review: Counselor training research has in recent
times focused major attention on facilitative conditions as criteria for evaluation. Several years earlier, such less objective and less easily quantifiable criteria as supervisor ratings were most typically employed.

Unfortunately, other course-length programs mentioned in the literature were not nearly so well described or evaluated. There were a total of 18 studies reported during the 1969-1972 period. Merely seven studies demonstrated the minimally acceptable condition for qualification as experimental: random assignment of subjects.

Summarizing the results of the studies involving randomization, a twelve week course incorporating training aimed at facilitative conditions resulted in no significant facilitative scale improvement beyond a control group who did not use the scales (Buckner, 1971). Chernoff (1971) attempted a similar study of an eleven session training experience. He concludes that "paper-and-pencil inventories of supposedly relevant counselor attitudes are of dubious value in assessing changes accompanying counselor training experiences (p. 3021)." No differences could be found between experimental and control group on the Affective Sensitivity Scale, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, or the Flexibility scale of the California Psychological Inventory.

In further uninspiring results, Parker (1973) found that although a microcounseling (Ivey, 1971) treatment positively affected the trainee's level of accurate empathy and the amount of affective and understanding (Counselor Verbal Response Scale) responses, this effect was short lived. By the time the term ended (5 weeks later), the control group (without microcounseling) did not perform significantly differently on any measures.

Spivack (1971) employed an experimental design to test the effects of Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR) training (Kagan, Krathwahl et al., 1967)
upon empathy, Affective Sensitivity (AS), and the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale (CVRS). Although the IPR training resulted in significantly higher understanding, specificity and exploratory CVRS scores, it did no better than a "traditional training" control in AS or empathy.

In the two remaining course-length experimental programs, a simulation games approach to teaching personality theory was demonstrated to be not significantly less effective than a lecture group (Engle & Maes, 1971), and systematic desensitization approach was demonstrated to be effective in reducing reported stress prior to a first practicum interview (Monke, 1969).

In the remaining studies of course-length programs, random assignment was not carried out. The results of these studies, then, may be either due to initial differences between treatment and control or due to treatment effects. Again, interpretation of such research is very tentative.

Eight studies employed facilitative conditions (empathy primarily) as the criterion variables. Carkhuff, Friel, and Kratochvil (1970) determined that teaching counselor-responsive dimension prior to counselor initiated dimensions is related to maximal learning of facilitative conditions. Dowall (1973) found a modification of microcounseling in a pre-practicum class was correlated with higher levels of response to feeling, summarization of feeling, communication of respect, confrontation, and contract setting. (In light of earlier findings, it is significant that there was no delayed follow-up in the Dowall study.) Pierce and Schauble (1970, 1971) carried out two companion studies that related supervisor and instructor facilitativeness to trainee change in facilitative functioning. Students with low functioning instructors and supervisors did not develop higher levels of functioning, and, in some cases, they declined in functioning.
Fletcher (1972) found that a group receiving both training and feedback reflected feelings more than groups receiving only one or the other component. Clients, however, did not feel more accepted by any one group over the other.

Researchers have attempted to influence trainees' facilitative functioning through a didactic/experiential group (Parry, 1970) and through training in interaction analysis (Redding, 1969). Neither method proved better than a no treatment control. Rowe (1973) developed a 50 hour Interpersonal Process Recall Approach (Kagan, Krathwohl, et al., 1967) which was related to changes in affective sensitivity, empathy, and two scales of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. As an uncontrolled study, however, alternative explanations of changes such as the Hawthorne effect, experimenter bias, maturation, and history cannot be ruled out (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).

The remaining three articles evaluating course-length programs were sufficiently poor in design so as to question the advisability of reporting them in this review. McClain (1969) studied a summer institute in such a way as to identify experimenter bias rather clearly to the subjects. Stoner and Riese (1971) found no change in self and ideal-self discrepancies over the period of one term. Subjects, perhaps feeling they should be consistent, had rated self and ideal-self as nearly identical in both pre and post measures. Bullmer (1972) compared classes given programmed interpersonal perception texts with classes who carried out entirely unrelated activities. Not surprisingly, the programmed text group was superior on a test specifically designed to measure accuracy of interpersonal perception. (This is not unlike my telling one person "a secret" and not talking to another individual, then testing each on whether they know the secret!)
A Group Processes Experience in Counselor Education

The examination of group processes as a part of a counselor training program is a subset of the larger category of course-length programs. The frequency with which this one research question appeared in the literature (24 times) was sufficient to devote special attention to its investigation.

