

A Comparison of Communication Responses
of Professional Helpers to Elderly
and Other Adult Clients

by

Goodwin P. Garfield
B.A., University of Toronto, 1948
M.S.W., University of Toronto, 1950

Submitted to the Department of Speech
and Drama, Division of Speech Communi-
cation and Human Relations, and to the
Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Kansas in partial ful-
fillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deep appreciation to my chairman, Dr. Walter Crockett, and to each member and reader of my committee: Dr. Thomas Beisecker, Dr. Paul Friedman, Dr. Wil Linkugel, and Dr. Robert Shelton.

To Dr. Allan Press, my friend and colleague, I want to offer my heartfelt thanks for so fully sharing his rich expertise.

I am grateful to Patti Hackney who typed this manuscript.

This dissertation was supported in part by the Administration on Aging, National Institutes of Health, Grant #90-A-1008.

Finally, I am indebted to Shirley Garfield, my wife and colleague, for her constant support throughout the lifetime of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Review of the Literature.....	2
Attitudes Toward the Elderly as a Group.....	2
Attitudes Toward Specific Elderly Persons.....	7
Attitudes and Behaviors of Profes- sional Helpers Toward Specific Elderly Clients.....	9
The Present Study.....	10
CHAPTER 2: METHOD.....	14
Subjects.....	14
Experimental Materials.....	14
Independent Variables.....	15
Dependent Measures.....	15
1. Free responses to each client....	16
2. Judgments of standard helper responses.....	17
3. Checklist ratings.....	19
Procedure.....	20
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS.....	23
Written responses.....	23
Judgments of standard helper responses.....	24
Client assessment.....	26
Client's concerns.....	26
Adjective checklist ratings.....	29
Individual analysis by each of the six cases.....	31
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION.....	32
Effects Due to Age of the Client.....	32
Level of facilitative responses.....	32

	<u>Page</u>
Judgments of the helpfulness of standard helper responses.....	32
Assessment of the client.....	33
Age-related concerns.....	33
Personality traits.....	34
Effects of Subjects' Experience.....	34
Possible Explanations.....	35
Implications for Future Research.....	38
Strengthening the present study.....	38
Training research.....	41
 REFERENCES.....	 43
 APPENDIX A: CLIENT EXCERPTS.....	 46
 APPENDIX B: TASK #1.....	 49
 APPENDIX C: EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES--A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT.....	 55
 APPENDIX D: TASK #2.....	 58
 APPENDIX E: INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	 66
 APPENDIX F: FACE SHEET.....	 68
 APPENDIX G: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES.....	 70

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>Page</u>
Table 1:	Subjects' Mean Responses in Rating the Four Possible Combinations of Helper Responses.....	25
Table 2:	Subjects' Mean Responses on the Four Questions Related to Client Assessment as a Function of the Age of the Client..	27
Table 3:	Subjects' Mean Responses on How Concerned the Client would be About Age-Related Issues as a Function of the Client's Age.....	28
Table 4:	Mean Scale Ratings on Negative Personality Characteristics, and on Positive Personality Characteristics Associated with Stereotypes of the Elderly, as a Function of the Age of the Client.....	30
Table 5:	Analysis of Variance for Variable Empathy in the Subjects' Written Responses.....	71
Table 6:	Analysis of Variance for Variable Subjects' Ratings of the Four Standard Helping Responses.....	72
Table 7:	Analysis of Variance for Variable How Much the Subjects Liked the Client.....	73
Table 8:	Analysis of Variance for Variable How Much Professional Helpers Would Like to Work with Client.....	73
Table 9:	Analysis of Variance for Variable How Much Subject Would Like to Work with Client.....	74
Table 10:	Analysis of Variance for Variable How Typical is the Client.....	74
Table 11:	Analysis of Variance for Variable How Concerned is Client about Health...	75
Table 12:	Analysis of Variance for Variable How Concerned is Client about Dying....	75

	<u>Page</u>
Table 13: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Concerned is Client about Loneliness.....	76
Table 14: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Concerned is Client about Male Companionship.....	76
Table 15: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Concerned is Client about Physical Safety.....	77
Table 16: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Concerned is Client about Money.....	77
Table 17: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Miserly is Client.....	78
Table 18: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Dependent is Client.....	78
Table 19: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Grouchy is Client.....	79
Table 20: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Selfish is Client.....	79
Table 21: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Good does Client feel about Self.....	80
Table 22: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Complaining is Client.....	80
Table 23: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Touchy is Client.....	81
Table 24: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Productive is Client.....	81
Table 25: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Stubborn is Client.....	82
Table 26: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Meddlesome is Client.....	82
Table 27: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Rigid is Client.....	83
Table 28: Analysis of Variance for Variable How Active is Client.....	83

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This research focuses on the helping relationship between professional helpers and elderly clients. It poses the question of whether professional helpers respond differently to elderly clients than they do to other adult clients who are closer to them in age.

There is a large, predominantly survey, literature which purports to show that adults hold generally negative views toward the elderly. Literature in the clinical field also suggests that elderly people are not seen as desirable clients. By contrast, empirical work which focuses on adults' impressions of specific elderly people, and a small body of work comparing professional helpers' responses to specific elderly as opposed to adult clients, indicates that the suggested negative attitudes toward the elderly may not translate into systematic discrimination against the elderly by professional helpers.

The purpose of this study is to focus on an area of the helper-client relationship which has to date not been addressed, namely, the specific helping responses a professional would make to a client. In varying the age of the client, it will be possible to determine if age alone affects the type of response a helper makes in reply to a client

communication. Since it is possible that professional experience with the elderly might influence this relationship, whether or not the professional helper has actual work experience with the elderly will also be considered in examining the above relationship.

Review of the Literature

This section begins with a review of the major thrust of the literature, namely, the attitudes of professional helpers and the general public toward the elderly as a group or category of people. It is followed by an examination of a much smaller number of studies focused on attitudes toward specific elderly persons, and concludes with a report of the single unpublished study addressed to the helping behaviors of professionals with specific elderly clients.

Attitudes Toward the Elderly as a Group

The central and pervasive finding is the negative appraisal by both the general public and professional helpers of the elderly as a group or category of people. This negative orientation is reflected in the widespread use of the term "ageism" to describe the process of systematic stereotyping of and discriminating against old people simply because they are old. Butler (1969), for example, writes that ageism is rooted in the myths of old age (chronological, unproductivity, disengagement, inflexibility, senility, and serenity), and that it "reflects a deep-seated uneasiness on the part of the young and middle-aged--a personal revul-

sion to and distaste for growing old, disease, disability, and fear of powerlessness, uselessness, and death" (pp. 243-246). Perry (1974) refers to ageism as the prejudiced attitudes of modern society that says there is something wrong with being old, and that being old is falsely equated with being sick, senile, foolish, and useless. Palmore and Manton (1974) compare ageism with racism and sexism, arguing that because age appears to be part of the natural order of life it is least subject to change and amelioration; hence ageism grows stronger while racism and sexism grow weaker.

McTavish (1971), in his summary review of studies of the perception of the elderly until 1970, reports that the most pervasive view to be found in the literature is that age prejudice exists, presumably for the same reasons that other prejudices occur. McTavish concludes that the aged are generally viewed as

...ill, tired, not sexually interested, mentally slower, forgetful and less able to learn new things, grouchy, withdrawn, feeling sorry for themselves, less likely to participate in activities (except perhaps religion), isolated, in the least happy or fortunate time of life, unproductive, and defensive. (p. 97)

Descriptive and analytic articles emphasize the apparent linkage between negative professional attitudes toward the elderly and the reluctance of professional helpers to work with the elderly. Brody (1977), in an article on Aging in the Encyclopedia of Social Work, attributes the underrepresentation of the aged as recipients in all types of social services to the negative attitudes toward the elderly on the

part of both the professional community and the general public. Schofield (1964) writes that the preferred client for psychological helpers is the YAVIS client--Young, Attractive, Verbal, Intelligent, and Successful. Blank's (1974) review of psychiatric services for the elderly indicates that psychotherapy is seldom used as a treatment of choice, suggestive of the negative orientation of psychotherapists regarding the value of psychotherapy for the aged. Blank also reports that therapists tend to overlook and discount the strengths of the elderly in favor of emphasizing their fragility.

Blank's review supports an earlier analysis by Kastenbaum (1964) of psychotherapist neglect of the elderly. According to Kastenbaum, the "reluctant therapist," having uncritically absorbed the prevailing societal views and stereotyped conceptions toward the elderly, is: unwilling to enter into what is perceived as a low-status relationship with a low status client; reluctant to use low-status techniques (maintenance rather than growth-enhancement, support rather than insight) considered appropriate for the elderly; unwilling to become involved in a relationship anticipated as threatening and unhedonic, and one in which it is calculated that the aged client may not live long enough to "pay back" the investment in him.

Empirical studies strike essentially similar themes. Coe (1967) investigated the attitudes of a medical team (doctors, dentists, nurses, physical therapists, and social

workers) toward the aging process and elderly patients by means of a content analysis of tape recorded team sessions. From the data, he drew the following tentative conclusions: 1) professionals view the aging process as an irreversible process of deterioration; 2) professionals tend to view the aged as rigid, unadaptable, and slow to respond to treatment; and 3) therefore, therapy with the elderly is largely custodial, or, at best, palliative especially when therapeutic intervention does not produce rapid results.

