Abstract

This article criticizes the extensive use of the helping model for interpersonal communiction courses in teacher training programs. As one of several alternative models, the helping model is endorsed; as the sole model, it is criticized. While the humane goals of the helping model may be retained, it is argued that diverse means for attaining humane goals be utilized. The alternatives to the helping model discussed include the psychological perspectives of Maslow and Clarizio and Goldstein, the perspectives involving the management of human and public relations of Galleraman and Cutlip and Rapaport, and the rhetorical perspectives of Frye and Andersen and Freeley. The article concludes with a reminder of the benefits associated with a limited use of the helping model for interpersonal courses in teaching programs and the burdens associated with the unlimited use of the helping model.

Résumé

L'article critique l'emploi trop fréquent du modèle de la relation d'aide dans les cours de communication interpersonnelle des programmes de formation à l'enseignement. Qui'il soit l'un de plusieurs modèles employés est acceptable mais qui'il soit le seul est sujet à la critique. L'auteur soutient que tout en conservant les objectifs humains de ce modèle on devrait se servir de différents moyens pour les atteindre. Parmi les modèles de remplacement à la relation d'aide, l'article traite des perspectives psychologiques de Maslow, Clarizio et Goldstein, des perspectives touchant la conduite des relations humaines et publiques de Galleraman, Cutlip et Rapaport et, enfin, des perspectives rhétoriques de Frye, Andersen et Freeley. L'auteur termine en rappelant les avantages d'une utilisation modérée du modèle de la relation d'aide dans les cours de communication interpersonnelle et les dangers d'un emploi excessif de ce modèle.

Richard Fiordo*

THE HELPING MODEL OF INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION: VIABLE ALTERNATIVES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Background

Interpersonal communication models are predominantly helping models. Although helping sounds noble in principle, undesirable complications may await those who presume to help others — especially as so-called professional helpers. An examination of the teacher training program at a selection of Canadian and American universities supports this view, whenever communication classes were a part of the curriculum.[1] Gerard Egan and Lawrence Brammer use helping models exclusively. Carl Rogers, Albert Ellis, John Stewart, David Johnson, and others discuss helping models as general communication models. Yet, Szasz criticizes their value pointedly (1979, pp. xxiv & 7). The argument presented in this paper is consistent with that of Szasz.

Through these models, interpersonal communication subsequently gets narrowly and falsely restricted in teacher training programs. Contrary to what might be expected, helping models of

---

* University of Calgary

interpersonal communication may prove harmful or foolish when used categorically in teacher training programs.

Morris explains that "systems can have subsystems as members, or be members of a supersystem." Since the "relations are reciprocal," the "functioning of the subsystem is dependent upon the functioning (or malfunctioning) of the supersystem, which is in turn dependent upon the functioning (or malfunctioning) of the subsystems" (1964, p. 21). In teacher training programs that overemphasize the helping relationship model of interpersonal communication, while relationships between students and teachers may receive attention, relationships between teachers and other teachers as well as relationships between teachers and administrators may be minimized or ignored. The relationships between teachers and parents, clerical staff, maintenance staff, technical staff, teacher aids, library aids, and school bus drivers may be minimized or ignored as well. In this paper, I view the helping model as a limited (yet worthwhile) model; I consequently, encourage the implementation of broad and diverse models of interpersonal communication.

The Helping Model

Before examining the alternative models, I will describe the helping model.[2] After examining the themes concerning helpful, understanding, and cooperative teachers, Wilfred Martin reports that from the "student perspective, getting along with teachers is facilitated by teachers who have 'open minds,' who are 'easy to ask questions to,' who are 'friendly' and 'helpful,' who 'understand' their students, and who are willing 'to cooperate' with them" (1983, p. 116). In his study, a number of students stressed the "need for students to get a considerable amount of help from teachers." In spite of "observations that some teachers 'don't help' their students, there is widespread belief among students that many teachers are willing to help, and, in fact, are perceived to be trying to help their students" (p. 117). In short, in order to have a helping relationship, the interaction between teacher and student must be meaningful, maximally communicative, and empathic (p. 2).