The results in this area appear to be more conclusive than in any other covered within this paper: neither a group processes course nor any other popular method of self-confrontation or personal growth has demonstrated significant effects upon counselor education trainees! It may simply be an artifact of our measures, but until we come up with better ones, we should admit that group counseling for counseling trainees just doesn't work!

Of the nine studies employing randomization, only two (McWhirter, 1970; Maroun, 1971) resulted in any significant differences in favor of the group process training. McWhirter (1970) found higher accurate empathy scores on an immediate post test favoring sensitivity group over a randomly-assigned didactic group. Maroun (1971) found groups facilitated by trained counselors to be higher on self-actualization scores (Personal Orientation Inventory-POI) than encounter groups directed by audiotapes. Although there is no way of knowing, these two positive results out of nine might be explainable by an error in analysis common to all group studies reported in this paper: the problem of experimental unit (Cox, 1958).

(A brief diversion is appropriate here in order to explain the meaning of the experimental unit problem. Essentially, what is involved is that the analysis of variance statistical procedure requires the assumption that subjects receive treatment independently of one another. This assumption, unlike the assumptions of normality and equal group...
variances, is not very flexible to violation. When a group treatment is performed, we know that each group member cannot possibly receive the "group" treatment independently. Every member of a small group is directly affected by every other member! If one person in the group is extremely dynamic and charismatic, we might well expect that that group may be greatly affected in a positive direction. Obviously, of course, the argument could be stated negatively: a group member might be so negative and pessimistic as to hold down the potential growth of other members. Thus, a researcher cannot employ the individual subject as an appropriate unit of analysis in the analysis of variance. The group—or the mean for the group—is the smallest unit which receives treatment independently of any other unit! An appropriate analysis of a group study requires multiple groups for each treatment condition with the means of these groups being entered into the analysis of variance.)

It is possible that the significant differences (and the nonsignificant differences, also) found in the group processes studies are the result of an artifact: either an individual or several individuals within any one group can influence all group members in certain unknown directions!

The remaining randomized group process studies resulted in no significant advantage for group process courses on such measures as Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Myrick & Pare', 1971), facilitative conditions (Myrick & Pare', 1971; Rowe, 1972; Salmon, 1972; Whyte, 1972), Personal Orientation Inventory (Rowe, 1972), Q-Sort measure of self-concept (Wirt, Betz, & Engle, 1969), Affective Sensitivity Scale (Cerra, 1969), Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Cerra, 1969), Personal Description Instrument (Cerra, 1969), and the Test of Implied Meanings (Eisenbeiss, 1972).

In four studies which attempted to match subjects in the control
group with those in the experimental, results were also mixed. Costinew (1971) found an encounter group stimulated growth on facilitative dimensions. Woody (1971a, 1971b), however, found essentially no differences on a number of variables including Tennessee Self-concept Scale, Elmore Psychological Anomie Scale, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and on the Porter Counselor Attitude Inventory. Felker (1971) tested the effects of forced counseling and found matched subjects were not significantly lower on the O'Hern Test of Sensitivity or the Woldt-Matuschka Group Rating Scale.

Within the uncontrolled (non randomization) studies of group process, seven resulted in no significant differences (Grand & Stockin, 1970; Grisham, 1973; Holmes, 1972; McKinnon, 1969; Pearson, 1973; Seelig, 1974; and Whittlesey, 1971). In addition to criteria already mentioned above, these investigations found lack of significance on California Psychological Inventory Scores, 16 Personality Factor Test, perceptual organization measured by Thematic Apperception Test scores, Counselor Evaluation Inventory scores, and an Adjective Checklist. Although one of the positive results in the experimental studies had indicated significant differences on the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) scores (Maroun, 1971), three of these non-experimental investigations yielded negative results on this same scale of self-actualization (Pearson, 1973; Seelig, 1974; Grisham, 1973).