Siless and Estes (1975) used a semantic differential technique with 54 staff subjects of organizations offering services to the elderly and found that their subjects viewed the aged as less potent, less active, less understandable, and of less value than youth or middle-aged groups. Cyrus-Lutz and Gaitz (1972) studied the responses of 175 psychiatrists to Golde and Kogan's (1959) Sentence Completion Procedure. They found that most introspective responses (those describing personal feelings) were either evasive and uneasy or impersonally phrased in a formal doctor-patient relationship manner. For instance, the stem, "When I am with an old person, I...", had much fewer responses and many more misreadings than other stems. Forty-five percent of the responses to such items were considered as passive and/or evasive. Among the psychiatrists' most frequently expressed negative feelings were impatience, boredom, and resentment of the physical and mental deterioration in so many of the aged.

Garfinkel (1975), in a follow-up study to Kastenbaum's

"reluctant therapist" article, used Oberledder's (1961) Attitude Toward Aging Scale (a test consisting of statements with which subjects either agree or disagree) with 30 psychotherapist subjects in a municipal hospital's psychiatric clinic. She found almost unanimous agreement to the statement, "Old people usually do not talk much." While Garfinkel's subjects held generally positive views toward the aged, she speculated that the near unanimity of belief in the "talk" item may represent a new stereotype that could serve to further insulate therapists from aged clients since a talking mode characterizes the essence of most psychotherapy.

Bergman's (1974) study of attitudes held by graduate nurses to geriatrics and psychiatry revealed a pronounced rejection of the aged as a group in comparison with other age groups. It also showed a marked preference for work with mental patients in the field of psychiatry over work with the aged in the new and lower status field of geriatrics. In a study which suggests the possibility that work experience with the elderly may serve to diminish negative attitudes, Burdman (1973) found no significant differences in views of the concepts Old Person and Average Person held by graduate gerontology trainees, whereas graduate rehabilitation counseling students with little or no work contact with the elderly regarded Old Person significantly more negatively.

While it can be seen that there is a consistent finding of a negative orientation toward the elderly as a group or

category of people, studies which focus on how people view specific elderly persons raise some questions as to the implication of this finding for the professional helping relationship. That relationship, after all, always involves a helper with a specific individual client.

Attitudes Toward Specific Elderly Persons

Three studies were found which focused on attitudes towards specific elderly persons, each producing contrasting results from the general attitudinal studies cited above.

Bell and Stanfield (1973) used the Tuckman-Lorge (1953) stereotype scale to measure attitudes of 280 college students toward a specific young adult and a specific elderly adult. After subjects had listened to a tape recorded discussion of ecology by a journalist described to some subjects as 25 years of age and to other subjects as 65 years of age, the subjects' rating was more positive for the elderly person, although no significant differences were obtained. Weineberger and Millham (1975) employed a general questionnaire with a large number of subjects to measure their attitudes toward a representative 25-year old or a representative 70-year old and obtained the customary results: older people were regarded as being less satisfied with life than younger people, as having fewer positive personality characteristics and more negative ones, as more dependent and less well-adjusted. But in a follow-up study using a substantial subgroup of subjects who read brief autobiographies of a particular 25-year old and

a particular 70-year old, the researchers found contrasting results: the older person was evaluated as being more self-accepting than the younger person, more satisfied with life, better adjusted, more adaptable, and more appealing.

Crockett, Press, and Osterkamp (in press) conducted an experiment with 245 college students to investigate the effects of deviations from stereotyped expectations upon attitudes toward specific older persons. They had their subjects read an interview in which either a 36-year old widow or a 76-year old widow talked about her life and told how she had spent the previous day, and then instructed subjects to record their impressions of the woman and to rate her on a number of scales. They found that attitudes toward the older woman were significantly more favorable than those toward the younger woman under each of the conditions created by the interview: 1) socially desirable behavior consistent with the stereotype of an older person; 2) socially desirable behavior not conventional for an older person; and 3) socially undesirable behavior consistent with the stereotype of an older person.

The consistent finding of positive attitudes toward the elderly in these three studies suggests the possibility that people can hold positive attitudes toward specific elderly persons while simultaneously holding negative attitudes toward the elderly as a category of people. It is possible, as Crockett et al., maintain, that holding positive attitudes toward specific elderly persons serves the function

of maintaining the general negative stereotype: the specific elderly person who deviates from the stereotyped expectation is perceived as an exceptional case who proves the rule.

In the face of the contradictory findings between attitudes toward the elderly as a category of people on the one hand and toward specific elderly persons on the other, the question remains as to whether and to what extent professional helpers respond differently to elderly clients compared to non-elderly adult clients. While little work appears to have been done on this, there has been a recent body of research done by Crockett and his associates which is especially relevant to the present study.

Attitudes and Behaviors of Professional Helpers Toward Specific Elderly Clients

In a series of studies using professional nurses and graduate counseling students, Crockett and his associates found that the age of the clients made virtually no differences in subject responses. Crockett and Press (1978), in the study closest to the one proposed here, had their subjects assume the role of intake workers in a multi-service community center addressing a wide variety of problems in social functioning. Subjects were presented with a typed transcript of segments of initial interviews between helpers and clients whose age was varied systematically so that each subject reviewed an interview of a specific young adult and a specific elderly adult. With different groups of subjects each interview portrayed a client from both age groups. Cases were intro-

duced in a balanced order across different groups. Following their reading of the interview, subjects filled out a referral form indicating how they would respond to the client. Would they try to resolve the problem in the 20-30 minutes available to them? What recommendations would they make for the client regarding resource people or programs to contact? Would the severity of the case warrant discussion at the next team staff meeting? What recommendations, if any, would they make to the team? Subjects were also asked to record their impressions and attitudes about the client and her situation and, further, to rate the appropriateness of a listed range of possible solutions or "strategies" for the problems portrayed. The major finding was that client age produced no consistent differences in attitudinal or behavioral responses.

The Present Study

The present study was seen as an extension of the work just cited. It both tried to make age a more salient dimension and to focus on the helper's communicative behavior, the most critical element of the helping relationship and one which is not addressed in previous studies. Special focus was on the level of the helper's facilitative responses, that is, those responses which are grounded in an empathic understanding of the client.

Empathic understanding, or accurate empathy, refers to the helper's ability to perceive and communicate accurately and with sensitivity both the current feelings and experiences

of the client and their meaning and significance to the client (Truax & Mitchell, 1971). A substantial body of research into the helping process suggests that the communication of high levels of empathic understanding is the cornerstone ingredient of a facilitative response and necessary for successful client outcomes (Rogers & others, 1967; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1976; Lewis, 1978). According to Lewis (1978), client benefits from the helper's offering of high levels of empathic understanding accrue from the growth-inducing value of feeling understood. That feeling facilitates the client's self-exploration of the problem for which help is being sought. Further, the self-exploration heightens the helper's understanding of the client by providing the helper with necessary data about the client, thereby allowing the helper to add to his own perspective on the client's problem within the context of empathic understanding.

It was thought the age of the client might make a difference in the level of facilitative and empathic responses because such responses entail the communication of certain attitudes that have been the subject of discussion up to this point. For example, empathic communication includes a desire to understand the client in the client's own terms; a willingness to participate with the client in the exploration of the client's problem; a receptivity to and acceptance of the client's feelings and experiences; an implicit respect for the client's personhood and potentiality as a problem-

solver as conveyed by a high attentiveness to and acknowledgment of what the client is saying and feeling; and a willingness to suspend judgments and to refrain from offering advice and direction until he or she has shown the client an understanding within the client's perspective. The results of the review of the literature on attitudes toward the elderly in general suggest that people, including professional helpers, hold generally negative attitudes toward the elderly, attitudes which should diminish their ability to empathize with an elderly client. On the other hand, the results of research with specific elderly people where subjects form more positive impressions of the elderly suggest that age will not make a difference or that professional helpers will be more empathic toward older compared to younger clients.

The problem of central concern, then, was whether a sample of professional helpers would react to age-differences in clients in a relatively invariant manner or whether age-differences would exert a marked effect upon certain helper responses. More specifically, the major questions posed for investigation were:

- 1) Would the level of facilitative responses offered by a sample of professional helpers to elderly clients differ from the facilitative level of their responses to non-elderly adult clients?
- 2) Would judgments by a sample of professional helpers of the helpfulness of various levels of facilitative responses to elderly clients differ from their judg-

ments of the helpfulness of responses to non-elderly adult clients?

- 3) In addition, in agreement with previous work, would the impressions formed by these helpers of older clients differ from impressions of younger ones?
- 4) Finally, a subsidiary question was raised with respect to the helper's work experience with elderly clients. Would there be differences in the above responses on the part of helpers who had prior work experience with the elderly clients compared with helpers who had no prior work experience with elderly clients?

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 48 professional social workers with MSW degrees; all are presently working in the Topeka-Lawrence-Kansas City area in the State of Kansas. Each subject was recruited from a pool of social workers attending two meetings on social work issues sponsored by the University of Kansas School of Social Welfare. They were recruited by means of brief oral announcements and a flyer inviting them to participate in a study of the helping process. Those expressing interest in participation at these times were then sent follow-up letters. Of the 63 social workers who expressed interest, 50 subjects actually took part in the study. Two people were discarded because they had not as yet received their MSW degree.