Brammer explains that certain characteristics of helpers are valued in their lives outside the helping relationship. Helpers must live up to certain values or be seen by "helpees" as "artificial and incongruous." He adds that the "necessity to function at a high level puts considerable pressure on the helper to become and remain his own best self" (1973, p. 20). The helping model Brammer describes is predominantly helpee-centered and includes teachers and school counselors as structured and professional helpers (p. 13). While it takes into account the fact that the "helper has feelings too," for the most part, the approach prescribes a Rogerian client-centered method (p. 29).

The helper prizes and tries to live up to the helpee-centered characteristics of empathy, warmth, caring, openness, positive regard, respect, concreteness, specificity, and flexibility (pp. 29-35). The pressure for teachers to live up to this rigorous and specialized standard is harmful when generalized as the only interpersonal communication model available to them. Admittedly, it is stressful, if not potentially false, even to full time counsellors (p. 20). To teachers in a training program, the specialized nature of this relation could be disastrous in its prescriptive power.

A third account of the helping relationship comes from Egan who attributes the major influence on his helping model of interpersonal communication to Carkhuff (1975, p. 3). Among those Egan includes as members of the helping professions are counselors, ministers, teachers, trainers, and tutors (p. 8). While Egan "focuses primarily on helping relationships," he also deals with the

"basics of interpersonal communication." Furthermore, Egan distinguishes between the "helping that is carried out by professionals and everyday helping." Although friends "help *each other*," in professional relationships "roles are more clear-cut: one is the helper or counselor and the other is the helpee or client" (p. 11). The difference in help obtained, given the so-called helper and helpee, may be one of degree rather than of kind.

If the helping model occurs in all interactions normatively (that is, because we believe we *should* help others, even if we are on trial or at a party), we risk being role-bound (or role-laden) rather than celebrate being role-free or (role-open). Teachers, basing their relational style on the helping model alone, which tends to be a part of real life as well as the professionally helping life, risk the narrowness implied by this model. "If counseling is essentially a role-free experience," as Egan says, "then role-laden terms do not seem to fit" (p. 12). In short, the role-laden helping model does not fit the generalist requirements of a teacher training program. Although Egan's derived model of helping communication is superb for counseling and has a specialized use for the teacher, as a general model it has limitations.

Alternative Models

The issue taken in this paper is not with helping models *per se* but with the generalizing of helping models in teacher training programs. Instead of situating the helping model in its proper and limited place within a teacher training program, the helping model is overextended dysfunctionally. Viable alternative models of the helping relationship either include helping as one aspect of a broad human relations effort or as one sequential step leading toward another. Other alternative models more or less ignore helping the other as a primary concern. If the focus is on protecting yourself, your position, or your policies, caring for the other may be neglected. For the most part, the alternative models do not limit themselves to helping others as a major or exclusive end. Mowrer (1973) repeatedly admonished his graduate students to take account of both parties in any interpersonal setting, as did Rogers[3] and Brammer (1973, p. 59).

While the helping model in teaching tends to be student-centered, the alternative models tend to be teacher-centered. As Kuhn declares, "we must recognize how very limited in both scope and precision a paradigm can be at the time of its first appearance. Although models or paradigms gain their status because they are more successful than their competitors in solving a few problems," to be "more successful is not . . . to be either completely successful with a single problem or notably successful with any large number" (1971, p. 23). The helping model has enjoyed success that is neither complete with a single problem nor notable with a large number of problems.

Maslow

Although Maslow's work is associated with the helping, humanistic, and soft tradition for the most part, Maslow accepted the disciplinarian tradition as well. Pointing to the limitations of the helping model in counseling, Maslow says the helping model "makes us think of the counselor as the person or the professional who knows and reaches down from his privileged position above to the poor jerks below who don't know and have to be helped in some way." Maslow also abhors the medical model characterized by words like "therapy" and "patient" because it suggests that the person who comes to the counselor is a "sick person, beset by disease and illness, seeking a cure." Maslow's preference is for a counselor who fosters "the self-actualization of people, rather than the one who helps to cure a disease" (1971, p. 51).

In discussing effective and healthy management, Maslow explains that "management policy or any other kind of policy is best which best fits the objective requirements of the objective situation." Solving a problem depends on being able to see the problematic situation "objectively, without expectations, without presuppositions, the way a god presumably would be able to see it" (1965, p. 71). To see the teaching world through the wishful eyes of the helping model along with its implicit moralistic prescriptions would therefore violate Maslow's advice.

