

Relationship of Power and Involvement to Counseling Effectiveness in the Initial Interviews

Chang-Ho Lee Seong-Ho Cho
Seoul National University

Power and involvement are two underlying dimensions of interpersonal behaviors. This study investigated the communicational processes of twenty seven early counseling sessions, by analyzing the relationship between in-session interacting behaviors of counselor/client and counseling effectiveness. Counseling effectiveness was measured by the Session Evaluation Questionnaire (Stiles & Snow, 1984) and message units of the participants were coded along the dimensions of power and involvement using the content-analysis scheme developed by Penman (1980). The results indicated that the involvement dimension explained more of the variance of counseling effectiveness than did the power dimension. Analysis of the transitions in message units of counselor/client showed that the temporal appropriateness of counselor's verbal interventions were important. Several discussions on the implication and limitation of the study were presented.

Since Eysenck (1952) published the classic paper on the effects of psychotherapy, many researchers have carried out studies of psychotherapy outcome. It was found, however, that different approaches to psychotherapy did not result in different outcomes (Kazdin, 1982; Meltzoff & Kornreich, 1970; Strupp, 1982). This made researchers view the psychotherapy world from a different perspective. That is, researchers came to recognize the need to

focus on the specific process variables which contribute to the desirable client change rather than on the global outcome variables (Garfield, 1983; Goldfried & Padawer, 1982; Hill, 1982).

With the increasing emphasis on the process research, the interactional perspective which focuses on the communicational exchange between counselor and client draws much attention in the field of counseling psychology (Strong & Claiborn, 1982;

Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967; Watzlawick & Weakland, 1977; Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974). The fundamental assumption of the interactional perspective is that client change is a function of communicational exchange or interaction between counselor and client(Lichtenberg & Barké, 1981).

According to Kiesler(1982), problems in living are defined as disordered, inappropriate, or inadequate interpersonal communications which result originally and cumulatively from a person's not attending to and not correcting the self-defeating, interpersonally unsuccessful aspects of his communications. It is assumed that client will communicate to counselor in the same self-defeating way as he communicates with other important persons in his life. As a result, the counselor in-sessions will experience "live" part of the client's distinctive interpersonal problems. In this regard, the therapeutic relationship itself could be a direct medium of client change(Cashdan, 1973; Greenson, 1967; Kell & Mueller, 1966).

One of the research streams in counseling literature takes systems approach to counseling(Lennard & Bernstein, 1960; Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974) which focuses on the relative power of counselor and client(Reandean & Wampold, 1991). The importance of power or influence in counseling is relatively clear, because counselor's role is to help client(Tracey, 1991) and therefore counselor must exert influences

to client's symptomatic behaviors in the process of counseling(Heller, 1985; Tracey, 1986).

Haley(1963) hypothesized that the most central issue in counseling and psychotherapy is that which person of the two participants control the events discussed during the counseling. According to him, for the counseling being successful, counselor must have a control over the events discussed during counseling. Otherwise, client will exert a control over counseling in a consistent manner with his symptomatic behavior pattern, and therefore there will be no change in client's problematic behaviors.

Several studies attempted to test this hypothesis. For example, Friedlander and Phillips(1984) found frequent topic shifts in the early counseling sessions, indicating the struggle between counselor and client to get control over the events discussed during the session. Lichtenberg and Barké(1984) investigated whether Haley's hypothesis is valid across different approaches to counselling and different types of client problems. According to their results, the extent of counselor's control over the session varied across the counselor's theoretical background and client problem types. Also interactional patterns at comparably equal extent of control were shown to be most pervasive.

Tracey and Ray(1984) defined control as a topic determination, the index of which is a proportion of one participant's topic following

behaviors to the other participant's topic initiation behaviors, and investigated the relationship between this index and counseling outcome measures with three successful and three unsuccessful counseling dyads. As a result, it was found that counselors of all dyads determined topics more significantly than did clients, and clients in successful counseling dyads were characterized as to give up control over topics to counselors than those in unsuccessful dyads.

The reason why researchers in this literature have emphasized the control acquisition and maintenance seems to be that these researchers recognized the main purpose of counseling and psychotherapy as to influence or control over client's maladaptive interpersonal behaviors, which would result in desirable client change (Lee, 1986). However, taking into account of methodological limitations in addition to conflicting results, no firm conclusions about the relationship between the interactional patterns and counseling outcome is possible.