Each subject received a \$10.00 honorarium for participating. Subjects who were licensed social workers in the State of Kansas also received two continuing education credit hours for social work licensing.

Experimental Materials

Subjects were presented with two booklets, each containing the same six excerpts taken from early helping interviews between clients and professional helpers. The excerpts re-

presented expressions by clients of different problem areas in their social functioning (Appendix A). These client excerpts were selected from a set of excerpts developed by Carkhuff (1969), slightly modified to eliminate specific age characteristics. Accompanying each client excerpt was the client's name (e.g., Marian R.), her age, and a photograph of the client to make her age more salient.

Independent Variables

The main independent variable of interest was the age of the client. The three age groups used in this study were: young adult (age range 28-32), middle-age adult (age range 47-50), and elderly adult (age range 68-72 years of age). Each subject read six cases, two cases in each age group. A modified latin-square design was used to rotate age with each of the excerpts.

A second "between groups" variable of interest was whether or not the subjects had had experience working with elderly clients. Twenty-four of the subjects had had no work experience with elderly clients, while twenty-four of the subjects had had at least some work experience (ranging from three months to twenty years) with them.

Dependent Measures

Subjects were asked to respond to three different types of questions. These constituted the dependent measures for this study; they will be described below in order of importance.

1. Free responses to each client: For each client, subjects were told to place themselves in the role of the client's helper, and to imagine that they were interacting with the client during an early interview; that is, they were to act as if they themselves were directly responding to the client in a helping interview. Subjects were then instructed to write as helpful a response as possible to the client's expression, as if they were actually speaking to the client (Appendix B). These free response measures were designed to approximate how helpers would respond in an actual professional/client interaction.

These written responses provided a measure of the helper's "level of facilitative response" for that client. This was obtained by rating each written communication on a scale of empathic understanding developed by Carkhuff (1969) which has been extensively validated in research on counseling and psychotherapy (Appendix C).

The scale is constructed as an empathy continuum. The mid-point of the scale represents minimally facilitative responses; these responses are essentially interchangeable with the client's expression, in that they express essentially the same affect and meaning. Below the mid-point on the scale are responses that detract or subtract from the client's affective communication by ignoring all or a part of the client's feeling, by distorting the level of meaning, and by shifting the focus from the client's expression. Above the mid-point of the scale are responses that add to what the

client has expressed by accurately addressing the content and feeling implicit in the client's expression.

Two scorers rated each subject's protocol. The final scores were based on a consensus reached by the two scorers. To check the reliability of these scores, a third rater independently rated 48 excerpts, a sixth of the total. The correlation between the two sets of ratings was 0.76.

2. Judgments of standard helper responses. For each excerpt, Carkhuff (1969) has developed four standard helper responses (Appendix D). Each set of responses systematically varies on two dimensions: the degree of facilitation it represents and the extent to which the response is action-oriented, that is, one that offers direction to the client. Thus, each set of the standard helper responses contains the following types of responses: low facilitative-low active, low facilitative-high active, high facilitative-low active, and high facilitative-high active. The following is an example of alternative responses to one client excerpt:

Client: Those people! Who do they think they are? I just can't stand being with them anymore. Just a bunch of phonies. They leave me so frustrated. They make me so anxious. I get angry at myself. I don't even want to be bothered with them anymore. I just wish I could be honest with them and tell them all to go to hell! But I guess I just can't do it.

Helper Responses

Rate the helpfulness of each response by circling one number on the scale.

1. They really make you very angry. You wish you could handle them more effectively than you do.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

2. Damn, they make you furious! But it's just not them. It's with yourself, too, because you don't act on how you feel.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

3. Why do you feel these people are phony? What do they say to you?

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

4. Maybe society itself is at fault here--making you feel inadequate, giving you this negative view of yourself, leading you to be unable to successfully be with others.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

High facilitation is represented in the first and second responses and low facilitation in the third and fourth responses. The first response combines high facilitation with a low action orientation, while the second response contains a high facilitation-high action mix. In the third response, low facilitation is combined with a low action orientation, while the low facilitation of the fourth response is combined with a high action orientation. In the Carkhuff system, ratings are scored in terms of degree of facilitation, with the highest rating assigned to responses combining high facilitation with a high action orientation.

That is, responses offering direction to the client in the context of empathic understanding receive the highest score. Responses that are low on both facilitation and action orientation receive the lowest score. Thus, for each item scale's scores are assigned, from highest to lowest: 1) high facilitative-high active; 2) high facilitative-low active; 3) low facilitative-high active; 4) low facilitative-low active.

After writing their own preferred responses to all of the cases, subjects were asked to re-read the cases and to rate each of the four types of helper responses as to how helpful they thought each response was for the client in that situation. This rating was made on a nine-point scale, as depicted in the above example.

3. Checklist ratings. Finally, subjects made a series of ratings of each client (Appendix B). First, they responded to four questions asking a) how much they liked the client, b) how much other professional helpers would like to work with the client, c) how much they would like to work with the client, and d) how typical or not typical the client was for her age. Each of these assessments was made on a nine-point scale.

Subsequently, subjects rated the client on how concerned she would be about six issues that are related to people's stereotype of the elderly: health, physical safety, dying, money, loneliness and male companionship. Each rating was made on a nine-point scale from 1 (Not at all concerned) to

9 (Very much concerned) with the issue in question.

Finally, subjects rated each client on sixteen personality characteristics, twelve of which represent negative personality characteristics associated with stereotypes of the elderly (e.g., miserly, dependent, complaining, rigidity of attitudes, stubborn, etc.) and four of which represent positive personality characteristics associated with stereotypes of the elderly (experienced, kind, wise, and interesting). Each of these ratings was made on a nine-point scale from 1 (Definitely) to 9 (Definitely not) possessing the characteristic in question.

Procedure

The experiment was conducted in five different group sessions, each two hours in length. Groups of subjects ranged in size from seven to fifteen. After subjects had signed the Informed Consent Form (Appendix E), folders containing the experimental materials were randomly distributed.

The first and second tasks--filling out the questionnaire checklist and writing helpful responses to the six client expressions--were combined into Task #1 (Appendix B) in the following manner.

The experimenter asked the subjects to follow his reading aloud of the cover page of the instructions for the two parts of Task #1, and invited them to raise any questions that they might have. Subjects were asked to take the first of the six cases (client excerpts and photographs)

out of their folders, to read the excerpt and examine the photograph, and then to fill out the checklist questionnaire. They were then to write as helpful a response to the client as they could. After writing that response, they were to proceed in the same fashion with the five remaining cases. They were told that if they had any questions while doing the task they were to signal the experimenter by raising their hand so that the experimenter could consult privately with them and not disturb the other subjects. Subjects were informed that they had up to 50 minutes to complete the task. They were alerted to the elapsed time at 30 minutes and again at 45 minutes.

Instructions for Task #2 were given in the same manner as the preceding task. They were asked to re-read the excerpts and to rate the helpfulness of each of four possible helper responses to each one (see Appendix D).

The experimenter read aloud the cover page of instructions and asked for questions. Subjects were then informed that they had up to 15 minutes to rate the helpfulness of each set of four standard helper responses to each of the six client expressions. They were alerted to the time after 12 minutes.

A Face Sheet (Appendix F) was distributed to subjects immediately after the completion of Task #2. Subjects were requested to fill out information pertaining to their sex, date of birth, MSW degree, years of employment as a social worker, and their work experience with elderly clients; they

were then to insert the Face Sheet information into their folders containing their responses to the experimental tasks. The folders were then collected by the experimenter, who initiated a discussion with the subjects regarding the nature and purpose of the study and their reactions to the experiment.

The session was concluded with a payment of the \$10 honorarium fee to the subjects and the issuance of 2 credit-hour certificates for social work licensing in the State of Kansas.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The dependent measures were analyzed in a 2 x 3 mixed model analysis of variance design. The between groups factor was whether or not the social worker had experience working with elderly people (no experience vs. some experience); the within groups factor was the age of the client (30 vs. 50 vs. 70). Since each subject responded to six cases, two for each of the three age ranges, each dependent measure was averaged over the two cases in each age range. The source tables for each of these analyses are found in Appendix G.

Written responses. Each of the subjects' six written responses was assessed for the extent to which the subject was empathetic. Following Carkhuff (1969) this rating was made on a scale from 1 (low empathy) to 5 (high empathy) in intervals of half a scale point; thus, there were nine scale points in all. This measure constituted the main dependent variable of the study.

There were no significant differences as a function of age, the mean responses were 1.98, 1.91, and 1.98 for the 30-, 50-, and 70-year old clients, respectively ($F(2,92) = 0.63, n.s.$).

There was a marginally significant main effect for experience of the subject (means of 1.82 vs. 2.10 for no vs.

some experience respectively; $F(1,46) = 3.18, p < .10$). These results indicate that the social workers with some experience working with the elderly were able to respond more empathically to young, middle-aged, and old clients than those who have had no experience working with the elderly.

The mean level of responses in all cases also indicates a level of empathy below the minimally facilitative level (3.0) on the Carkhuff scale.

Judgments of standard helper responses. Subjects were given four possible responses a social worker might make to each client in response to the client's statement. They were asked to rate each of these responses on a nine-point scale from 1 (Not at all helpful) to 9 (Extremely helpful). In this analysis, two additional repeated measures dimensions were added: facilitativeness of the responses and action orientation of the responses.