As far as teaching is concerned, Maslow maintains that there is sufficient empirical support to claim that authoritarian students prefer, require, and function best under an authoritarian teacher. Any other kind of teacher is taken advantage of and cannot maintain control in the classroom. Uttering a statement shocking to the tradition of humanistic psychology, Maslow declares the correct thing to do with authoritarians: "take them realistically for the bastards they are" and "break their backs immediately . . . [to] show very clearly who is boss in the situation" because "*then* and only then" can one teach them that it is possible for "a boss . . . to be kind, gentle, permissive, trusting, and so on" (p. 72). In other words, Maslow encourages a transitional leadership that evolves from the authoritarian to the humanistic form. Since humanistic democracy simply will not work in many situations from the start, the kind of leadership which best manages people is that which works best in any particular situation (p. 73).

Prospective teachers need to distinguish pious expectations from expectations that are situationally possible and probable. To maintain a steady but cautious movement toward humanistic and helping styles of teaching seems reasonable to Angyal as a direction, if not as a goal (1965, p. 322). A dialectical balance must occur between a teacher's autonomous desire to be of assistance and the situation's heteronomous requirement to have a boss (p. 321). Teachers must be trained to resolve or even accept this antinomy as a way of proceeding on intelligent and sane grounds.

Acknowledging that learning may come in many forms, after observing a Synonyn session, Maslow concluded that fragile notions of people may be outdated: "the idea that you mustn't say a loud word to anybody because it might traumatize him" (1971:p. 227). Since "people are very tough, and not brittle," the hard, fast, and direct approach removes "the rationalizations, the veils, the evasions, and politenesses of the world" (pp. 226-27). Such a direct helping methodology sees human beings as tough as well as fragile. Both sides of the human coin are taken into account in order to instruct students as holistically as possible. Frankl reports that despite "all the enforced physical and mental primitiveness of the life in a concentration camp, it was possible for spiritual life to deepen" (1966, p. 56). The general and diverse models of interpersonal communication that are alternatives to the helping ones take the toughness as well as the tenderness of the human race into account, thereby allowing teachers a wide frame of reference from which to respond to students.

Clarizio

Basing the interpersonal communication model on the helping model creates a clash between educators and mental health workers. The helping models, growing primarily out of the mental health movement, emphasize the affective domain, whereas alternative educational models emphasize the cognitive domain, since "teacher performance is judged by cognitive values (mandated achievement tests, behavioral objectives, etc.)" (Clarizio, 1980, p. 3). While helping models reward "warmth of feeling; spontaneity; insight; a high interest in others; the ability to communicate; warm parents; freedom to exercise judgment; warm teachers; and democratic classrooms," alternative educational

models recognize "competitive striving; intellectualism; being achievement oriented; teachers who are curriculum oriented; the regimentation of school work; group tests; and vice-principals in charge of discipline" (White, 1965, p. 190).

Imposing a mental health model on teachers, according to Clarizio, overlooks these unique and differential aspects of teaching: (1) Teachers must usually work with groups and rarely with one student. (2) Teachers aim primarily to achieve academic objectives and secondarily — if at all — to increase students' personal insights. (3) Teachers have to "reflect cultural values and, hence, cannot be permissively accepting." (4) Teachers deal mostly with "conscious or preconscious processes and materials." (5) Teachers have to confront "problems as they exist in the present situation." Since personal adjustment and academic achievement have been seen as incompatible objectives, being asked to do what they cannot do, teachers have been made to feel "anxious, inadequate, helpless, and guilty." The result is that teachers are "less well prepared to fulfill their roles" (Clarizio, p. 4).

Ausubel reports that permissiveness was probably over-emphasized from 1935 to 1955 in the United States. In recent years, there has been a movement away from the policy of permissiveness, since advice to teachers to be accepting, understanding, and nonthreatening has not helped them to handle misconduct successfully (1961, p. 26). Morse declares that mental health concepts have been of little value to teachers. Asking clinicians for practical and concrete suggestions, teachers tend instead to get general platitudes (1961, p. 333).