One person's specific interpersonal behavior elicits another person's specific interpersonal behavior above chance level in a variety of dyadic situations (Heller, Myers, & Kline, 1963; Raush, Dittmann, & Taylor, 1959; Raush, 1965). According to Kiesler (1983), each person's interpersonal behaviors are not randomly emitted, and does not encompass all ranges of interpersonal behaviors. Instead, each person's behaviors

and another person's responses to them tend to be limited in relatively small ranges of interpersonal behaviors.

According to many factor-analytic studies of human personality traits, the first two extracted factors explain for the most parts of human personality variances (Becker & Krug, 1964; Foa, 1961; Kassebaum, Couch, & Slater, 1959; Schaefer & Plutchik, 1966). Also, according to a series of studies which investigated interpersonal behaviors in a variety of dyads and small groups, human interpersonal behaviors could be explained with two or three fundamental factors and their combinations (Benjamin, 1979; Carson, 1969; Leary, 1957; Penman, 1980; Wiggins, 1979, 1982; Lorr & McNair, 1965). Wiggins (1982) reviewed results of twenty one studies which suggested two-dimensional models about human interpersonal behaviors. According to him, dimension I represents constructs such as dominance-submission, control, influence, and assertiveness, and dimension II represents constructs such as affiliation-hostility, love-hate, positive-negative, and affiliation-disaffiliation.

Kiesler and Goldston (1988) analyzed initial therapy interviews of Rogers, Ellis, and Perls with Gloria (Shostrom, 1966) using the Checklist of Psychotherapy Transaction (CLOPT) developed by Kiesler (1984). This study tested the hypothesis that the interactional patterns between each of the three therapists and Gloria would exhibit complete complementarity on control and

affiliation dimension. Complementarity was defined as reciprocity on control dimension, and correspondency on affiliation dimension. The results partly supported the hypothesis. That is, transactions of some of these dyads revealed as noncomplementary. Orford (1986) reviewed fourteen studies which investigated dyadic interpersonal interaction in a variety of settings including counseling setting. He found that the interactional patterns were differently manifested according to whether the participant's involvement was friendly or hostile. That is, when the antecedent participant's response was friendly on the involvement dimension, complementary response to it was frequently followed. But when the antecedent participant's response was hostile on the involvement dimension, the following response of another participant was frequently noncomplementary.

Henry, Schacht, and Strupp(1986) divided interpersonal transactions into two types of transactions: positive and negative. They defined positive transaction as giving-and-taking message between the participants on a positive side of involvement, and negative transactions as interacting on a negative side of involvement. They found that positive transactions were more frequently occurred while negative transactions were less frequently occurred in successful therapies than in less successful therapies. This line of results were not obtained if the involvement dimension was not considered.

In fact, previous studies investigating the

interactional processes under the systems approach have limitations of oversimplifying the complexity of human interactions. It is necessary to reevaluate Haley's hypothesis by considering the power and involvement dimensions simultaneously in study of communicational process in counseling. The purpose of this study is to analyze the verbal communicational processes between counselor and client by using the content-analysis scheme developed by Penman(Penman, 1980) which considers the power and involvement dimensions simultaneously to classify verbal messages. Also, this study is to investigate the relationship between the dyadic interactional patterns and the counseling effectiveness.

Method

1. Participants

The data was gathered at the Student Guidance Center of Seoul National University. Professional staffs and predoctoral psychology interns and their clients were asked to participate in the study. Clients who denied tape-recording and had psychotic problems on psychological tests were excluded from the study. The principles of case-sampling were as follows: (1) to select only one session for each dyad; (2) to select early counseling sessions, defined here as the first, second, and third session of each dyad. Finally, twenty seven sessions were chosen for analysis. Among the fourteen counselors

who participated in the study, seven were experienced counselors who had five to nine post-master level of counseling experiences, and the other seven were predoctoral psychology interns who had two to four post-master level of counseling experiences. The major complaints of twenty seven clients included in the study were emotional problems such as anxiety and depression, heterosexual dating problems, adjustment difficulties, and career development problems.

2. Measure and Coding System

Session Evaluation Questionnaire(SEQ) :

Session Evaluation Questionnaire(SEQ), developed and revised by Stiles and Snow(1984), is an instrument which measures the smoothness and depth of counseling session experienced by counselor and client. Each of the smoothness and depth subscale consists of five adjective items displayed on seven-point bipolar scale. The smoothness of counseling is concerned with how comfortable, relaxed, and pleasant the counseling session is as perceived by the participants, while the depth of counseling concerned with how powerful and valuable the counseling session as perceived by the participants. A Korean version of SEQ rated by client was used in the study. The index of internal consistency using Cronbach α was observed as .81.