Subjects rated the high facilitative responses as significantly more helpful than the low facilitative responses (means of 5.54 vs. 3.13 respectively; $F(1,46) = 156.10, p < .001$, see Table 1). Subjects also rated the high action responses as significantly more helpful than the low action responses, although the differences were not nearly as large (means of 4.59 vs. 4.08 respectively; $F(1,46) = 14.59, p < .001$, see Table 1). As can be seen in this table, the interaction of these two effects was not significant.

With respect to client age, contrary to expectations no interactions were found between age and type of response.

Table 1

Subjects' Mean Responses in Rating the Four
Possible Combinations of Helper Responses

		ACTION		
		<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	
FACILITATION	<u>Low</u>	2.92	3.34	3.13
	<u>High</u>	5.24	5.84	5.54
		4.08	4.59	

Neither were effects found for experience of the social worker, or the interaction of experience with age of client.

Client assessment. For each client, the subject was asked to rate the client on how much he or she liked the client, how much other professional helpers would like to work with the client, how much they themselves would like to work with the client, and how typical or untypical the client was for her age. Each of these assessments was made on a nine-point scale from 1 (Like very much or Typical for her age) to 9 (Dislike very much or Not typical for her age).

The analyses indicated that none of these four measures varied significantly as a function of age, as a function of experience, or on the interaction of experience with age (see Table 2 for the mean responses as a function of age for each of the four questions).

Client's concerns. Subjects were asked to rate how concerned each client would be on six issues that relate to people's stereotype of the elderly (see Table 3 for the issues). Each rating was made on a nine-point scale from 1 (Not at all concerned) to 9 (Very much concerned) with the issue in question.

The effects for age are shown in Table 3. With the exception of one issue (Loneliness), subjects rated the older client as being significantly more concerned with the issue in question than the younger client. For the concerns of health, dying and safety, the middle-aged (50-year old)

Table 2

Subjects' Mean Responses on the Four Questions
 Related to Client Assessment as a Function
 of the Age of the Client

	<u>Age</u>			F- value	P- value
	30	50	70		
Do you think you would like or dislike this person?	3.41	3.56	3.25	1.51	n.s.
Do you think professional helpers would like or dislike to work with this person?	3.23	3.56	3.44	0.88	n.s.
Do you think you would like or dislike to work with this person?	3.08	3.27	3.16	0.40	n.s.
Do you think this person is typical or not typical for her age?	4.51	4.57	4.44	0.41	n.s.

Table 3

Subjects' Mean Responses on How Concerned the
Client would be About Age-Related Issues
as a Function of the Client's Age¹

Concern About	<u>Age</u>			F- value	P- value
	30	50	70		
Health	4.26a	5.15b	6.23c	27.73	< .001
Dying	3.83a	4.99b	6.59c	70.69	< .001
Loneliness	7.30	7.20	7.14	.25	n.s.
Male Companionship	6.33b	5.59a	5.43a	6.95	< .01
Safety	3.94a	4.49b	5.62c	20.55	< .001
Money	4.62a	4.77a	5.41b	5.86	< .01

¹

A higher score indicates greater concern.

client was rated as being significantly less concerned than the 30-year old, and significantly less concerned than the 70-year old. For male companionship, the 50- and 70-year olds were rated identically; and for money, the 50- and 30-year olds were rated identically. Thus these results indicate that with one exception, in which no differences due to age were found, the older clients were perceived in a "stereotypic" way on these concerns.

No main effects or interactions were found as a function of experience.

Adjective checklist ratings. Subjects rated each of the clients on twelve dimensions representing negative personality characteristics associated with stereotypes of the elderly, and on four dimensions associated with positive stereotypes of the elderly. Each of these ratings was made on a nine-point scale from 1 (Definitely) to 9 (Definitely not) possessing the characteristic in question.

The results for age are presented in Table 4. On the three dimensions in which the effect for age was significant (How selfish, How good does the client feel about herself, and How active), the older client was rated as less selfish, as feeling better about herself, and as more active than the young client. All three of these effects were counter to the stereotype associated with the elderly. In all three cases, the response for the middle-aged client was between the other two responses, and close to the response for the old client.

Table 4

Mean Scale Ratings on Negative Personality Characteristics,
and on Positive Personality Characteristics Associated
With Stereotypes of the Elderly, as a Function of
the Age of the Client¹

Personality Characteristics	Age			F- value	P- value	
	30	50	70			
	How miserly	5.47	5.51	5.64	.022	n.s.
N	How dependent	3.16	3.53	3.64	2.16	n.s.
E	How grouchy	4.73	5.20	4.79	1.72	n.s.
G	How selfish	4.73a	5.12a,b	5.32b	3.21	< .05
A	How good feels about self ²	6.91c	6.32b	5.73a	10.73	< .001
T	How complaining	4.10	4.41	4.29	.39	n.s.
I	How touchy	3.62	4.01	4.06	2.02	n.s.
V	How productive ²	4.77	4.40	4.51	1.30	n.s.
E	How stubborn	4.75	4.73	4.88	.17	n.s.
	How meddlesome	5.74a	5.26a	5.66a	2.40	< .10
	How rigid	4.62	4.48	4.45	.25	n.s.
	How active ²	4.88b	4.36a	4.23a	3.54	< .05
P	How interesting	3.85a,b	4.02b	3.44a	4.19	< .05
O	How experienced	5.05b	4.18a	3.83a	12.12	< .001
S	How wise	5.30b	4.62a	4.41a	7.07	< .01
I	How kind	4.52	4.33	4.00	2.10	n.s.
V						
E						

¹

A low score indicates greater possession of the attribute.

²

The reverse of the negative stereotype.

Significant effects for age were found on three of the four positive personality characteristics (How interesting, How experienced and How wise). The older person was rated as significantly more experienced and wiser than the young client, while not differing from the middle-aged client. The old client was seen as significantly more interesting than the middle-aged client, with neither of these age groups differing from the young client on this dimension.

No effects were found for experience or the interaction of experience with age.

Individual analysis by each of the six cases. Despite the lack of age effects overall, it is still possible that in analyzing each case separately, age effects will be found. To check this, each of the six cases was analyzed separately on all the dependent measures in a 2 x 3 between groups design. The results were quite consistent with those already presented. In particular, none of the cases showed any consistent pattern of results due to age not already found in the overall analysis.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This chapter contains a discussion of the results and the implications of the study for future research.

Effects Due to Age of the Client

Contrary to expectations no age effects were found on 1) the subjects' level of facilitative responses; 2) their judgments of the helpfulness of standard helper responses; and 3) their assessment of the client on liking and age-typicalness dimensions; in agreement with previous research, age effects were found on a number of personality traits and on age-related concerns.

Level of facilitative responses. The client's age made no difference in the subjects' level of facilitative responses on their written communication responses. It is also worth noting that the actual levels of facilitative responses for each age-group (mean responses of 1.98, 1.91, 1.98 for young adult, middle-aged, and elderly clients respectively) were considerably below the minimal level of helpfulness (3.0) on the Carkhuff scale. This is in agreement with Carkhuff's (1969) finding with a variety of professional and untrained helpers.

Judgments of the helpfulness of standard helper responses. Again, the age of the client did not affect the

manner in which subjects rated the helpfulness of sets of alternative helper responses. Consistent with the Carkhuff assumptions, subjects rated the responses in the following order of helpfulness, from most helpful to least helpful: 1) high facilitative-high active; 2) high facilitative-low active; 3) low facilitative-high active; and 4) low facilitative-low active.

Assessment of the client. The client's age was also not a factor in the subjects' assessment of the client: no significant differences were found as a function of age on how much subjects liked the client, on how much they and other professional helpers would like to work with the client, and on how typical or not typical the client was for her age.

As noted earlier, the age of the client did have a significant effect on two sets of measures pertaining to the impression of clients--age-related concerns and personality traits.

Age-related concerns. For five of six age-related concerns associated with elderly stereotypes, there was a linear relationship between the client's age and subjects' ratings; subjects viewed elderly clients as being more concerned than young clients about health, dying, physical safety, and money, and less concerned about male companionship. These ratings were consistent with elderly stereotypes and with the findings from previous studies (Crockett, Press & Osterkamp, in press; Press, Osterkamp & Crockett, 1978).

Personality traits. For six of sixteen personality traits associated with elderly stereotypes, there were significant effects due to client age; for three of the four positive traits associated with stereotypes of the elderly, and for three of the twelve negative traits, subjects rated elderly clients more positively than young adult clients.

Effects of Subjects' Experience

Only one effect was found between those subjects who had had previous work experience with the elderly and those who had none, and that reached only a marginal level of significance. Experienced subjects had a somewhat higher level of facilitative responses in their written communication than non-experienced subjects. Of more importance is the finding that there was no interaction between degree of experience and age of the client on any of the measures used in the study. Thus, work experience with elderly clients does not seem to affect either the clinical judgment or the impressions formed of elderly clients.

Thus, while the subjects of this study did form somewhat different impressions of elderly clients, these differences apparently had no effect on the subjects' level of facilitative responses nor on their judgments of the helpfulness of a range of helper responses in the context of helping interviews. There were also no differences in the subjects' overall liking for the client and assessment of the client's typicalness. Thus, the results offer little support for the idea that the age of the client by itself makes a

difference in specific helping responses and judgments.