The focus of Clarizio and his sympathizers is control. The teacher has to be in charge of the class, and the helping model is insufficient to put the teacher in command under all circumstances. The ways to control through discipline include combining punishment with reward, rewarding acceptable alternative behaviors after providing them, removing rewards, employing behavior contracts, and avoiding punitive behavior as a basis for modelling (1980, p. 137).

Gellerman

Another viable alternative to the helping model emerges from research on the management of human relations in industry. This model would improve relations between teachers and students as well as teachers and administrators. Gellerman reports that some supervisors were "predominantly *production-centered*"; some were "predominantly *employee-centered*"; and some displayed a mixed pattern. The most productive supervisory style, according to the study was the mixed pattern which was regarded as optimum. However, the mixed style is not in itself "necessarily conducive to productivity." What is truly important is "how well the style can be adapted to different circumstances and personalities." In affinity with Maslow, Gellerman points out that the "theoretically best approach adopts itself continuously to the demands of the job, the needs of the men being supervised, and the capabilities of the supervisor himself" (1966, p. 34-35).

As to which style to employ, Gellerman suggests a delicate balance between adaptability and consistency. Supervisors who adhere rigidly to one of the three styles will probably conclude that "people are utterly unpredictable" and that there is "nothing [they] can do to affect their performance one way or another" (p. 36). However, to claim that adaptability is necessary for effective leadership does not imply inconsistent leadership. Gellerman reports that supervisors who tried to follow an employee-centered style but lapsed frequently into other styles only succeeded in confusing and worrying their employees. To be consistent, supervisors should always be "no less permissive than [they] can be and no more demanding than [they] must be." When supervisors

vary their tactics, in order to remain consistent in their adaptability, the variation must occur because the job requires it, not because the supervisors are "experimenting or yielding to a whim." In other words, when supervisors become "more or less permissive, more or less demanding," it must stem from the situation, not fanciful activities (p. 36).

As teachers or as administrators, educators would likely relate vertically and horizontally through this model with beneficial results. The ancient issue of task *vs.* relationship has a potential resolution in Gellerman's formulations of supervisory styles. Adapting to circumstances yet consistent with their natural style, educators as teachers or administrators can utilize this model interpersonally and expect productivity, whether or not there is a helping relationship involved, since the pleasant or unpleasant manner of the supervisor is not crucial to productivity (pp. 33-36).

Self-Defense Models

Under the general model of self-defense, four models will be presented — public relations, conflict resolution, assertiveness training, and rhetoric. Again, while the helping models attend primarily to the students, the self-defense models attend primarily to the teachers.

Public Relations

Cutlip and Center tell us that effective public relations aims to "gain and hold the favorable opinions of the publics of an institution or industry" (p. 18); it entails the "performance and communications used to build profitable *relationships with the public*" (p. 5). Since we often are more influenced by "the way an event is interpreted than we are by the event itself," the following public relations principle is valuable: "X (the Deed) plus Y (the way the deed is interpreted) = Public Attitudes" (p. 6).

Since corporations attempt to build goodwill long before any accusations have been made, having built their credibility, corporations then can provide "alternative interpretations of particular social problems." Even when deviant acts of corporations become known, corporations have enormous resources with which to "(1) turn away efforts at labeling, (2) build reservoirs of goodwill, (3) provide alternative interpretations of particular problems, and (4) attack their accusers" (Ermann and Ludman, 1982, 21). Thus, teachers as public relations directors might concern themselves with administrators, trustees, other teachers, librarians, counselors, students, parents of students, nonteaching staff such as secretaries, custodians and school bus drivers, ATA members and officials (in Alberta), community groups, and educational specialists such as speech pathologists and school psychologists. Given a public relations perspective, rather than focus on the helping relationship only between the teacher and students, teachers would take the overall systems network into account in deciding what to do and to avoid in order to protect or enhance their status and relationship in the school community.

Conflict Resolution

In terms of Rapoport's (1960) notions of the fight, game, and debate, conflict resolution becomes particularly useful to teachers when facing colleagues, students, administrators, or anyone else in their professional circle. In a fight, the "opponent is mainly a nuisance" who "should not be there, but somehow is." The object of a fight is to "harm, destroy, subdue, or drive away the opponent." The opponent has to be "eliminated, made to disappear, or cut down in size or importance." In a game, the "opponent is essential." In fact, since a "strong opponent is valued

more than a weak one," the opponents cooperate in that they follow "absolutely and without reservation the rules of the game," while "presenting to each other the greatest possible challenge" — which is "what makes the game worth while." Although an opponent's "interests may be diametrically opposed," the opponent is seen as a "mirror image of self." Hence, the adversaries in a game cooperate, even though their interests are opposed (p. 9). In a debate, which is a problem-solution method, "the opponents direct their arguments *at each other*." Neither "harming of the opponent nor outwitting of the opponent is relevant to the objective" in a debate, the objective being to "*convince* your opponent, to make him see things as you see them" (p. 9).