On two subscales of the Motivation Analysis test, Apostal and Muro (1970) found differences between counseling students in a group process class and a "control" of educational administration students! De Boer (1970) also found some differences favoring group procedures, but his controls were at different universities! Reddy (1970) found changes in certain questionnaire answers but had no control group at all. Finally,
Tucker (1974) found some few scales of the POI changing more in a highly structured Human Potentials Seminar group than in a no treatment control. The POI results, then, continue to be inconsistent.

Summary

Beyond the contributions of Carkhuff, the research on course-length programs in counselor education tells us very little of a positive nature. On the negative side, however, it is clear that the time has come to discontinue research on the effectiveness of group process in counselor education!

Short-term Counseling Training

Evaluations of short-term attempts to develop counseling behaviors are not only the most numerous (38 studies) but also the most rigorously designed (29 involve random assignment to groups). There are at least two reasons for this: (a) short-term treatments are more controllable because of their brevity, and (b) doctoral dissertations are normally designed to be carried out in relatively brief time periods (21 of 38 studies are doctoral dissertations). Since there are some common categories of investigation within the short-term evaluations, the remainder of this section will identify results within each category.

Training Approaches to Facilitative Functioning

Studies in this section consist either of alterations of Carkhuff's Human Resources Development (HRD) training model or of unique approaches to developing facilitative functioning. Kratochvil (1969), Butler (1971) and Butler and Hansen (1973) essentially employed the HRD model in
short-term training and found, as had Carkhuff, that trainees were more facilitative than randomly-assigned controls in role-plays with standard clients. In addition, Butler (1971) found these differences persisted for at least four weeks. Another experimental study (MacDonald, 1971) determined that standardized audiotaped materials would not effect change in empathy and congruence. Apparently, when you take the human feedback out of the HRD model, it is not as effective.

Among more poorly designed studies (no random assignment), Ashworth (1971) found an empathy training group helped develop discrimination and communication of empathy. Mehnert (1972) compared a systematic training program (somewhat "HRD-like") with a discussion group and located no differences between groups in client ratings despite the treatment group's increase in specific responding. Gimmestad (1971) prepared a program similar to HRD for developing perceptual sensitivity. There was no significant pre-post change on the perceptual sensitivity measure.

In a different training model, Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR), Ward, Kagan and Krathwohl (1972) could find no measurable differences between counselors with IPR (video or audio) and a group exposed to traditional supervision. Grzegorek (1971), also testing the IPR model, compared two methods of IPR presentation. In one treatment, he focused on experiential learning and attempted to create an accepting atmosphere. With the second group, the concentration of attention was directed to cognitive and intellectual discussion and interpretation. The experiential group developed better empathy, understanding, specificity and exploration. The study was flawed, however, by a lack of random assignment.

Apparently, we can surmise from the work cited above that HRD models (and other models of similar nature) will promote facilitative functioning. Since the total model involves a complexity of factors...
(discrimination training, modeling, role-playing, and feedback), further research is needed to identify the critical components of the process. Some of the following research reports deal with these components.

Modeling

The research consistently supports the effectiveness of modeling as a method to encourage learning in counselor education. Miller (1969) found a consistent model with reinforcement effected change in trainees' counseling behavior (fewer topic changes and fewer counselor statements). Eisenberg (1970) and Eisenberg and Delaney (1970) trained counselors using videotaped procedures to give tacting (concrete) responses. Their experimental study compared subjects who merely saw the video client stimuli (control) with three treatments: (a) subjects who received verbal reinforcement for practicing tacting responses, (b) subjects who observed a videotaped counselor giving tacting responses, and (c) subjects who received both reinforcement and modeling. Results indicated that the two groups with modeling were significantly higher than the reinforcement-only and control groups in tacting response generation.

Hutchcraft (1970), Ronnestad (1974) and Frankel (1971) demonstrated modeling's effects upon counselor trainee behavior. With one short supervisor modeling treatment, Hutchcraft's (1970) subjects reduced interruptions, number of responses and duration of counselor talk. Although the counselor models (videotaped) in the same study had demonstrated desired behaviors, subjects' responding was only changed in the condition where a supervisor model (also videotaped) gave the model counselor feedback and information. Changes, however, were not retained on a delayed post test. Ronnestad (1974) had randomly assigned subjects to treatment
or to a control group that "explored client/counselor feelings." The treatments (modeling or feedback) outperformed the control on expression of empathy. Frankel's (1971) single presentation of a video model increased frequency of counselor feeling statements but did not influence the accuracy of reflection.