This pattern of results is consistent with the results obtained in related research by Crockett and Press (1978). These authors found little or no age-related differences in the type and quality treatment offered by their nurse subjects even as they held generally more favorable impressions of elderly patients than of younger patients.

Possible Explanations

What can be made of the findings is that there were age-related effects on impressions of clients, but no such effects appeared on helping responses and judgments in the helping interview.

One explanation may be that the subjects' stereotypes and impressions of elderly clients were rather lightly held, serving more as tentative hunches about what the clients might be like than as strong convictions about them. It should be noted, for example, that despite their more positive impressions of elderly clients on a number of personality traits, subjects did not have a more positive overall assessment of elderly clients than young ones. Subjects neither had a greater liking for elderly clients compared to younger ones, nor did they express a stronger desire to work with them.

Perhaps part of the explanation lies in the fact that they are predisposed to form positive impressions of individual elderly people, particularly those who deviate from their expectations in a positive way. This would support the

finding of Crockett, Press and Osterkamp (in press), in which such an effect was hypothesized and found. However, that interpretation would suggest that the elderly clients should be rated as less typical than the younger clients; no differences were found for age along this dimension.

Looking at this study in the context of similar work already carried out (see Crockett & Press, 1978 for a description of these studies), the similarity of the results found here to those studies done with counselors and nurses suggest that biases toward the elderly may not be manifested in the actual professional actions of helpers. There may sometimes be behaviors which elderly people exhibit that elicit negative responses on the part of helpers (e.g., irritableness, behavior which suggests senility, inability to carry out directions, etc.). The results of these several studies, however, suggest that it is the negative behavior which is being responded to either positively or negatively, not the age of the subject per se. While some behaviors may occur more often in older than in younger people, when the behaviors are held constant, as in studies like the present one, no effects occur for age alone.

Thus, the pervasive bias that some writers believe exists toward the elderly seems to have little support from this present piece of work.

There is one dimension of this study that merits further comment, that relating to the lack of differences due to age

(and in particular the fact that no differences existed across cases either) in the subjects' level of facilitative responses. This may be due in part to the restricted range of their responses subjects made to all clients, as measured on the Carkhuff empathy scale: In examining the distribution of scores, it was found that the scores clustered heavily at the low end of the scale, below the minimally facilitative level of 3.0. This could be a consequence of the subjects' low level of empathic skill, but it could also reflect some limitations in the study design.

One problem could lie in this study's use of a written format. The written format raises the question of whether essential nonverbal material might be lost in the transmission of messages between client and subject. In particular, nonverbal affective expression would be lost in this type of measurement. Several studies have demonstrated that nonverbal behavior is a crucial component of people's perception of empathy and other personal dimensions of helping (Strong et al., 1971; Haase & Tepper, 1972; Shapiro et al., 1968; Schmidt & Strong, 1970). Also, while a written format utilizing the Carkhuff scale has been a reliable means for differentiating high levels of facilitative communicators from low levels, Carkhuff (1969) has reported that high-level helpers, unlike low-level helpers, were much more accurate and spontaneous when they had the benefit of the client's feedback and when they were tested over several responses in an extended interview. Thus the written format

in this study, along with its asking for a single helper response to a single stimulus expression by each client, may have inhibited the emergence of a wider range of helper responses. Finally, the single stimulus expression by each client may have provided insufficient data about content and feelings and the arousal of highly charged emotions (anger, fear, impatience, personal animosity, etc.) which are widely regarded as major barriers to facilitative communication (Egan, 1976; Lewis, 1978). It is possible that helpers' biases toward working with the elderly emerge only when they are strongly aroused in a specific situation.

Implications for Future Research

The results suggest the profitability of at least two lines of research. Both would maintain the present study's focus on the helper's communication to the elderly client, on the grounds that the helper's communicative behavior is a decisive factor in determining success or failure of the helping interview. One line of inquiry would represent a direct extension and strengthening of the present study. The other line of inquiry would take the form of a training program designed to test the efficacy of training professional helpers in the enhancement of their communication skills with elderly clients.

Strengthening the present study. The present study could be strengthened in the following ways:

1. By investigating the effects of variations in the behaviors of elderly clients rather than

age alone, on the quality or level of the helper's facilitative responses. The present study strongly suggests that age by itself is not a critical factor in determining responses. However, when certain behaviors are combined with age--e.g., irritableness, chronic grief, and hopelessness--they may produce age-by-behavior interaction effects upon professional responses.

2. By heightening the real-life characteristics of a simulated helping interview. This could be done by the use of audio-visual recordings (sound film or videotape) rather than the written format used in the present study, and by extending the time period of the interview beyond the present study's single client stimulus expression and single helper response.

To illustrate: Procedures could be adapted from Strupp's (1973) research into the helping process. Thus four 15-minute audio-visual recordings, each portraying an enactment of a helping interview between a different elderly client and a helper, would be shown to subjects. The helper's contribution would be kept to a minimum by presenting him or her as a minimal facilitator of communication rather than as an interpreter of behavior. In the interest of economy and maximum standardization of information available to subjects, no information about the clients would be given apart from the transactions in the interview. The subjects' res-

ponses would be obtained by interrupting the film at a number of stopping points for 30 seconds. During these times, subjects would respond to the uniform title on the screen: "What Would You Do?". They would then respond in the helper's role into their own hand microphone connected to a tape recorder in the 30 seconds allotted to them. If they preferred to remain silent or to communicate non-verbally at any point of interruption, they could do so. In that event, they would be requested to say, "No Comment," and/or to describe their gestures. Following each recording, subjects would be requested to complete a questionnaire relating to their attitudes toward the client, their diagnostic impressions, clinical judgments, and treatment plans.

This design would appear to have several advantages over the present one. First, in investigating the effects of variations in the behavior of elderly clients on specific helping responses it would more likely yield insight into the effects, if any, of the subjects' stereotypes and initial expectations of the elderly. Second, the audio-visual format would seem to provide a closer approximation of a real-life helping interview. The heightened simulation would likely serve to capture more of the rich nonverbal material lost in a written format, increase the subjects' personal and emotional involvement, and would likely yield not only more typical helper behaviors but a wider range of facilitative responses. Thus the subjects' responses, as Carkhuff's (1969) research has indicated, would more likely have

greater variations with respect to accuracy and spontaneity as high-level communicators increase their differentiation from low-level communicators. Finally, the extended interview format in the proposed study would likely be a factor in differentiating helper responses; for each of the four audio-visual presentations, subjects would have up to six responses. This is a sizeable increase over the present study in which subjects made a single response to each of six client statements. This increase would likely serve to further differentiate high-level communicators from low-level communicators since high-level communicators have a wider repertoire of responses available to them.

Training research. The second line of inquiry, testing the efficacy of training professional helpers in the enhancement of their communication skills with elderly clients, follows from the present study's results concerning the subjects' low scores on the empathy scale for all client age-groups. These scores fall well below the minimal level of facilitation and strongly suggest the need for further professional training in facilitative communication.

A considerable body of research evidence on the efficacy of such training has accumulated within the past decade, as has a well-developed training technology (Carkhuff, 1969; Aspy, 1975; Hammond, Hepworth & Smith, 1977; Fischer, 1978). The strength of the evidence led Aspy to entitle his article summarizing training effects in counseling and education, "Empathy: Let's Get the Hell on With It." That exhortation

would seem to be especially applicable for work with the elderly since none of the substantial published research has focused on this neglected age-group.

REFERENCES

- Aspy, D.N. Empathy: Let's get the hell on with it. The Counseling Psychologist, 1975, 5(2), 10-14.
- Bell, B. D. & Stanfield, G. G. The aging stereotype in experimental perspective. The Gerontologist, 1973, 13, 341-344.
- Bergman, S. Nursing attitudes to psychiatry and geriatrics as preferred work areas with deviant groups. Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines, 1974, 12(2), 156-160.
- Blank, M. L. Raising the age barrier to psychotherapy. Geriatrics, 1974, 29(11), 147-148.
- Brody, E. M. Aging. Encyclopedia of Social Work, 17th edition. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1977, 55-78.
- Burdman, G. D. M. Student and trainee attitudes on aging. The Gerontologist, 1974, 14(1), 65-68.
- Butler, R. N. Age-ism: Another form of bigotry. The Gerontologist, 1969, 9(4), 243-246.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and human relations, Vol. 1, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Carkhuff, R. R. & Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and therapy, 2nd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1976.
- Coe, R. M. Professional perspectives on the aged. The Gerontologist, 1967, 7, 116-119.
- Crockett, W. H. & Press, A. N. Effects of attitudes toward older persons upon the behavior of service delivery personnel. Final Report to the Administration on Aging, National Institutes of Health, Grant #90-A-1008, 1978.
- Crockett, W. H., Press, A. N. & Osterkamp, M. B. The effect of deviations from stereotyped expectations upon attitudes toward older persons. Journal of Gerontology, in press.
- Cyrus-Lutz, C. & Gaitz, C. Psychiatrists' attitudes toward the aged and aging. The Gerontologist, 1972, 12(2), 163-167.