Penman Classification Scheme : The Penman Classification Scheme(Penman, 1980) was designed to code verbal behaviors

along the dimensions of power and involvement. In this scheme, power is defined as interpersonal influence. The involvement continuum ranges from being negative to being positive and represents interpersonal properties such as affiliation, sociability, acceptance, and solidarity. Verbal discourse is simultaneously coded on two levels, manifest and latent. The manifest level is coded on the content of verbal discourse and is described as the report level of communication, while the latent level of coding takes into account the implicit, relational context of discourse (Penman, 1980). This study included only the latent level of coding in the analysis of the verbal discourse, based on the recommendation that this level of coding might reflect the covert communicational meaning of verbal discourse(Tracey, 1991).

Each coding category lies in a two-dimensional matrix created by the continua of power and involvement as showed in Figure 1. The vertical axis represents the power dimension, and the horizontal axis represents the involvement dimension. It is possible that each unit will be coded at different positions of power and involvement at latent level(Holloway et al., 1989; Penman, 1980). The latent level is organized in a four-by-four matrix and consists of sixteen codes: reject, control, initiate, share, counter, resist, offer, collaborate, evade, abstain, seek, oblige, remove, relinquish, submit, and cling. Each of the discourses is coded in one category on the latent level, Which is uniquely characterized

as to its relative position along the two axes. The key points of each description in each of the sixteen category cells and their relative positions are presented in Figure 1.

The Penman Classification Scheme was originally developed and tested under

laboratory conditions using marital interactions. Penman(1980) reported a stable interrater reliability of approximately 70% using a point-by-point reliability index for both manifest and latent levels. In this study the mean interrater reliability was observed

P O W E R	REJECT RJ · Show hostility · Discredits other · Denigrates task /other	CONTROL CN · Manoeuvres to gain control · Forceful challenges · Takes over, directs	INITIATE IN · Influences other · Leads without control · Stands for self while inviting other	SHARE SH · Joins forces · Openly confronts · Affirms self and other
	COUNTER CT · Defies, refuses · Defends self · Stands for self at expenses of other	RESIST RS · Counteracts · Is cynical, skeptical · Sets up obstacles	OFFER OF · Tentatively suggests · Informs other · Is task oriented	COLLABORATE CB · Reciprocates other · Consents to cooperate · Expands on other
	EVADE EV · Vague and wordy abstraction · Don't respond directly · Manoeuvres out of situation	ABSTAIN AB · Is indecisive · Uses delaying tactics · Is unwilling to commit self	SEEK SK · Seeks confirmation · Requests information · Allows other to start	OBLIGE OB · Willingly accepts · Concurs with other · Endorses other
	REMOVE RM · Refuses to participate · Ignores other totally · Disassociates self	RELINQUISH RL · Concedes defeat · Backs away · Abandons previous position	SUBMIT SB · Defers to other · Gives responsibility to other · Takes path of least resistance	CLING CL · Seeks control by other · Accepts any directive · Mutually exclusive
	←————— INVOLVEMENT —————→			

Figure 1. The latent-level categories of the Penman(1980) Classification Scheme. (From *Communication Processes and Relationships* by R. Penman, 1980, London: Academic Press.)

as .73 using Cohen's kappa coefficient.

3. Procedure

For all dyads participating in the study, one of the first three sessions after the intake session were audiotaped. After the selected session was completed, the Korean version of Session Evaluation Questionnaire was administered to each client. Clients were assured that their counselors would not be informed of their counselors would not be informed their responses.

Typed transcripts were made for each session chosen. To insure the reliability of the transcripts, entire sessions were analyzed (Friedlander, Ellis, Siegel, Raymond, Haase, & Highlen, 1988). In addition to discourses, the transcripts also included speaker turns, pauses, and laughters. Speaker turns were divided into thought units in which there was a connected flow of words expressing a single attempt at communication (Penman, 1980). Each unit embodied a single elocutionary intent (Searle, 1969) and consisted minimally of a single word, pause, or laughter, and maximally of an entire speaker turn. The unitizing was performed by the second author of the study.

Two counseling psychologists and two practicing counselors who were unaware of the purpose of the study were trained to use the Penman Classification Scheme until the desired level of interrater reliability was reached. Each transcript was coded by two of the four raters. This process resulted in a

mean interrater agreement of Cohen's kappa of .73, a range of .61 to .78 for the latent level. This level of reliability compares favorably with the original Penman Classification Scheme interrater reliability of Cohen's kappa of .70 (Penman, 1980) at the latent level.

