

Book Reviews

Gershen Rosenblum, Ph.D., Editor
Region V Mental Health Administrator
Massachusetts Dept. of Mental Health
888 Washington St., Dedham, Mass. 02026

TOWARD EFFECTIVE COUNSELING AND PSYCHOTHERAPY: TRAINING AND PRACTICE. Charles B. Truax and Robert R. Carkhuff. *Chicago: Aldine, 1967. pp. xiv + 416. \$10.75.*

These are difficult years for those engrossed in practice, theory-building, or research in psychotherapy. Doubts about the effectiveness of any kind of psychotherapy, much less one's favorite brand, have been trumpeted, with supporting data, controversial and tortured though they may be. Even if psychotherapy were to prove more influential than a placebo or no treatment, the question of its social usefulness is raised. Meeting national manpower requirements for a comprehensive preventive and treatment mental health program requires a pool of workers so great that it cannot be filled out of those receiving training for psychotherapy as part of one of the traditional mental health disciplines. Furthermore, the readers of this Journal are familiar with the arguments against the central relevance of the "one to one relationship" to confrontation of many of the problems of large segments of our population.

Beleaguered psychotherapists will want to applaud *Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice* and hail its authors as saviours. In fact, Jerome D. Frank, himself a distinguished research contributor, in the Foreword enthusiastically awards it the title of "breakthrough." For the authors have explained away negative results of evaluative studies, have combined their own data with that of others to establish the validity of three ingredients of effective psychotherapy, accurate empathy, genuineness, and nonpossessive warmth, and have demonstrated that even laymen can be trained within a relatively brief period to maintain fairly high levels of these three conditions while interacting with patients. Furthermore, the patients studied ran the gamut from outpatient neurotics to chronic hospitalized psychotic patients, with juvenile delinquents thrown in for good measure. Thus Truax and Carkhuff have not only established the effectiveness of psychotherapy, but described certain important bases for the effect and spelled out and validated a method of training which promises to ease drastically the manpower problem.

The central core of the book is, of course, the three above-mentioned ingredients, their definition, measurement, and validation. Initially stated by Rogers, scales for measuring them were developed under his leadership during the University of Wisconsin studies of psychotherapy with schizophrenics. Truax and Carkhuff present data from that project, from their later collaboration at the University of Kentucky, and finally from studies carried on by each of them with other collaborators. The three scales are fully described, with protocols designed to illustrate different levels of each aspect of therapeutic interactions. From the descriptions, nonpossessive warmth comes off as therapist expression of caring for the patient and genuineness comes out as therapist expressiveness, suggesting the possibility that there will be a lot of overlap between these two when they are being rated. The results obtained run somewhat differently, with warmth and accurate empathy correlating almost to the level of their reliabilities and with genuineness and warmth correlating least. Since genuineness is rated least reliably, this may account for the discrepancy from ex-

pectation. Truax and Carkhuff offer an impressive array of data ordered from their own work and that of others to support their thesis. Yet this reviewer finds himself responding with reservations. Having labored in the same vineyards, his response might be dismissed as envy, less generous than that of Frank. And there is much to envy in the authors' ingenuity and energy. Yet the reviewer is not disposed to retire into introspective self-criticism. Instead, he will seek to detail the basis for his reservations so that each reader can freely reach his own conclusions.

Sources of his disquiet are listed as follows:

1. A major source of data, coming from the Wisconsin project, seems to be in dispute. This report, published almost simultaneously with the Rogers edited report (Rogers, 1967), protects itself against discrepancies (which in fact appeared) by the curious statement, "Should it (the Rogers volume) report differences in, say, hospitalization rates favoring the treated patients, our present statements of the findings would not be altered, since therapy was discontinued on most patients in 1962 and on all patients in 1963" (p. 11). Incidentally, it is a very frustrating experience to turn time and again to the references seeking a more detailed report of research than is available in the text and find that the citation refers to reports in the files of the Wisconsin project or Truax's current project at the University of Arkansas.

2. The authors display an astonishing facility for shaping all kinds of seemingly contradictory data to fit their theory. For example, two studies come up with the contradictory results that, in one instance, warmth, in the other instance, genuineness, were *negatively* related to outcome. The puzzling question of how an aspect of relationships that is thought to contribute to personal growth can in such instances act as though it interferes with growth is brushed aside with the happy thought that, since in both instances the offending ingredient is also negatively related to the other two conditions, "then patient outcome is best predicted by whichever two conditions are most closely related to each other." This facility is matched by the ease with which they seem to stretch their theoretical commitments. While subscribing to Rogers' principles of *unconditional* positive regard, they profess to find no contradiction with rewarding patients differentially for desired as compared to undesired behavior, which to me sounds like an operational definition of *conditional* positive regard.

The fact that editing out the patient's communications does not change ratings of accurate empathy is discussed only from the view that it shows that ratings are uncontaminated by knowledge of patient conditions. How one can judge the accuracy of an empathic response without the opportunity to observe what is being responded to is swept under the rug along with the possible inference that even when raters have these observations available to them, their ratings are influenced by them. To the reviewer it suggests that raters are responding to formal characteristics of a generalized empathic response, e.g., "you feel . . .", rather than to accuracy. Where brief descriptions of the training of raters is given, they suggest that it does not take much time to train raters unsophisticated in psychotherapy. Yet even lay therapists need at least 100 hours of intensive training in which recognizing these conditions in others is an important part.

3. Too many links in the chain of evidence rest on unverified simplifications of psychotherapy, for example, the level of effectiveness attained by laymen in training is based on observations from a single interview (not from an interview sampled from an ongoing therapeutic relationship) with a patient or from interviews with simulated patients. Elsewhere I have detailed the argument for a chain of evidence necessary to support such simplifications (Bordin, 1965).

To sum up, the claims to definitive results, the volume and range of the studies that have been done, make this book required reading for anyone interested in the

empirical basis for the conduct of psychotherapy and its teaching. Of special interest to those engaged in teaching psychotherapists or related workers are the protocols of training sessions included in the second half of the book.

REFERENCES

- Bordin, E. S. Simplification as a strategy for research in psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1965, 29, 493-503.
- Rogers, C. R. (Ed.) *The therapeutic relationship and its impact*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Edward S. Bordin, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor

LSD, MAN AND SOCIETY. Edited by Richard C. DeBold and Russell C. Leaf
Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1957. 219 pp. \$5.

This book can be recommended without question to archaeologists and historians one hundred years hence who may wish to study the reaction of American society to the psychedelic cultist revolution of 1967. During the past 18 to 24 months, we have witnessed the burgeoning and declining use of LSD among a portion of the young people of this country plus the reaction of their elders in the colleges, courts, Congress, and homes across the nation. During this time the universities of our country have been trying to find a medium in which students could be correctly informed about hallucinogenic drugs while abiding by the students' antipathy toward preaching and the society's demand that these agents be decried. The speakers at these conferences have become something of a traveling tour, and the publication of this book (which encompasses the proceedings of one such meeting at Wesleyan University in Connecticut) may save the members of this traveling lecture company from future forays.

This book has all of the strengths and weaknesses of the conference format of education and will probably not deter any wavering person from taking LSD. The individual papers adequately convey the opinions and experiences of the speakers. None, however, really answers the question for the young member of the audience (p. 138) who asks why he should wait fifty years until science comes up with some kind of result which may tell him that he has been missing something all along. The manifest gap between this question and the conference format which strives to present all viewpoints in an intellectually sophisticated manner is adequate testimony to our inability to educate vulnerable young people against the potential hazards of drug abuse. Similarly if one were to provide this book to an adolescent in answer to a question about hallucinogenic drugs, one would be as effective as the parent providing a copy of "Growing Up" to a youngster inquiring about sex.

The book also has certain inherent deficiencies for other audiences. The psychiatrist dealing with this problem in the community will notice the absence of clinical material dealing with adverse reactions to these drugs. Dr. Louria's discussion of the subject is not adequate for the use of professionals in the field who will wish for clinical examples of case material as well as possible methods of treatment. More technical research questions are dealt with in the three papers at the end of the book. These are sufficiently broad and clearly written as to be of value to the professional or lay person interested in the pharmacology, neurophysiology, and behavioral effects of LSD. There is probably some merit in placing technical papers back to back with a paper dealing with LSD and religious experience. The technical papers take some of the aura away from the potent psychedelic, and the paper on religious ex-

perience adds a dimension to the technical works which they need in order to be relevant to the controversy under discussion.

The book itself provides an overview of LSD. The publishers feel that this topic is hot enough to sell, and are now distributing the book in paperback as well as in hard cover. I tend to subscribe to the belief that the specific use of LSD by young people may have passed its peak in the fall of 1967 and that a book dealing specifically with this pharmacological agent (no matter how controversial) has at best limited mileage in the marketplace. Some people, however, may find it useful in their work or of nonprofessional interest. I would have placed Chayet's paper at the front of the book because it presents the controversy, and our societal reaction to it, in perspective. After reading Chayet's paper, it is easier to identify the positions of the other speakers and to conclude whether they wear "white or black hats." Dr. Joffe's statement (p. 133) that he does not care about the policies of an agency that he works for provided that they "give him an opportunity to do the scientific work" that he wants is a good rationale for why college students have difficulty heeding speakers over 30. The doveish positions of Dr. Pahnke and Dr. Barron and the seductive case examples of Dr. Kurland's psychedelic therapy contrast sharply with Dr. Louria's feeling (p. 57) that "we have just gone too far in allowing permissiveness in the family and in the colleges." He (Dr. Louria) is a hawk when it comes to hippies. LSD clearly touches a philosophical controversy deeper than its medical hazards. These hazards have now been documented by a number of authors. Psychiatrists should gain familiarity with these reactions as well as with the controversy surrounding the genetic and chromosomal changes that have been observed in some (but not all) laboratories. Again, these issues were not dealt with in sufficient detail for the mental health professional.

Apart from archaeologists and historians in the year 2067, how can this book be useful to professionals? The community psychiatrist who has been faced with the difficulties of presenting facts on hallucinogenic drugs to interested lay audiences may learn much about the pitfalls and something about the necessary content involved in such presentations. I am not being facetious. The psychedelic revolution which has to a certain extent continued beyond LSD is a true psychiatric epidemic. As such it tests our skills at preventive psychiatry and challenges our ingenuity. It is important therefore to treat this book in its entirety as a case report, to criticize it constructively from this point of view, and to improve upon it in our own activities.

Roger E. Meyer, M.D.
Boston University School of Medicine
Psychopharmacology Laboratory
Boston

THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD: ISSUES AND INNOVATIONS. Edited by Joe L. Frost and Glenn R. Hawkes. *Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1966. 444 pp. \$4.95, paperbound.*

DISADVANTAGED CHILD, Vol. I. Edited by Jerome Hellmuth. *Seattle, Wash.: Special Child Publications of the Seattle Sequin School, 1967. 499 pp. \$10, plastic-bound.*

THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD: SELECTED PAPERS OF MARTIN DEUTSCH AND ASSOCIATES. *New York: Basic Books, 1968. 400 pp., \$10.*

The titles of these books are almost exactly the same, but in each there is some diversity of emphasis and content. As Deutsch notes in an introduction (not to his

own collection, however, but in *The Disadvantaged Child*, Vol. 1.) "The approach to disadvantaged children has not become stereotyped and there is no strong orthodoxy in the field—at least not yet."

The Frost and Hawkes volume provides an anthology of a generalized nature. Most of the materials are standard. They are well known and represent materials that are somewhat dated, uncritical, and quite speculative. Many, unfortunately, are not too precise in content and offer only the merest insights into the present problems. The several articles found in Part 2, which is entitled "Characteristics of the Disadvantaged," are lacking in the ingredients necessary to establish some strong bases for educational programs. In this section one finds the constant use of the terms "culturally disadvantaged" and "culturally deprived." These terms are basic attestations of the overwhelming "rehabilitation bias" that marks the behavior of so many individuals working with lower-income people. The final article is an example and is almost sophist in nature. It is an interesting but rather shallow attempt to defend middle-class values in an uncritical way. It seeks the support of the teaching profession in furthering, with intensity, the imposition of these on the already alienated, disaffected, and denied youngsters in the schools. Any casual reading of recent materials of Jonathan Kozol, Robert Coles, and Herbert Kohl, indicates how impossible if indeed not unconscionable this posture is.

Part 7 entitled "Training Teachers of the Disadvantaged" reflects problems of a similar nature. This section carries articles that represent generally some sentimentalized approaches to teacher training and the teacher-model. Haubrich's article, a realistic and germane analysis, helps the reader to see the polarization of two points of view when it is related to the major article in the section written by Goldberg. The juxtaposing of these two represents the problem from which this volume suffers: that of critical balance and evenness. Some of the material is valueless in terms of what we now know. But there are some outstanding exceptions. Throughout one can gain valuable ideas from articles by J. McVicker Hunt, Thomas Pettigrew, David Ausubel, Robert Ström, Robert Hess, and Jules Henry. In general, this volume serves only to give a reader the smallest of introductions to the socially and educationally explosive realities of the disadvantaged child and the educationally denied. It does not even begin to deal with the culture of poverty and the ramifications of that culture on life, life styles, and learning. The articles generally tend to be descriptive. They are based upon much speculation rather than any real, durable theory. Many of them contribute to a highly questionable mythology about lower-income people. This is lamentable because these articles frequently become standards that are referred to and reprinted. This denies us the opportunity of dealing with the central issues that must be addressed. There is a good bibliography contained in this volume and that represents a service. I disagree with the publisher's statement found on the jacket that one "will find here between the covers of one book the best current thinking on the topic." It is not the best current thinking. It is a diverse collection that at times tends to be uncritical. In terms of building backgrounds or insights, it falls wide of the mark.

Diversity also marks the Hellmuth volume on the disadvantaged child. This is a collection of 11 articles that are far more critical in nature and intent. There is much more material here than one would normally find in a book of readings. For example, the article on "The Preparation of the Teacher of the Disadvantaged" precisely lines up the needs and the activities necessary to any program for educational betterment. It is tight and relevant. Other articles here are germane research statements that require very careful reading. Throughout the volume, one finds the development of the theories that need to be crystalized into precise research designs studied and proven out or discarded as we continually move toward the determination of

ways to deal with one of the major problems of American public education—the education of lower-income inner city populations. Of the three volumes under consideration, this seems to be the richest in true intellectual input. For that reason, it should be a must reading for anyone in the fields of education, mental health, community relations, and social work.

The Deutsch volume serves as an interesting historical reference point. The name of Deutsch is well known in the field of psychology and early childhood education. There have been marked contributions made by him and his associates. On rereading the articles of this volume that have all been published elsewhere and that are somewhat dated, one starts to wonder whether much of the material doesn't become a "licking of one's own footnotes" rather than a continuous program of expansion and insight based upon collected and analyzed "hard-nosed" data. The Deutsch collection does do that which he sets out to do—presents a select number of articles that exemplify a *particular approach*. This reviewer, in many ways, finds some disagreement with the approach from his own experiences and work in slums and in inner city schools. Much of what Deutsch bases his theory on is derived from his concept of the cumulative deficit. From my work with the lower-income youth, both in the slums and in other contexts, I find the concept of the cumulative deficit one that relates directly to the idea of rehabilitation. Perhaps it is not these children who are disadvantaged and need rehabilitation, but frequently the people who teach them.

There are some essential problems in the Deutsch volume. His use of phrases such as "the lack of environmental opportunities," "the lack of artifacts in the environment," and "the lack of stimulation that leads to the full development of auditory and visual modalities," is very difficult to accept as I have not seen the lack except as related to middle-class value expectations. Stimulation and artifacts are *déclassé*. There are no data which one can adduce that indicates that youngsters in lower-income areas, when one fully understands with intensity the cultural representations of their life, suffer from the lack of stimulations and various other kinds of necessities that make for them a whole life. Deutsch (in his particular approach) aims at measuring the ingredients of deprivation and would develop therefrom a typology of deprivation so that organized experiences developmentally could be related to the performance. It is possible that this denies the existence of a necessary and worthwhile cultural functionalism. This is questionable, both on anthropological and sociological grounds. One has to question deeply, for lack of hard data, the fact that there should be the kind of social intervention and change advocated by Deutsch and based on his insights and acceptance of the present data of family cohesion and preschool experience. (Moynihan is still open to question as it concerns the family.) The basic intervention must be in the alteration of the total environmental structure that disenfranchises, alienates, disaffects, and does not allow for the legitimating of ethnicity.

Deutsch offers a great deal of empirical data. He establishes theoretical insights that offer an arena of thought and cogitation to those who work with lower-income youth. This volume will serve as a reference to those who would want to change the egregious conditions that so desperately erode the opportunity for a full life for everyone in our country by offering a collection of findings albeit those arrived at from a certain point of view.

Maurie Hillson, Ed.D.
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers—The State University of New Jersey
New Brunswick