In a well-designed study, Rank, Thoresen, and Smith (1972) established the effects of modeling upon affective, group-focused, and personal group behaviors of counselor trainees. This study, although carried out in a very short time span, is one that provides a good model for possible counselor education research in the future.

Payne, Weiss, and Kapp (1972) in another well designed (but very complex) study found a combination of audio modeling and didactic supervision resulted in increased counselor empathy. They concluded that the didactic and modeling portions of their treatment were essentially additive, each contributing a unique effect. Similarly, Stern (1972) studied didactic (programmed manual), modeling (four videotapes), and experiential (four interviews with feedback from the client) approaches to training of feeling reflections. Subjects in both didactic and modeling treatments gave more feeling reflections than did those in the experiential group. The non-structured nature of the client feedback apparently had little effect on the experiential subjects. Stone (1973) questioned whether subjects would learn better from written, audio, video, or live models and/or practice. The further the model and practice was from reality, the poorer was the learning.

In the only contradictory finding in the modeling research, Thielen (1971) observed that trainees in a treatment of supervisor modeling, reinforcing, and role-playing were not significantly higher on CVRS items than a
randomly assigned taped lecture control. The experimental group did, however, feel better about themselves, apparently as a result of all the individual attention.

Modeling, then, appears to be an effective teaching procedure in counselor education. It tends to be more beneficial when presented within the context of a didactic presentation or conceptualization. Unfocused experiential activities and unclarified reinforcement or feedback are not as effective as a modeling approach.

Feedback and Reinforcement

As was already mentioned, Eisenberg (1970), Eisenberg and Delaney (1970) and Ronnestad (1974) all determined that modeling was superior to a feedback/reinforcement condition. Ronnestad (1974), however, found that a feedback-only group was more empathic than an experiential control. Altekruse and Brown (1969), Kelley (1971), Sodetz (1973), Reddy (1968), and Carlson (1971, 1974) have demonstrated significant effects for feedback treatments over no feedback controls. Altekruse and Brown (1969) found trainees encouraged to self-analyze their audiotapes (i.e., to give feedback to themselves) were less directive in their subsequent counseling. Other research suggested supervisor feedback was more effective than either self-feedback (Kelley, 1971) or client feedback (Sodetz, 1973). Also, immediate feedback (bug-in-the-ear) was more effective than delayed (Reddy, 1968, 1969).

Carlson's (1971, 1974) experiment established that a conceptual basis for training will promote change. His "feedback and instructions" group, despite non contingent feedback presentation, outperformed immediate feedback subjects.
Elsenrath, Coker, and Martinson (1972) presented an effective audiotaped treatment to influence specified counselor interaction variables. Their treatment involved practice, reinforcement, and instructions. Differences from the randomly assigned control were still evident after a seven to ten day delay. The Carlson (1971, 1974) and Elsenrath et al. (1972) results are consistent with Dowd and Blocher's (1974) finding that immediate reinforcement and awareness of the reinforced response class seem to be additive factors. The combination of the conceptual framework (awareness) and reinforcement was more effective than either factor alone.

The only study is inconsistent with the previously cited feedback research is Olson's (1974) investigation of immediate and delayed feedback. He found no significant differences between immediate, delayed or no-feedback control on any of three criterion variables--interview termination, silence management, or client ratings of effectiveness. Although it is possible that Olson's investigation was an experimental study, it was not clear that random assignment had occurred.

As with modeling, feedback appears to be an effective training method when presented within a meaningful conceptual framework. The further the reward is removed from its conceptual base, the less effective it appears to be.

Counselor Anxiety

Several authors have addressed counselor anxiety about interviewing as a criterion variable in short-term training programs. Miller (1973) and Carter (1973) demonstrated that systematic desensitization was able to reduce anxiety significantly more than a no-treatment control. Carter's (1973) study, however, found no significant differences between
systematic desensitization and a insight-affect control. Rihani (1973) found an implosive treatment increased counselor trainees' ability to handle anxiety aroused by emotionally charged words.

Miller (1971), however, was unsuccessful in locating any anxiety differences between self-desensitization, in-vivo desensitization, and no-treatment control groups. His subjects were not selected because of expressed anxiety, and he concludes that as masters counseling students, they were simply not very anxious about a role-played counseling session!