4. Analysis

Two analytic approaches were taken in order to investigate the dyadic interaction in this study. First, we examined the rates of power and involvement exhibited in the discourse. Based on the mounting evidence indicating that timing and patterning are critical to understand social interaction (cf., Bakeman & Gottman, 1986), we also conducted a sequential analysis of the discourse.

The sequential analysis included a lag-1 unidirectional test of independence and a transformed kappa testing the strength of the dependence between antecedent and subsequent behaviors. The transformed kappa has a range of -1.00 to +1.00. Positive transformed kappas indicate the degree to which the subsequent behavior followed the antecedent behavior more frequently than would have occurred by chance, whereas negative transformed kappa indicate the degree to which the subsequent behavior followed the antecedent behavior less frequently than would have occurred by chance (Wampold & Kim, 1989). All sequential analysis, descriptive statistics, and

transition-frequency matrices were generated by the Sequential Analysis Program(SAP; Wampold & Roll, 1986).

Results

1. Session Evaluation Questionnaire

The Session Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ) was completed by each of the twenty seven clients. The mean and standard deviation were 25.67 and 4.25 for the smoothness subscale of SEQ, and 24.70 and

4.17 for the depth subscale of SEQ.

2. Base-rates of Behavior

The frequency and proportion of the codes for each client and counselor for each of the twenty seven dyads were determined. The base-rate proportion of message units in each code category was calculated for each speaker by dividing the frequency of the code by the total frequency of message units for that speaker for each dyad. The proportions(Ps) for each category at the latent level and their

Table 1. Mean proportions of message units and correlations with SEQ(N=27)

	Counselor			Client		
	Mean Ps(SD)	Smoothness(r)	Depth(r)	Mean Ps(SD)	Smoothness(r)	Depth(r)
RJ	.007(0.4)	-.360	-.609*	.001(0.4)	.063	.206
CN	.035(4.0)	-.306	-.388*	.006(1.3)	-.329	-.561*
IN	.502(10.0)	.455	.158	.017(2.2)	.006	.074
SH	.053(6.2)	.470*	.287	.004(1.0)	.179	.069
CT	.002(0.5)	-.215	-.291	.017(3.1)	-.354	-.630***
RS	.009(1.5)	-.470*	-.460*	.076(5.3)	-.180	-.221
OF	.098(8.1)	-.324	-.089	.579(12.5)	-.235	-.083
CB	.102(6.4)	.430*	.381*	.086(8.4)	.724***	.549**
EV	-	-	-	.017(2.2)	-.508**	-.686***
AB	.002(0.6)	-.102	-.580*	.110(6.5)	-.102	-.115
SK	.178(10.1)	-.459*	-.164	-.020(2.1)	.308	.361
OB	.022(3.3)	-.276	-.170	.020(2.4)	.308	.361
RM	-	-	-	.001(0.4)	.063	-.082
RL	.022(0.5)	.124	-.118	.004(1.0)	.054	.251
SB	-	-	-	.005(1.1)	-.098	.090
CL	-	-	-	.005(1.1)	.109	.124

Note. Rj = reject; CN = control; IN = initiate; SH = share; CT = counter; RS = resist; OF = offer; CB = collaborate; EV = evade; AB = abstain; SK = seek; OB = oblige; RM = remove; RL = relinquish; SB = submit; CL = cling.
 *p < .05, two-tailed; **p < .01, two-tailed; ***p < .001, two-tailed.

correlations with smoothness and depth subscale scores are presented in Table 1.

It is shown from Table 1 that counselors responded frequently in the order of initiate ($p = .502$), seek ($p = .178$), collaborate ($p = .102$), and offer ($p = .098$), while clients responded frequently in the order of offer ($p = .579$), abstain ($p = .110$), collaborate ($p = .086$), and resist ($p = .076$). The smoothness rating by client showed positive correlation with counselor's share ($p < .05$) and collaborate ($p < .05$) messages and client's collaborate ($p < .001$) messages, while it was negatively correlated with counselor's seek ($p < .05$) and resist ($p < .05$) messages and client's evade messages ($p < .01$). The depth rating by client was positively correlated with counselor's and client's and client's collaborate ($p < .05$) messages, while it was negatively correlated with counselor's reject ($p < .05$), control ($p < .05$), resist ($p < .05$), and abstain ($p < .05$) messages and client's control ($p < .05$), counter ($p < .001$), and evade ($p < .001$) messages. These results seem to indicate that counselors were primarily in the role of initiating the conversation to invite clients into the counseling situation. But the manner of initiating, manifested by counselors' verbal discourses, seem to influence the perception of the sessions by clients. That is, counselors' warm and leading manner could be perceived for the sessions as being smooth and deep, while negative and controlling manner could be perceived as being the opposite.

