

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

Spring 2004

Instructor: Debra VanderVoort, Ph.D.

Class, Room, & Time : Psy 377, UCB 245, W 5:00-7:45

Office: UCB 273; 974-7402

Office Hours: MW: 2:00-2:50; 4:15-4:45; 7:45-9:30 and by appointment.

The focus of the course will be on the various theoretical approaches to counseling, the therapeutic relationship, techniques of counseling, ethical issues, research, diagnosis and assessment, cross-cultural counseling, as well as career, family and couples, and group interventions.

The objectives of this course are: (1) To identify the basic concepts and assumptions that underlie the various theories of counseling as well as similarities and differences between these theories; (2) To understand what is involved in the development of a positive therapeutic relationship and the techniques used in counseling; (3) To enhance one's critical thinking skills; and (4) To see the applicability of counseling theories to one's everyday life.

Evaluation and Grading:

Exams: There will be four exams covering the readings and class material. The exams are multiple choice and essay. Each exam is worth 55 points.

Journals: 72 points. Eight journal entries (1-2 pages) on the material to be covered that week are due. It should include your critique of the readings (i.e., what you agreed with or did not agree with and why), and aspects of the material you found applicable to your (or someone else's) life. Each journal must have at least one critique (positive or negative and rationale) and one aspect that applies to your or someone else's life for full credit. These two must be separate (i.e., your critique cannot be that it does or does not apply to your life). Please use the subheadings of "Critique" and "Applied" (or a similar subheading) to differentiate these two sections, and number your journals. Points will be deducted for late entries. Revisions are allowed within one month of your receipt of the original paper. Please submit the original paper (or previous draft) with the revised paper. The last day of class is the last day to turn in papers.

Grading:

A = 94% of total score and above
A- = 90-93% of total score
B+ = 87-89% of total score
B = 83-86% of total score
B- = 80-82% of total score
C+ = 77-79% of total score
C = 73-76% of total score
C- = 70-72% of total score
D+ = 66-69% of total score¹
D = 63-65% of total score
D- = 60-62% of total score
F = 59% of total score and below

Text: Gelso, C. J., Fretz, B. R. (2001). Counseling psychology:
2nd Edition. Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich: New York.

Any student with a documented disability who would like to request accommodations should contact the University Disability Services Office at 933-0816(V), 933-3334(TTY), Campus Center Room 311, as early in the semester as possible.

Advising is a very important resource designed to help students complete the requirements of the University and their individual majors. Students should consult their advisor at least once a semester to decide on courses, check progress towards graduation, and discuss career options and other educational opportunities provided by UH-Hilo. Advising is a shared responsibility, but students have final responsibility for meeting degree requirements.

¹ Note: Any student receiving a D+, D, or D- will receive a D for the course per university policy.

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

Syllabus

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Assigned readings</u>
1/13	Introduction and Overview	
1/15	Counseling Psychology; Development of the Profession	CP Chapters 1; 2
1/20	Holiday: Martin Luther King Day	
1/22 -1/27	Research and Science	CP Chapter 3
1/29	Ethics and Being an Ethical Psychologist	CP Chapter 5 -2/3
2/5	1st EXAM	
2/10 -2/12	The Therapeutic Relationship	CP Chapter 8
2/17	Holiday: President's Day	
2/24 -2-26	Tactics and Techniques of Counseling	CP Chapter 9
3/3 -3/5	The Psychoanalytic Approach	CP Chapter 10
3/10 -3/12	The Behavioral and Cognitive Approaches	CP Chapter 11
3/17	2nd EXAM	
3/19 & 3/31	The Third Force: The Humanistic- Experiential Approach	CP Chapter 12
3/24 -3/26	Spring Break!	
4/2 -4/7	Science and Practice of Assessment	CP Chapter 13
4/9 -4/14	Competent Counseling in a Culturally Diverse Society	CP Chapter 6