Role-Playing and Simulation

Counselor-trainee role-playing, when presented without didactic material, may not be an effective technique in promoting counselor behavior. A number of the studies cited under the modeling and feedback headings employed role-playing or practice as a control for the other treatments. In most cases, the role-playing alone was not effective (e.g., Eisenberg & Delaney, 1970; Carlson, 1974; Reddy, 1968). In another investigations, Rastatter (1970) could find no significant differences in facilitative functioning between counselors who had and had not role played. This study was not, however, well-designed or well-described. The content and length of the role-plays was unspecified, and random assignment was absent. Shoemaker (1973) compared a micro-lab training (Ivey, 1971) with a didactic presentation and found no significant effects for the role playing components of the micro-lab.

Panther (1971) prepared a simulation (role-playing) treatment to develop counselor skills in consultation. Counselors who had been involved in the simulation experiences (and presumably involved in instructional experiences as well) were rated more highly than controls on recommendations
they had made relative to problem situations. It must be mentioned, however, that there was apparently no random assignment, and the control group was not exposed to any discussion of consultation whatsoever!

**Discussion and Summary**

My review has covered 108 research studies related to outcomes of counseling training. I would remind the reader that no studies on supervision and practicum have been included, and the time period of my review does no bring us up to date. Thus, my conclusions and suggestions may possibly be answered in other and more up-dated research.

Nonetheless, I will make a few summary comments and suggestions. First of all, Carkhuff has had a remarkable impact upon counseling training. To a certain extent, Carkhuff has begun to answer a criticism raised by Whiteley (1969) in an earlier review of counselor education: "It will not be possible to study with any precision the effects of a training program until it becomes clearer what effects the counselor should produce and how he is to accomplish his purposes" (p. 180). Carkhuff has argued that facilitative conditions and systematic programs are the needed skills of the counselor. Apparently counselor educators have heard his message since over half of the research reviewed employed facilitative functioning as a criterion variable. I would hope, however, that counselor education does not get lost in its search for facilitative functioning. Certainly there are other, additional criteria that we desire our students to learn!

Second, group process experience for counselor education students is of questionable value. Perhaps we maintain these program components as a result of our own rewards from the experience of a "group high," but in terms of objective criteria, there seems to be little justification.
Third, modeling and reinforcement/feedback techniques are effective approaches to counselor education. They are particularly beneficial when presented within a cognitive structure, normally presented didactically. Since most of a counselor education program is didactic, we should be able to include modeling and feedback approaches effectively at almost any point!

Fourth, many of the problems addressed in the research are not of major impact. To borrow from Goldman's (1977) recent statement on research: "Research tells us something about what courses are offered to counselors in training but rarely anything about the important things that happen in those courses and their outcomes in the counselors and their later work" (p.363). There are many important questions that have simply not been addressed. To suggest just a few: Are counselors trained under a consistent cognitive model more effective on the job than those whose programs are more eclectic? Does repeated exposure to videotaping create more relaxed and competent counselors? Can content classes be taught through self-instruction and programmed units allowing for more staff attention to experiential portions of the program? Do counselor educators who have read the "latest research" perform their jobs differently than those who have not? Is every required course in our present counselor education programs truly a necessary component in preparation? These questions (and of course, there are many more possibilities) could teach us various directions depending upon their answers. All, then, would meet Krumboltz's (1967) test of relevance for research.

Fifth, we should begin to move our assessments of effectiveness as counselor educators from observations of our trainees to observations of our trainees' clients. Our major purpose is to develop effective counseling, which is not directly inferable from process measures. Only when we
observe clients growing and changing in their desired directions can we surmise that counselor effectiveness is present.

Sixth, we need more planned, comprehensive and coordinated research projects. Too many studies are isolated investigations on available samples (Goldman, 1976). Generalization is problematical, particularly so when replications are seldomly reported.

Our counselor education research is not good! The studies reviewed are full of design and statistical problems, and yet, I am encouraged by a trend toward increasingly sound methodology (particularly in Counselor Education and Supervision) and correspondingly solid conclusions. To return to the two questions I posed at the outset ("Do counselor educators educate?" and "What do their students learn?"), I feel justified in confidently answering: "I think so" and "At least a few things!"
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