- Egan, G. The skilled helper. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1975.
- Fischer, J. Effective casework: An eclectic approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Garfinkel, R. The reluctant therapist. The Gerontologist, 1975, 15(2), 136-137.
- Golde, P. & Kogan, N. A sentence completion procedure for assessing attitudes toward old people. Journal of Gerontology, 1959, 14, 355-363.
- Haase, R. F. & Tepper, D. T. Nonverbal components of empathic communication. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 417-424.
- Hammond, D. C., Hepworth, D. H., & Smith, V. G. Improving therapeutic communication. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Kastenbaum, R. The reluctant therapist. In R. Kastenbaum (Ed.), New thoughts on old age. New York: Springer, 1964, 139-145.
- Lewis, J. M. To be a therapist: The teaching and learning. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1978.
- McTavish, D. Perceptions of old people: A review of research methodologies and findings. The Gerontologist, 1971, 11(4), 90-102.
- Oberledder, M. An attitude scale to determine adjustment in institutions for the aged. Journal of Chronic Diseases, 1961, 15, 915-923.
- Palmore, E. B. & Manton, K. Modernization of the status of the aged: International correlations. Journal of Gerontology, 1974, 29, 205-210.
- Perry, P. W. The night of ageism. Mental Hygiene, 1974, 58(3), 13-20.
- Press, A. N., Osterkamp, M. B. & Crockett, W. H. Stereotypes and impressions of the elderly. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association. Toronto, Canada, August, 1978.
- Rogers, C. R., Gendlin, E. T., Kiesler, D. J., & Truax, C. B. (Eds.), The therapeutic relationship and its impact. A study of psychotherapy with schizophrenics. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

- Schmidt, L. D. & Strong, S. R. 'Expert' and 'inexpert' counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 115-118.
- Schofield, W. Psychotherapy: The purchase of friendship. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Shapiro, J. G. Relationship between visual and auditory cues of therapeutic effectiveness. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 233-236.
- Siless, S. & Estes, C. L. Perceptions of the aged, adults, and youth: The attitudes of persons working in the field of aging. The Gerontologist, 1973, 13(3), 82.
- Strong, S. R., et al. Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor characteristics. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 554-561.
- Strupp, H. H. Psychotherapy: Clinical, research, and theoretical issues. New York: Jason Aronson, 1973.
- Truax, C. B. & Carkhuff, R. R. Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine, 1967.
- Truax, C. B. & Mitchell, K. Research on certain interpersonal skills in relation to process and outcome. In A. Bergin and S. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of Psychotherapy and behavior change. New York: Wiley, 1971, 299-344.
- Tuckman, J. & Lorge, I. Attitudes toward old people. Journal of Social Psychology, 1953, 37, 249-260.
- Weinberger, L. E. & Millham, J. A multi-dimensional, multiple method analysis of attitudes toward the elderly. Journal of Gerontology, 1975, 30, 343-348.

APPENDIX A
CLIENT EXCERPTS



The excerpt below is of Marian R., who is 31 years of age.

Client: He is ridiculous! Everything has to be done when he wants to do it, the way he wants it done. It's as if nobody else exists. It's everything he wants to do. There is a range of things I have to do--not just be a housewife and take care of the house. Oh no, I have to do his typing for him, errands for

him. If I don't do it right away, I'm stupid--I'm not a good wife or something stupid like that. I have an identity of my own, and I'm not going to have it wrapped up in him. It makes me--it infuriates me! I want to punch him right in the mouth. What am I going to do? Who does he think he is anyway?



The excerpt below is of Barbara L., who is 72 years of age.

Client: I'm so thrilled to have found a social worker like you. I didn't know any existed. You seem to understand me so well. It's just great! I feel like I'm coming alive again.



The excerpt below is of Helen A., who is 46 years of age.

Client: I don't know if I am right or wrong feeling the way I do. But I find myself withdrawing from people. I don't seem to socialize anymore. I get upset and come home depressed and have headaches. It all seems so superficial. There was a time when I used

to get along with everybody. Everybody said, "Isn't she wonderful. She gets along with everybody. Everybody likes her." I used to think that was something to be really proud of, but that was who I was at that time. I had no depth. I was what the crowd wanted me to be.

The excerpt below is of Elizabeth D., who is 73 years of age.



Client: Those people! Who do they think they are? I just can't stand being with them anymore. Just a bunch of phonies. They leave me so frustrated. They make me so anxious. I get angry at myself. I don't even want to be bothered with them anymore. I just wish I could be honest with them and tell them all to go to hell! But I guess I just can't do it.

The excerpt below is of June C., who is 48 years of age.



Client: I finally found some people I can really get along with. There is no pretentiousness about them at all. They are real and they understand me. I can be myself with them. I don't have to worry about what I say and that they might take me wrong, because I do some-

times say things that don't come out the way I want them to. I don't have to worry that they are going to criticize me. They are just marvelous people! I just can't wait to be with them! For once I actually enjoy going out and mixing. I didn't think I could ever find people like this again. I can really be myself. It's such a wonderful feeling not to have people criticizing you for everything you say that doesn't agree with them. They are warm and understanding, and I just love them! It's just marvelous!

The excerpt below is of Doris W., who is 33 years of age.



Client: I'm so disappointed. I thought we could get along together and you could help me. We don't seem to be getting anywhere. You don't understand me. You don't know I'm here. I don't even think you care for me. You don't hear me when I talk. You seem to be somewhere else. I don't know where to

turn. I'm just so--doggone it--I don't know what I'm going to do, but I know you can't help me. There is just no hope.

APPENDIX B

TASK #1

Task #1

Introduction and Instructions

On the following pages there is an excerpt taken from an early helping interview between a client and a professional helper. The excerpt represents an expression by the client in a problem area. A photograph of the client accompanies the excerpt to assist you in doing the task described below. The task is in two parts, as follows:

1. On the first page there is the client excerpt and photograph, followed by a number of questions asking you about your impression of the client.

Read the excerpt and look at the photograph. Then answer each question about the client by checking (✓) the one most appropriate place on the scale accompanying each question. Make only one check for each question. Please be sure to answer every question.

2. On the fourth page, there is the same client excerpt and photograph.

In the task, place yourself in the role of the helper. This client is seeking assistance from you in a time of need. Imagine that you are actually interacting with the client at an early interview. Read the client excerpt and look at the client's photograph as if she were speaking directly to you. Then write as helpful a response as you can as if you were speaking directly to the client.



The excerpt below is of Barbara L., who is 30 years of age.

Client: I'm so thrilled to have found a social worker like you. I didn't know any existed. You seem to understand me so well. It's just great! I feel like I'm coming alive again. I have not felt like this in so long.

Do you think you would like or dislike this person?
(Check appropriate place.)

Like very _____
much

Dislike _____
very much

Do you think professional helpers would like or dislike to work with this person?

Like very _____
much

Dislike _____
very much

Do you think you would like or dislike to work with this person?

Like very _____
much

Dislike _____
very much

Do you think this person is typical or not typical for her age?

Typical for _____
her age

Not typical _____
for her age

People may express concern about a variety of things when they are really concerned with other things. To what extent do you think this person is concerned about each of the following:

- | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| 1. Health: | <u> </u>
Not at all
concerned | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Very much
concerned |
| 2. Physical safety: | <u> </u>
Not at all
concerned | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Very much
concerned |
| 3. Dying: | <u> </u>
Not at all
concerned | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Very much
concerned |
| 4. Money: | <u> </u>
Not at all
concerned | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Very much
concerned |
| 5. Loneliness: | <u> </u>
Not at all
concerned | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Very much
concerned |
| 6. Male companionship: | <u> </u>
Not at all
concerned | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Very much
concerned |

Below are a number of characteristics that describe people's personalities. For each one please check to what extent this person would have that characteristic or not.

- | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| 1. Miserly: | <u> </u>
Definitely
miserly | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Definitely
not miserly |
| 2. Experienced: | <u> </u>
Definitely
experienced | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Definitely
not experienced |
| 3. Kind: | <u> </u>
Definitely
kind | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Definitely
not kind |
| 4. Dependent: | <u> </u>
Definitely
dependent | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Definitely
not dependent |
| 5. Feels good about self: | <u> </u>
Definitely
feels good
about self | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Definitely
does not feel
good about self |
| 6. Complaining: | <u> </u>
Definitely
complaining | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u>
Definitely
not complaining |

- | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| 7. Active: | <u>Definitely</u>
active | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not active |
| 8. Rigidity of attitudes: | <u>Definitely</u>
rigid | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not rigid |
| 9. Touchy: | <u>Definitely</u>
touchy | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not touchy |
| 10. Productive: | <u>Definitely</u>
productive | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not productive |
| 11. Inconsistent: | <u>Definitely</u>
inconsistent | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not inconsistent |
| 12. Friendly: | <u>Definitely</u>
friendly | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not friendly |
| 13. Grouchy: | <u>Definitely</u>
grouchy | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not grouchy |
| 14. Agreeable: | <u>Definitely</u>
agreeable | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not agreeable |
| 15. Selfish: | <u>Definitely</u>
selfish | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not selfish |
| 16. Unpredictable: | <u>Definitely</u>
unpredictable | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not unpredictable |
| 17. Meddlesome: | <u>Definitely</u>
meddlesome | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not meddlesome |
| 18. Stubborn: | <u>Definitely</u>
stubborn | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not stubborn |
| 19. Wise: | <u>Definitely</u>
wise | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not wise |
| 20. Interesting: | <u>Definitely</u>
interesting | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u>Definitely</u>
not interesting |



The excerpt below is of Barbara L., who is 30 years of age.