Given Rapoport's terminology, while a fight, a game and a debate all have their useful places, the debate is the court of highest appeal. It is through debate that fights and games are resolved. The dialectical conflict is transcended through debate. In schools, the transcendental dialectic might occur for students through a teacher, for teachers through an administrator or union, and for administrators through a board of education.

However, to claim that resolution should be a uniform reaction to a conflict would be harmful in the long run. While conflict is not here treated as worthwhile as a final end, its use in the classroom as a functional means to an end is encouraged. It is functional when we avert grand problems in the future through the creation of conflict now (Abrahamson, 1978, pp. 41-45). Janis' (1972) work on groupthink encourages conflict as a remedy to oppressive and dysfunctional comformity and conflict resolution.

Distinguishing between destructive and productive conflicts, Frost and Wilmot argue that conflict can have "highly desirable, productive functions in a relationship" and offer four strategic avenues concerning the direction people in conflict might choose: (1) avoiding it, (2) maintaining it at the present level, (3) reducing it, and (4) escalating it (1978, p. 17). Whatever avenue the contestants choose, "realistic conflict tends to be productive" since it is "directly related to a goal," while "unrealistic conflict often leads to random, meaningless violence" (p.18). Teachers may therefore choose to create an immediate conflict as a constructive means to the distant end of conflict resolution.

Assertiveness Training

Distinguishing between assertiveness and aggressiveness, Goldstein states that assertiveness means "expression of not only anger or irritation, but of all feelings including warm and loving feelings." Since appropriateness is valued in assertiveness training in the sense that the "expression should accurately convey the person's feelings in a way that will produce the most positive of possible results," it is a "good idea to raise your restraints and inhibitions against aggressive and nonassertive behavior and to lower [them] about being assertive" (1973, p. 228). When we are nonassertive, we "say nothing in response to a provocation," keep our feelings to ourselves, and hide our feeling from others and sometimes from ourselves. While nonassertiveness is "often dishonest and involves letting other people violate [our] personal right to be treated with respect and dignity," aggressiveness involves expressing our feelings through "insults, sarcasm, labels, put-downs, & hostile statements and actions" in a way that "violates others' rights to be treated with respect and dignity" (Johnson, 1972, p. 226).

Teachers would benefit from the assertiveness alternative model of interpersonal communication because "one of [our] basic human rights is self-defense when [our] rights are being stepped on" (Bower & Bower, 1976, p. 6). Given the vertical and horizontal communication networks that

efficient teachers recognize, assertiveness training would assist them in improving their self-esteem (pp. 26-44), coping with stress (pp. 52-60), requesting favors from others (pp. 106-12), protesting unfavorable actions of others (pp. 115-20), and dealing with dysfunctional avoidance behavior (pp. 143-60). Whether dealing with irate parents, delinquent students, authoritarian administrators, or belligerent colleagues, teachers schooled in assertiveness would have a useful model of self-defense for handling their communicative affairs.

Rhetoric

The last self-defense model we will present is that of rhetoric which entails sales, argumentation, and interrogation. According to Frye, rhetoric entails the "social or public use of words" (1963, p. 57). Rhetorically speaking, "the way you say things can be just as important as what's said." In short, rhetoric is *"communication intended to influence choice"* (Brembeck & Howell, 1976, p. 19). From a rhetorical point of view, teachers would establish their credibility in terms of communicating their expertise, trustworthiness, presentation of material, and adaptability to their students (Zimbardo et al., 1977, p. 98).