The sixteen individual categories were consolidated into two sets of four classes of categories on the basis of the ordering of power and involvement level, which resulted in one set of four power classes ('very high', 'high', 'low', and 'very low') and another set of four involvement classes ('very positive', 'positive', 'negative' and 'very negative'). Each class consisted of four individual categories.

The frequency and base-rate proportion of message units in each category class were calculated for each speaker, for each of the twenty seven dyads, according to the same calculating procedure as in the individual categories. But the correlations of these base-rate proportions with each SEQ subscale score were calculated in a different manner. As mentioned earlier, each sixteen individual category is defined as a relative position in a four-by-four matrix, in which a vertical axis represents power and a horizontal axis represents involvement.

For example, reject code is defined as very high on the power dimension and very negative on the involvement dimension, while cling code is defined as very low on the power dimension and very positive on the involvement dimension. In this regard, the amount of power and involvement is being mixed in each individual category. But the focus of this study is on the pure amount of power and involvement contained in individual categories which contributes to the variance of counseling effectiveness measures.

To get the pure estimate of the contributions to the variance of each SEQ subscale score, we calculated partial correlations which might reflect the pure correlations between the proportions of messages in one set of each of four classes on one of the two dimensions, from which another set of four classes on the other dimension being partialled out. The partial correlations between each set of four

classes on power and involvement with smoothness and depth subscale scores of SEQ are presented in Table 2.

It was found that counselor and client tended to use higher levels of power class messages(that is, P1+P2 messages) more frequently than lower levels of power class messages(that is, P3+P4 messages). But the most frequently used counselor's power class

Table 2. Mean proportions of message classes and correlations with SEQ(N=27)

	Counselor			Client		
	Mean Ps(SD)	Smoothness(r)	Depth(r)	Mean Ps(SD)	Smoothness(r)	Depth(r)
P1	.590(11.9)	.623**	.210	.028(3.3)	-.020	.102
P2	.210(7.1)	-.123	.171	.757(9.9)	.188	-.211
P3	.202(10.8)	-.585**	-.325	.196(8.2)	-.190	.094
P4	.002(0.5)	.001	-.233	.016(1.9)	-.044	.269
P1+P2	.800(10.9)	.589**	.339	.785(10.1)	.179	-.150
P1+P4	.204(10.7)	-.589**	-.339	.212(8.9)	-.179	.150
I1	.002(0.8)	-.352	-.513*	.036(4.4)	-.520*	-.798***
I2	.047(4.3)	-.587**	-.644***	.196(4.4)	-.226	-.354
I3	.777(9.5)	-.222	-.069	.621(10.9)	-.434*	-.041
I4	.177(10.2)	.494*	.388	.145(9.5)	.715***	.626**
I1+I2	.050(4.8)	-.581**	-.659***	.231(10.2)	-.418*	-.646***
I3+I4	.954(5.3)	.581**	.659***	.766(11.0)	.418*	.646***

Note. The correlations presented in this table are partial correlation. P1(very high power class) = reject + control + initiate + share; P2(high power class) = counter + resist + offer + collaborate; P3(low power class) = evade + abstain + seek + oblige; P4(very low power class) = remove + relinquish + submit + cling; I1(very negative involvement class) = reject + counter + evade + remove; I2(negative involvement class) = control + resist + abstain + relinquish; I3(positive involvement class) = initiate + offer + seek + submit; I4(very positive involvement class) = share + collaborate + oblige + cling.

*p < .05, two-tailed; **p < .01, two-tailed; ***p < .001, two-tailed.

was very high($P=.590$), while the most frequently used client's power class was high($P=.757$), which indicated that the messages used by counselor were, in general, more powerful compared with those used by client. It was also found that counselor and client tended to use positive and very positive involvement classes of messages more frequently than negative and very negative classes of messages. However, as in the power, the extent of involvement of the messages used by counselor was, in general, more positive than the extent of involvement of the messages used by client.

Power dimension was significantly correlated with the smoothness rating of SEQ only for counselor, and furthermore it showed no significant correlation with the depth rating for both counselor and client. However, the involvement dimension showed significant correlation with both the smoothness and depth rating for counselor and client.

3. Sequential Analysis

The transformed kappas for several selected transitions and their correlations with the smoothness and depth rating of SEQ are presented in Table 3. Counselor's initiate code followed by client offer code was positively correlated with the smoothness and depth rating($p<.01$), while counselor's collaborate code followed by client offer code was negatively correlated with the smoothness and depth rating($p<.01$). In these transitions, counselor's different categories

(i.e., initiate and collaborate) were followed by the client's same category (i.e.,offer), but the two transitions were correlated with the SEQ rating in the opposite direction.

The transitions which include counselor's collaborate and share code and client's collaborate code were found to be negatively correlated with the smoothness rating of SEQ(see Table 3), though these individual codes were positively correlated with one of or both of the two SEQ subscale scores(see Table 1). This somewhat conflicting result indicates that responses which are positively related to counseling effectiveness on a individual response level might be perceived as negatively by client on a transition level of responses.

Discussion

In this study, analysis of the in-session verbal interaction between counselor and client on power and involvement dimension in early counseling sessions were made, and the relationship between the interaction patterns and counseling effectiveness was also investigated. This line of investigation is based on the observation that previous studies on this issue are methodologically limited and resulted in conflicting results.

For example, some of the previous studies investigated verbal interactions between counselor and client in a small number of cases(e.g., Reandeu & Wampold, 1991). Therefore, the results from these studies have

Table 3. Mean transformed kappa for selected transitions and correlations with SEQ

	Transition	Mean Kappa(SD)	Smoothness	Depth(r)
Counselor	IN - OF	.444(N=27)	.526***	.516***
	IN - CB	.179(N=11)	-.298	-.576*
	OF - OF	.459(N=17)	.403	.068
	CB - OF	.314(N=18)	-.596***	-.575**
	↓ CB - CB	.500(N=14)	.058	-.422
Client	IN - RS	.571(N=16)	.003	-.303
	IN - AB	.587(N=23)	-.126	.158
	SK - OF	.731(N=25)	-.295	-.154
Client	OF - IN	.350(N=26)	.169	.134
	OF - CB	.631(N=22)	-.348	-.275
	OF - OF	.469(N=16)	.364	.210
	OF - SH	.550(N=11)	-.694**	-.303
	↓ CB - IN	.400(N=12)	-.337	-.327
Counselor	RS - IN	.505(N=14)	-.027	-.113
	AB - IN	.600(N=25)	.424**	.298
	OB - IN	.649(N=15)	.374	.388
	OF - SK	.592(N=23)	-.294	-.056

Note. In the parentheses are numbers of cases included for analysis.

*p < .10, two-tailed; **p < .05, two-tailed; ***p < .01, two-tailed.

limitations in generalization. Also, the previous studies tended to focus on the power dimension only, in spite of the fact that involvement is another underlying dimension of primary relationships(Holloway, Freund, Gardner, Nelson, & Walker, 1989). Taking into account these considerations, a relatively large number of cases were included for analysis in this study to enhance the generalizability of the results. And also, by using the Penman Classification Scheme (Penman, 1980) the verbal discourses between counselor and client were coded along the both dimensions of power and

involvement.

The major results of the base-rate analysis are as follows. It was found that both counselor and client frequently used high power and positive involvement messages. But the level of power and involvement of counselor's messages were relatively higher and more positive than those used by client. It was also found that the depth rating of the session by client was not correlated with the power level of messages for neither counselor nor client. Instead, the depth rating was significantly correlated only with the involvement level of messages for both

counselor and client. The power dimension was significantly correlated only with the smoothness rating for counselor's messages. It may be concluded from these results that Haley(1963)'s hypothesis concerning the relationship between the power level of counselor's in-session interacting behavior and the counseling outcome was only partly supported in this study. This conclusion is based on the results that while the power dimension was significantly correlated only with the smoothness rating, not with the depth rating, the involvement dimension was significantly correlated with both the smoothness and depth rating.

The most interesting finding from the sequential analysis for transitions of both participants' messages is that while the transition of counselor's initiate code followed by client's offer code was positively correlated with the SEQ rating, the transition of counselor's collaborate code followed by client's offer code was negatively correlated with the SEQ rating. Taking into account the base-rate results that counselor's collaborate code was positively correlated with both the smoothness and depth rating, this result is apparently conflicting. In fact, counselor's share code was positively correlated with the SEQ rating, but the transitions which involved this code were found to be negatively correlated with the SEQ rating.

There would be two possible explanations for this finding. First, the most likely and expected interactional pattern in the

beginning phase of counseling is that of the counselor's active exploration of client's problems(coded as initiate), and client's giving informations to this exploration(code as offer). The transition of counselor's collaborate code followed by client's offer code would be out of the expectation above, and therefore it is probable that the more frequently this transition occurred in the counseling session, the less smooth and the less deep the session as perceived by client.

Secondly, it is possible that some of counselor's collaborate and share responses were perceived by client as timely inappropriate and out of the ongoing interactional context. In other words, client could not understand the exact meaning of counselor's antecedent responses. Therefore, if these counselor's antecedent responses had client respond to them by offering new informations unrelated to the antecedent responses instead of giving immediate reactance by showing negative involvement responses, the transition of counselor's collaborate or share code followed by client's offer code could be perceived as being negative by client.

To confirm these possible explanations directly, future studies need to measure the impact messages(Kiesler, 1982) of client which are covert responses to counselor's preceding responses. And it is also necessary to measure vocal quality(Rice and Kerr, 1986) of client messages which reflects nonverbal leakage of covert emotional

responses. With these measures included in the future studies, it will be possible to analyze the covert and latent emotional meanings contained in the client's overt messages, thus enabling them to test the two possible explanations aforementioned.

Another interesting finding from the sequential analysis is that counselor's initiation code followed by client's offer code was positively correlated with both the smoothness and depth rating, though each of these individual code categories was not significantly correlated with the two SEQ ratings. In view of the characteristics of the beginning phase of counseling, this transition, as mentioned earlier, may be the desirable one as it reflects the most likely initial contact between counselor and client.

To summarize, the results of the study indicate that the involvement dimension is more important in the understanding of in-session interacting behaviors of counselor and client than is the power dimension. In addition, an implication from the sequential analysis results is that the temporal appropriateness of counselor's verbal messages and client's internal processings of these messages are important in the client's perception of counseling effectiveness.

The limitations of the study are as follows. First, the cases included for analysis in this study are all from the beginning phase of counseling. Therefore, the findings of the study have a limitation in generalization to all phases of counseling. Secondly, having

selected only one session per each case, the study could not identify the idiosyncratic interactional patterns specific to each dyads. Thus the case-specific change processes of interactional patterns across all phases of counseling remain yet unexplored and anticipated for future investigation.

The Penman Classification Scheme (Penman, 1980) was originally designed to investigate the communicational transactions between marital partners who are characterized to have inherently equal power status and equal amount of involvement to each other. In this respect, the direct application of this scheme to counseling setting could result in a bias of assigning high power and positive involvement to counselor, because the scheme takes into account the role of participants when assigning codes (Reandeanu & Wampold, 1991). Therefore, it is necessary to replicate the findings of this study by using another scheme to classify the same data. Also, it would be possible that the involvement dimension represents unidirectional extent of involvement ranging from 'noninvolvement' to 'full involvement', rather than bidirectional extent of involvement ranging from negative to positive involvement.

Lastly, the client's subjective perceptions of how smooth and deep the session was were taken as the indices of counseling effectiveness in this study. Client's subjective perceptions of this kind, however, cannot be total but partial measures of counseling

outcome. Therefore, it is felt desirable to include further comprehensive and objectively identifiable indices in the future researches in order that the results may be more explanatory.

References

- Carson, R. C. (1969). *Interaction Concepts of Personality*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Cashdon, S. (1973). *Interaction Psychotherapy: Stages and Strategies in Behavior Change*. New York: Grune & Stratton, Inc.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1952). The effects of psychotherapy: An evaluation. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 16, 319-324.
- Friedlander, M. L., Ellis, M., Siegel, S., Raymond, L., Hasse, R., & Highlen, P. (1988). Generalizing from segments to sessions: Should it be done? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34, 243-250.
- Friedlander, M. L., & Phillpis, S. D. (1984). Stochastic process analysis of interactive discourse in early counseling interviews. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31, 139-148.
- Garfield, S. L. (1983). Effectiveness of psychotherapy: The perennial controversy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 14, 35-43.
- Heller, K., Myers, R., & Kline, L. (1963). Interviewer behavior as a function of standardized client role. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 27, 117-122.
- Henry, W. P., Schacht, T. E., & Strupp, H. H. (1986). Structural analysis of social behavior: Application to a study of interpersonal process in differential psychotherapeutic outcome. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 27-31.
- Hill, C. E. (1982). Counseling process research: Philosophical and methodological dilemmas. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 8(4), 7-20.
- Holloway, E. L., Freund, R. D., Gardner, S. L., Nelson, M. L., & Walker, B. R. (1989). Relation of power and involvement to theoretical orientation in supervision: An analysis of discourse. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 88-120.
- Kazdin, A. E. (1982). Symptom substitution, generalization, and response covariation: Implications for psychotherapy outcome. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 349-356.
- Kell, B. L., & Mueller, W. J. (1966). *Impact and Change: A Study of Counseling Relationships*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Kiesler, D. J. (1982). Interpersonal theory for personality and psychotherapy. In J. C. Anchin & D. J. Kiseler (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal Psychotherapy*. New York: Pergamon.
- Kieler, D. J. (1983). The 1982 interpersonal circle: A taxonomy for complementarity in human transactions. *Psychological Review*, 90, 185-214.