Client: I'm so thrilled to have found a social worker like you. I didn't know any existed. You seem to understand me so well. It's just great! I feel like I'm coming alive again. I have not felt like this in so long.

Response:

APPENDIX C

EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

**EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT¹**

Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper either *do not attend to* or *detract significantly from* the verbal and behavioral expressions of the helpee(s) in that they communicate significantly less of the helpee's feelings and experiences than the helpee has communicated himself.

EXAMPLE: The helper communicates no awareness of even the most obvious, expressed surface feelings of the helpee. The helper may be bored or disinterested or simply operating from a preconceived frame of reference which totally excludes that of the helpee(s).

In summary, the helper does everything but express that he is listening, understanding, or being sensitive to even the most obvious feelings of the helpee in such a way as to detract significantly from the communications of the helpee.

Level 2

While the helper responds to the expressed feelings of the helpee(s), he does so in such a way that he *subtracts noticeable affect* from the communications of the helpee.

EXAMPLE: The helper may communicate some awareness of obvious, surface feelings of the helpee, but his communications drain off a level of the affect and distort the level of meaning. The helper may communicate his own ideas of what may be going on, but these are not congruent with the expressions of the helpee.

In summary, the helper tends to respond to other than what the helpee is expressing or indicating.

Level 3

The expressions of the helper in response to the expressions of the helpee(s) are essentially *interchangeable* with those of the helpee in that they express essentially the same affect and meaning.

EXAMPLE: The helper responds with accurate understanding of the surface feelings of the helpee but may not respond to or may misinterpret the deeper feelings.

In summary, the helper is responding so as to neither subtract from nor add to the expressions of the helpee. He does not respond accurately to how that

person really feels beneath the surface feelings; but he indicates a willingness and openness to do so. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The responses of the helper *add noticeably* to the expressions of the helpee(s) in such a way as to express feelings a level deeper than the helpee was able to express himself.

EXAMPLE: The helper communicates his understanding of the expressions of the helpee at a level deeper than they were expressed and thus enables the helpee to experience and/or express feelings he was unable to express previously.

In summary, the helper's responses add deeper feeling and meaning to the expressions of the helpee.

Level 5

The helper's responses *add significantly* to the feeling and meaning of the expressions of the helpee(s) in such a way as to accurately express feelings levels below what the helpee himself was able to express or, in the event of ongoing, deep self-exploration on the helpee's part, to be fully with him in his deepest moments.

EXAMPLE: The helper responds with accuracy to all of the helpee's deeper as well as surface feelings. He is "tuned in" on the helpee's wave length. The helper and the helpee might proceed together to explore previously unexplored areas of human existence.

In summary, the helper is responding with a full awareness of who the other person is and with a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of that individual's deepest feelings.

APPENDIX D

TASK #2

Task #2

Introduction and Instructions

On the following pages there are several excerpts taken from early helping interviews between clients and professional helpers. The excerpts represent a) expressions by clients on different problem areas and b) four (4) helper responses to each client expression. A photograph of each client accompanies each excerpt to assist you in doing the task described below.

Imagine that you are observing the interaction between the client and the helper. Read each client expression using the client's photograph to help you visualize that expression. Read each of the four (4) helper responses to each client expression. Then use the scale following each response to rate how helpful you think each response is for the client. Rate by circling the one number on the scale that best reflects your judgment.



The excerpt below is of Marian R., who is 31 years of age.

Client: He is ridiculous! Everything has to be done when he wants to do it, the way he wants it done. It's as if nobody else exists. It's everything he wants to do. There is a range of things I have to do--not just be a housewife and take care of the house. Oh no, I have to do his typing for him, errands for

him. If I don't do it right away, I'm stupid--I'm not a good wife or something stupid like that. I have an identity of my own, and I'm not going to have it wrapped up in him. It makes me--it infuriates me! I want to punch him right in the mouth. What am I going to do? Who does he think he is anyway?

Helper Responses

Rate the helpfulness of each response by circling one number on the scale.

1. It really angers you when you realize in how many ways he has taken advantage of you.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

2. Tell me, what is your concept of a good marriage?

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

3. Your husband makes you feel inferior in your own eyes. You feel incompetent. In many ways you make him sound like a very cruel and destructive man.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

4. It makes you furious when you think of the one-sidedness of this relationship. He imposes upon you everywhere, particularly in your own struggle for your own identity. And you don't know where this relationship is going.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful



The excerpt below is of Barbara L., who is 72 years of age.

Client: I'm so thrilled to have found a social worker like you. I didn't know any existed. You seem to understand me so well. It's just great! I feel like I'm coming alive again. I have not felt like this in so long.

Helper Responses

Rate the helpfulness of each response by circling one number on the scale.

1. Gratitude is a natural emotion.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

2. This is quite nice but remember, unless extreme caution is exercised, you may find yourself moving in the other direction.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

3. That's a good feeling.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

4. Hey, I'm as thrilled to hear you talk this way as you are! I'm pleased that I have been helpful. I do think we still have some work to do yet, though.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful



The excerpt below is of Helen A., who is 46 years of age.

Client: I don't know if I am right or wrong feeling the way I do. But I find myself withdrawing from people. I don't seem to socialize anymore. I get upset and come home depressed and have headaches. It all seems so superficial. There was a time when I used

to get along with everybody. Everybody said, "Isn't she wonderful. She gets along with everybody. Everybody likes her." I used to think that was something to be really proud of, but that was who I was at that time. I had no depth. I was what the crowd wanted me to be.

Helper Responses

Rate the helpfulness of each response by circling one number on the scale.

1. You know you have changed a lot. There are a lot of things you want to do but no longer can.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

2. You are damned sure who you can't be any longer but you are not sure who you are. Still hesitant as to who you are and what you can do now.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

3. Who are these people that make you so angry? Why don't you tell them where to get off! They can't control your existence. You have to be your own person.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

4. So you have a social problem involving interpersonal difficulties with others.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful



The excerpt below is of Elizabeth D., who is 73 years of age.

Client: Those people! Who do they think they are? I just can't stand being with them anymore. Just a bunch of phonies. They leave me so frustrated. They make me so anxious. I get angry at myself. I don't even want to be bothered with them anymore. I just wish I could be honest with them and tell them all to go to hell! But I guess I just can't do it.

Helper Responses

Rate the helpfulness of each response by circling one number on the scale.

1. They really make you very angry. You wish you could handle them more effectively than you do.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

2. Damn, they make you furious! But it's just not them. It's with yourself, too, because you don't act on how you feel.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

3. Why do you feel these people are phony? What do they say to you?

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

4. Maybe society itself is at fault here--making you feel inadequate, giving you this negative view of yourself, leading you to be unable to successfully be with others.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful



The excerpt below is of June C., who is 48 years of age.

Client: I finally found some people I can really get along with. There is no pretentiousness about them at all. They are real and they understand me. I can be myself with them. I don't have to worry about what I say and that they might take me wrong, because I do some-

times say things that don't come out the way I want them to. I don't have to worry that they are going to criticize me. They are just marvelous people! I just can't wait to be with them! For once I actually enjoy going out and mixing. I didn't think I could ever find people like this again. I can really be myself. It's such a wonderful feeling not to have people criticizing you for everything you say that doesn't agree with them. They are warm and understanding, and I just love them! It's just marvelous!

Helper Responses

Rate the helpfulness of each response by circling one number on the scale.

1. Sounds like you found some people who really matter to you.

Not at all helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Extremely helpful
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

2. Why do these kind of people accept you?

Not at all helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Extremely helpful
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

3. That's a real good feeling to have someone to trust and share with.
"Finally, I can be myself."

Not at all helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Extremely helpful
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

4. Now that you have found these people who enjoy you and whom you enjoy, spend your time with these people. Forget about the other types who make you anxious. Spend your time with the people who can understand and be warm with you

Not at all helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Extremely helpful
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------



The excerpt below is of Doris W., who is 33 years of age.

Client: I'm so disappointed. I thought we could get along together and you could help me. We don't seem to be getting anywhere. You don't understand me. You don't know I'm here. I don't even think you care for me. You don't hear me when I talk. You seem to be somewhere else. I don't know where to

turn. I'm just so--doggone it--I don't know what I'm going to do, but I know you can't help me. There is just no hope.

Helper Responses

Rate the helpfulness of each response below by circling one number on the scale.

1. I have no reason to try and not to help you. I have every reason to want to help you.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

2. Only when we establish mutual understanding and trust and only then can we proceed to work on your problem effectively.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

3. It's disappointing and disillusioning to think you have made so little progress.

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

4. I feel badly that you feel that way. I do want to help. I'm wondering, "Is it me? Is it you, both of us?" Can we work something out?

Not at all helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extremely helpful

APPENDIX E
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in this project. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate you are free to withdraw at any time.

The study is concerned with the helping process. You will be asked to do three tasks related to that process. In one, you will be asked to write helpful responses to a number of written stimulus expressions representing clients seeking assistance in a time of need. In another, you will be asked to rate the helpfulness of written responses made by professional helpers to client stimulus expressions. In the third task, you will be asked to record your impressions of each client on a check list. Your anonymity will be preserved on all the data you provide.

Your participation is solicited, but is strictly voluntary. Do not hesitate to ask any questions about the study. Be assured that your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings. Your cooperation is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Goodwin P. Garfield
Principal Investigator

Signature of subject agreeing to participate

APPENDIX F
FACE SHEET

Please fill in the information requested.

1. Sex: Male _____; Female _____
2. Date of birth: _____/_____/_____
 mo. day year
3. Do you have a MSW degree: Yes _____; No _____?
4. If yes to #3, year obtained: _____
5. Since receipt of your MSW degree, how many years have you been employed as a social worker? _____
6. Have you worked in a direct service role with the elderly? Yes _____; No _____
7. If yes to #6, for how long? _____
8. Have you worked in behalf of the elderly as an administrator, supervisor, or trainer? Yes _____; No _____
9. If yes to #8, for how long? _____

APPENDIX G
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

Table 5
 Analysis of Variance for Variable
 Empathy in the Subjects' Written Responses

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	1.83		
Experience (Ex)	1	5.56	3.18	< .10
Error Between	46	1.75		
Within	240	0.30		
Age (A)	2	0.19	0.63	
Ex x A	2	0.35	1.12	
Error Within	92	0.31		

Table 6

Analysis of Variance for Variable
Subjects' Ratings of the Four Standard Helping Responses

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	12.95		
Experience (Ex)	1	1.32	0.10	
Error Between	46	13.20		
Within	1104	6.61		
Age (A)	2	1.99	0.74	
Ex x A	2	3.02	1.13	
Error (A)	92	2.68		
Facilitation (Fa)	1	1665.12	156.10	< .001
Ex x Fa	1	9.57	0.90	
Error (Fa)	46	10.67		
Action (Ac)	1	74.52	14.59	< .001
Ex x Ac	1	7.51	1.47	
Error (Ac)	46	5.11		
A x Fa	2	0.47	0.05	
Ex x A x Fa	2	1.74	0.17	
Error (A x Fa)	92	9.94		
A x Ac	2	8.97	1.85	
Ex x A x Ac	2	1.44	0.30	
Error (A x Ac)	92	4.85		
Fa x Ac	1	2.26	0.41	
Ex x Fa x Ac	1	0.46	0.08	
Error (Fa x Ac)	46	5.53		
A x Fa x Ac	2	0.38	0.07	
Ex x A x Fa x Ac	2	0.50	0.09	
Error (A x Fa x Ac)	92	5.76		

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Much the Subjects Liked the Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	3.10		
Experience (Ex)	1	3.78	1.22	
Error	46	3.09		
Within	240	1.85		
Age (A)	2	2.69	1.51	
Ex x A	2	0.97	0.54	
Error (A)	92	1.79		

Table 8

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Much Professional Helpers Would Like to Work with Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	3.03		
Experience (Ex)	1	0.06	0.02	
Error	46	3.09		
Within	240	3.01		
Age (A)	2	2.72	0.88	
Ex x A	2	0.68	0.22	
Error (A)	92	3.08		

Table 9

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Much Subject Would Like to Work with Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	2.57		
Experience (Ex)	1	1.53	0.59	
Error	46	2.59		
Within	240	2.24		
Age (A)	2	0.86	0.40	
Ex x A	2	0.32	0.15	
Error (A)	92	2.15		

Table 10

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Typical is the Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	7.45		
Experience (Ex)	1	2.72	0.36	
Error	46	7.55		
Within	240	3.51		
Age (A)	2	0.44	0.14	
Ex x A	2	4.42	1.36	
Error (A)	92	3.25		

Table 11

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Concerned is Client about Health

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	8.03		
Experience (Ex)	1	8.00	1.00	
Error	46	8.04		
Within	240	4.56		
Age (A)	2	102.77	27.73	< .001
Ex x A	2	4.38	1.18	
Error (A)	92	3.71		

Table 12

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Concerned is Client about Dying

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	8.40		
Experience (Ex)	1	10.89	1.30	
Error	46	8.34		
Within	240	4.33		
Age (A)	2	184.48	70.69	< .001
Ex x A	2	4.29	1.65	
Error (A)	92	2.61		

Table 13

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Concerned is Client about Loneliness

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	5.83		
Experience (Ex)	1	8.34	1.44	
Error	46	5.77		
Within	240	2.63		
Age (A)	2	0.68	0.25	
Ex x A	2	3.10	1.13	
Error (A)	92	2.74		

Table 14

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Concerned is Client about Male Companionship

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	8.67		
Experience (Ex)	1	6.12	0.70	
Error	46	8.72		
Within	240	2.91		
Age (A)	2	22.34	6.95	
Ex x A	2	6.57	2.05	
Error (A)	92	3.21		

Table 15

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Concerned is Client about Physical Safety

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	8.55		
Experience (Ex)	1	19.53	2.35	
Error	46	8.32		
Within	240	3.30		
Age (A)	2	71.07	20.55	< .001
Ex x A	2	7.72	2.23	
Error (A)	92	3.46		

Table 16

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Concerned is Client about Money

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	12.26		
Experience (Ex)	1	20.06	1.66	
Error	46	12.09		
Within	240	2.46		
Age (A)	2	16.88	5.86	
Ex x A	2	0.32	0.11	
Error (A)	92	2.88		

Table 17

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Miserly is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	5.67		
Experience (Ex)	1	5.84	1.03	
Error	46	5.66		
Within	240	3.30		
Age (A)	2	0.72	0.22	
Ex x A	2	1.01	0.31	
Error (A)	92	3.30		

Table 18

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Dependent is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	5.54		
Experience (Ex)	1	8.34	1.52	
Error	46	5.48		
Within	240	3.24		
Age (A)	2	6.10	2.16	
Ex x A	2	2.35	0.83	
Error (A)	92	2.82		

Table 19

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Grouchy is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	4.38		
Experience (Ex)	1	1.25	0.28	
Error	46	4.45		
Within	240	3.83		
Age (A)	2	6.22	1.72	
Ex x A	2	3.92	1.08	
Error (A)	92	3.62		

Table 20

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Selfish is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	6.99		
Experience (Ex)	1	11.68	1.69	
Error	46	6.89		
Within	240	3.21		
Age (A)	2	8.71	3.21	< .10
Ex x A	2	7.44	2.74	
Error (A)	92	2.72		

Table 21

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Good does Client Feel About Self

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	5.36		
Experience (Ex)	1	6.72	1.26	
Error	46	5.33		
Within	240	4.73		
Age (A)	2	33.25	10.73	< .001
Ex x A	2	1.48	0.48	
Error (A)	92	3.10		

Table 22

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Complaining is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	5.09		
Experience (Ex)	1	2.53	0.49	
Error	46	5.15		
Within	240	5.17		
Age (A)	2	2.23	0.39	
Ex x A	2	13.88	2.40	< .10
Error (A)	92	5.78		

Table 23

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Touchy is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	5.99		
Experience (Ex)	1	7.67	1.29	
Error	46	5.95		
Within	240	2.83		
Age (A)	2	5.48	2.02	
Ex x A	2	0.11	0.04	
Error (A)	92	2.71		

Table 24

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Productive is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	3.90		
Experience (Ex)	1	3.34	0.85	
Error	46	3.91		
Within	240	3.09		
Age (A)	2	3.54	1.30	
Ex x A	2	2.84	1.04	
Error (A)	92	2.73		

Table 25

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Stubborn is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	4.87		
Experience (Ex)	1	4.50	0.92	
Error	46	4.88		
Within	240	3.42		
Age (A)	2	0.60	0.17	
Ex x A	2	1.04	0.30	
Error (A)	92	3.47		

Table 26

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Meddlesome is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	6.48		
Experience (Ex)	1	2.53	0.38	
Error	46	6.57		
Within	240	3.11		
Age (A)	2	6.29	2.40	
Ex x A	2	0.87	0.33	
Error (A)	92	2.62		

Table 27

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Rigid is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	4.83		
Experience (Ex)	1	0.09	0.02	
Error	46	4.93		
Within	240	3.38		
Age (A)	2	0.86	0.25	
Ex x A	2	0.17	0.05	
Error (A)	92	3.49		

Table 28

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Active is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	3.54		
Experience (Ex)	1	0.28	0.08	
Error	46	3.61		
Within	240	4.23		
Age (A)	2	11.13	3.54	< .05
Ex x A	2	5.32	1.69	
Error (A)	92	3.14		

Table 29

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Interesting is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	4.86		
Experience (Ex)	1	6.12	1.27	
Error	46	4.83		
Within	240	2.62		
Age (A)	2	8.67	4.19	< .05
Ex x A	2	0.37	0.18	
Error (A)	92	2.07		

Table 30

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Experienced is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	5.29		
Experience (Ex)	1	0.06	0.01	
Error	46	5.40		
Within	240	3.21		
Age (A)	2	37.91	12.12	< .001
Ex x A	2	0.36	0.11	
Error (A)	92	3.13		

Table 31

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Wise is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	4.43		
Experience (Ex)	1	0.35	0.08	
Error	46	4.52		
Within	240	2.76		
Age (A)	2	20.94	7.07	
Ex x A	2	2.96	1.00	
Error (A)	92	2.96		

Table 32

Analysis of Variance for Variable
How Kind is Client

	df	MS	F	p
Between	47	2.95		
Experience (Ex)	1	1.39	0.46	
Error	46	2.98		
Within	240	2.80		
Age (A)	2	6.68	2.10	
Ex x A	2	1.26	0.40	
Error (A)	92	3.19		