Sales, as a manipulative form of rhetoric, might use these tactics: (1) identifying ourselves with the students and their interests, (2) associating ourselves with something or someone our colleagues respect or revere, (3) disassociating ourselves from something or someone administrators fear or dislike, (4) getting students to follow the crowd and jump on the bandwagon, (5) citing testimonials from authorities to support our proposals, suggesting a point through words and voice rather than explicitly stating it, (6) maximizing the superiority of our proposal over others, and (7) minimizing the value of opposing proposals (Stewart & Cash, 1982, p. 293).

As for ethics of the sales approach, Andersen recognizes the double bind in the ethics of persuasion when he suggests that while the "persuader has the responsibility not to try to deceive, the persuadee has the obligation not to be deceivable." Through his "200 percent responsibility theory," Andersen suggests that both parties involved in a sales interview should assume 100 percent responsibility for conducting an ethical transaction. If "either source or receiver defaults on his responsibility, the other active participant presumably continues to shoulder sufficient responsibility to provide some protection for both" (1971, p. 326).

Argumentation, as a rhetorical model, entails "reason giving in communicative situations by people whose purpose is the justification of acts, beliefs, attitudes, and values" (Freeley, 1981, p. 1). Argumentation teaches how to discover the presumption and carry the burden of proof in establishing a *prima facie* case. It teaches the tests of evidence and reasoning, valid logical arguments and fallacies of argument, requirements of a case, the building of an affirmative case and a negative case, and refutation and rebuttal tactics (pp. 32-229). Argumentation might appear to some as an intellectual version of assertiveness training and perhaps it is. For teachers, it might serve both ends in one — assertive rhetorical self-defense.

The last rhetorical mode is interrogation which, as used here, is restricted to humane, though rigorous, interviewing techniques. Mills tells us that questioning in academic debating is not the same as in judicial. In educational interrogation, there is typically less emphasis on "trapping witnesses in lies and badgering them to make damaging admissions," while there is more emphasis on "getting information, testing inferences, verifying sources, clarifying meanings of statements, and sharpening the contrasts in their cases" (Mills, p. 279).

Hard, though ethical, advice usually pours from the experience of lawyers. Wellman stresses "above all, the instinct to discover the weak point in the witness under examination" (1948, p. 8). Ziegelmueller maintains moreover that outside of the lawcourt the interrogator "establishes a priority order of question forms from high safety to low safety," determining the "degree of risk in asking a question by the possibility of refuting an answer not desired by the cross-examiner" (1983, p. 898).

Thinking from both the questioner and respondent viewpoints gives teachers a sound basis for protecting themselves in a spoken encounter. To see themselves in relation to the grand structure of supersystem and subsystem would give teachers an insight into the difference between a helping interview and an interrogation. Oftentimes what in isolation looks like a job for the teacher as helper is really a job for the teacher as interrogator. Whether asking or responding, the interrogation model calls unequivocal attention to the complex responsibilities teachers may actually be facing yet failing to recognize through the gentle veil of the helping model. While the intimidation style of interrogation is acknowledged, it is not endorsed here. Teachers are no more prosecuting attorneys than they are therapists. Calling attention to the self-defensive potential of the interrogation model for teachers has been the only concern in this context.

Conclusion

Unequivocally, helping models of interpersonal communication in teacher training programs play a valuable role. However, to use helping models exclusively may prove useless to disastrous. Teacher training programs, it has been argued in this paper, would benefit from retaining the helping models as one type of interpersonal model among numerous others.

NOTES

[1] Programs investigated in Canada were those at the University of Calgary, University of Lethbridge, University of Alberta, Athabasca University, University of British Columbia, University of Victoria, York University, University of Toronto, University of Guelph, University of Western Ontario, University of Manitoba, University of Saskatchewan, and Dalhousie University. Programs investigated in the U.S.A. were those at the University of Minnesota, University of Illinois (Circle and Urbana), University of Colorado, SUNY-Queens, University of Utah, Montana State University, Arizona State University, San Francisco State University, University of California (Santa Barbara and Chico), Northern Illinois University, and the University of Hawaii (Manoa and Hilo). An examination of teacher education programs at these institutions showed no models of interpersonal communication offered serious competition to the helping model. Furthermore, after questioning 120 teachers and 80 student teachers in Alberta from 1978 through 1984 about helping models of interpersonal communication, 182 of those questioned reported that few to no alternative models were made available to them during their training programs. Surprisingly, 151 teachers reported that the relationship fostered by the helping model is potentially an occupational hazard. They attribute this to potential exploitation.