- Kiesler, D. J., & Goldston, C. S. (1988). Client-therapist complementarity: An analysis of the Gloria Films. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 127-133.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality*. New York: Ronald.
- Lee, C. H. (1986). *Introduction to counseling psychology*. Seoul: Pak young-Sa.
- Lichtenberg, J. W., & Barke, K. H. (1981). Investigation of transactional communication relationship patterns in counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 471-480.
- Lorr, M., & McMair, D. M. (1965). Expansions of the interpersonal behavior circle. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*, 823-830.
- Orford, J. (1986). The rules of interpersonal complementarity: Does hostility beget hostility and dominance, submission? *Psychological Review, 93*, 365-377.
- Penman, R. (1980). *Communication Processes and Relationships*. San Diego, CA: Academic press.
- Reandeau, S. G., & Wampold, B. E. (1991). Relationship of power and involvement to working alliance: A multiple-case sequential analysis of brief therapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 107-114.
- Rice, L. N., & Kerr, G. P. (1986). Measurement of client and therapist vocal quality. In L. S. Greenberg & W. M. Pinsof(Eds.), *The Psychotherapeutic process: A Research Handbook*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Stiles, W. B. (1980). Measurement of the impact of psychotherapy sessions. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 48*, 176-185.
- Stiles, W. B., & Snow, J. S. (1984). Counseling session impact as viewed by novice counselors and their clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 3-12.
- Strong, S. R., & Claiborn, C. D. (1982). *Change Through Interaction: Social Psychological Process of Counseling and Psychotherapy*. New York: Wiley.
- Tracey T. J. (1986). The stages of influence in counseling and psychotherapy. In F. J. Dorn(Ed.), *The Social Influence Process in Counseling and Psychotherapy*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Tracey, T. J. (1991). The structure of control and influence in counseling and psychotherapy: A comparison of several definitions and measures. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 265-278.
- Tracey, T. J., & Ray, P. B. (1984). The stages of successful time-limited counseling: An interactional examination. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 13-27.
- Wampold, B. E., & Roll, R. (1986). *Sequential Analysis Program(SAP)*,

Unpublished computer program.
University of Oregon, College of
Education.

Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J., & Fisch, R.
(1974). *Change: Principles of Problem
Formation and Problem Resolution*. New
York: Norton.

Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A Psychological
taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The
interpersonal domains. *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology*, 37,
395-412.

Wiggins, J. S. (1982). Circumplex models of
interpersonal behavior in clinical
psychology. In P. C. Kendall & J. N.
Butcher(Eds.), *Handbook of Research
Methods in Clinical Psychology*. New
York: Wiley.

초기상담에서 대인권력과 대인관여에서의 상호작용 패턴과 상담효율성과의 관계

이장호 · 조성호

서울대 심리학과

본 연구는 대인권력과 대인관여가 대인행동의 두개의 기본적인 차원이라는 전제하에, 이 두가지 차원을 중심으로 27개의 초기상담 회기들에서 상담자와 내담자의 언어적 상호작용 과정을 분석하였다. 그리고 여기에서 나타난 상호작용 패턴과 상담효율과의 관계를 조사하였다. 상담효율성은 회기 평가질문지(SEQ, Stiles & Snow, 1984)에 의해 측정되었고, 상담 참여자들의 언어반응은 Penman(1980)에 의해 개발된 내용분석도식을 사용하여 대인권력과 대인관여 차원에서 부호화되었다. 연구결과 대인권력 차원에 비해 대인관여 차원이 상담효율성의 전체 변량중 더 많은 부분을 설명한 것으로 나타났다. 또한 상담자와 내담자의 언어반응의 연계패턴에 대한 분석에서 상담자의 언어적 개입의 시의적 적절성이 중요하다는 것이 밝혀졌다. 마지막으로 본연구의 의의와, 제한점, 그리고 앞으로의 연구방향에 대한 시사점이 논의되었다.