4/16 **3rd EXAM**

4/21 Career Psychology; Career Counseling
-4/23

CP Chapters 14; 15

4/28 Systems in Action: Family and Couples
-4/30 Interventions

CP Chapter 17

5/5 Therapeutic Groupwork
-5/7

CP Chapter 16

5/14 **Final: 2:00-4:00**

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

Syllabus

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Assigned readings</u>
1/14	Introduction and Overview Counseling Psychology; Development of the Profession	CP Chapters 1;2
1/21	Research and Science	CP Chapter 3
1/28	Ethics and Being an Ethical Psychologist	CP Chapter 5
2/4	1st EXAM	
2/11	The Therapeutic Relationship	CP Chapter 8
2/18	Tactics and Techniques of Counseling	CP Chapter 9
2/25	The Psychoanalytic Approach`	CP Chapter 10
3/3	The Behavioral and Cognitive Approaches	CP Chapter 11
3/10	2nd EXAM	
3/17	The Third Force: The Humanistic- Experiential Approach	CP Chapter 12
3/24	Spring Break	
3/31	Science and Practice of Assessment	CP Chapter 13
4/7	Competent Counseling in a Culturally Diverse Society	CP Chapter 6
4/14	3rd EXAM	
4/21	Career Psychology; Career Counseling	CP Chapters 14; 15
4/28	Systems in Action: Family and Couples Interventions	CP Chapter 17 Article on reserve by VanderVoort
5/5	Therapeutic Groupwork	CP Chapter 16
5/12	Final	

THE BASICS OF CRITICAL THINKING

In attempting to assess the plausibility of an author's position, the following ideas may be useful to consider.

(1) Differentiating Between Fact and Opinion / Accuracy of Information

Fact: A statement that can be proven true by other verifiable facts.

Opinion: A statement of a person's feelings or impressions.

This includes an assessment of author bias and rhetoric. For example, does the author support his/her views with relevant facts? Are the alleged facts accurate? Does the author overlook relevant facts that would discredit her/his position? Can you differentiate between the interpretation of information and the presentation of factual data? Are the assumptions the author makes true or at least plausible?

(2) Completeness / Relevance of Information

Is there enough information presented to make a convincing argument? Are there other types of information that would strengthen the argument? Are the facts presented or points made relevant to the conclusions drawn?

(3) Recognizing Logical Fallacies and Faulty Reasoning

Some major examples of faulty reasoning or invalid inferences are:

a. Incorrect assumption of cause/effect relationship.

For two events to be causally related, one event must always follow the other event. For example, when the sun rises, it gets light outside. Association between two events does not necessarily imply a cause and effect relationship. For example, let us say that a cross-sectional study (i.e., one which gathers information at a single time period) finds that hostile people have high heart disease rates. One cannot say that hostility is a causal factor in heart disease unless: (1) additional research shows that hostility consistently precedes heart disease; and (2) other factors known to play a role in heart disease are controlled for (e.g., cholesterol, smoking, obesity, family history).

b. Inaccurate interpretation or distorted use of the numerical or statistical information.

For example, take the claim: Lowering of the speed limit on highways from 65 to 55 mph results in fewer traffic fatalities. Did the person check to see if there were the same number of people using the highway when the speed limit was 65 as when it was 55 (e.g., if there was a decrease in the population of the community in which the study was done, this could be a fallacious interpretation).

c. Faulty analogy, comparison carried too far, or comparison of

things that have nothing in common.

For example: Both apples and oranges are fruit; therefore if I like the taste of apples, I will like the taste of oranges.

d. Oversimplification.

Potentially relevant information is ignored in order to make a point. For example: The majority of voters in the U.S. are Democrats; therefore, Democratic candidates will win the next election. Another example: If we have free will, then there are no factors that determine the course of our lives. We are either totally free or totally determined.

e. Stereotyping.

People or objects are included together under simplistic labels that ignore important differences between them. For example: All Hispanic Americans who speak Spanish prefer listening to music in Spanish.

f. Ignoring the question.

Digression, obfuscation, or similar techniques are used to avoid answering a question. For example: When asked about the possibility of a new tax increase, a senator replies, "I have always met the obligations I have to those I represent".

g. Begging the question.

Assuming what you are trying to prove. For example, assume you are trying to prove that mental health professionals find mental health hard to define and your argument is that mental health professionals don't agree on who is mentally healthy. You haven't proven anything, you have only restated your claim. To prove the claim with that line of argumentation, you need evidence to show that various mental health professionals define mental health with different criteria (e.g., psychiatrists define it with one set of criteria, psychologists with another, and social workers with another).

h. Faulty generalization.

A judgement is based on insufficient evidence. For example: Dogs and cats like people; therefore all animals like people.