[2] The following texts exemplify the helping model of interpersonal communication with its stress on openness, honesty, trust, empathy, involvement, agape, and other humane and therapeutic qualities: Buber's *Between Man and Man*, Jourard's *The Transparent Self*, Johnson's *Reaching Out*, Howe's *The Miracle of Dialogue*, Stewart's *Bridges Not Walls*, De Vito's *The Interpersonal Communication Book*, Mayeroff's *On Caring*, Douglas' *Philosophers on Rhetoric*, Roger's *Client—Centered Therapy*, and Carkhuff's *The Art of Helping*.

[3] See, *Three Approaches to Psychotherapy*, Series I & II, Psychological Films, Inc., 1965 & 1977.

REFERENCES

Abrahamson, M. (1978). *Functionalism.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Andersen, K. (1971) *Persuasion theory and practice.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Angyal, A. (1965). Basic principles of a holistic theory of personality. In W.S. Sakahian (Ed.), *Psychology of personality: Readings in theory.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Ausubel, D. (1961). A new look at classroom discipline. *Phi Delta Kappan, 43,* 26-27.

Bower, S.A., and Bower, G.H. (1976). *Asserting yourself: A practical guide for positive change.* Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley.

Brammer, L.M. (1973). *The helping relationship: Process and skills.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Brembeck, W.L., and Howell, W.S. (1976). *Persuasion: A means of social influence.* 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Clarizio, H.F. (1980). *Toward positive classroom discipline.* 3rd ed. Toronto: John Wiley and Son.

Cutlip, S.M., and Center, A.H. (1971). *Effective public relations.* 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc..

Egan, G. (1975). *The skilled helper: A model for systematic helping and interpersonal relating.* Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc..

Ermann, M.D., and Lundman, R.J. (1982). *Corporate deviance.* Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fiordo, R. (1981). Integrity training: A moral code and method for moral education. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 15,* 47-60.

Frankl, V.E. (1966). *Man's search for meaning: An introduction to logotherapy.* New York: Washington Square Press, Inc..

Freeley, A.J. (1981). *Argumentation and debate: Reasoned decision making,* 5th ed. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Co..

Frost, J.H., and Wilmot, W.W. (1978). *Interpersonal conflict.* Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co..

Frye, N. (1963). *The educated imagination.* Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corp..

Gellerman, S.W. (1966). *The management of human relations.* Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Goldstein, A. (1973). Behavior therapy. In R. Corsini (Ed.), *Current psychotherapies.* Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Holt, J. (1974). *Escape from childhood: The needs and rights of children.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Janis, I. (1972). *Victims of groupthink.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Johnson, D. (1972). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualization,* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc..

Kuhn, T.S. (1971). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Martin, W.B.W. (1983). *Helpful, understanding, and co-operative teachers.* St. Johns, Newfoundland: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Maslow, A.H. (1965). *Eupsychian management.* Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin and the Dorsey Press.

Maslow, A.H. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature.* New York: Viking Press.

Mills, Glen E. (1968). *Reason in controversy: On general argumentation.* 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Morris, C.W. (1964). *Signification and significance: A study of the relations of signs and values.* Cambridge: Mass.: The M.I.T. Press.

Morse, W. (1961). The mental hygiene dilemma in public education. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 31,* 330-338.

Mowrer, O. Hobart (1973). *Integrity group process.* Lecture printed at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. October 10, 1973.

Rapoport, A. (1960). *Fights, games, and debates.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Stewart, C.J., and Cash, W.B. (1982). *Interviewing: principles and practices,* 3rd ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co.

Szasz, T. (1979). *The myth of psychotherapy: Mental healing as religion, rhetoric, and repression.* Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Wellman, F.L. (1948). *The art of cross-examination.* 4th ed. New York: Garden City Publishing Co.

White, M. (1965). Little red schoolhouse and little white clinic. *Teachers College Record, 67,* 187-193.

Ziegelmueller, G. (1983). Cross-examination reexamined. In Zarefsky, D., Sillars, M.O., and Rhodes, J. (Eds.), *Argument in Transition.* Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication.

Zimbardo, P.G., Ebbesen, E.B., and Maslach, C. (1977). *Influencing attitudes and changing behavior.* 2nd ed. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley.