

FACILITATION SKILLS FOR TRAINERS

F CILLIERS

Department of Industrial Psychology
UNISA

ABSTRACT

This research aims to develop the facilitation skills of trainers. Facilitation is defined from the Person-Centered approach, as providing an opportunity for the trainee to experience personal growth and learning. A facilitation skills workshop was presented to 40 trainers, focussing on enhancing selfactualisation, its intra and inter personal characteristics, and attending and responding behaviour. Measurement with the Personal Orientation Inventory and Carkhuff scales, indicate enhanced cognitive, affective and conative sensitivity and interpersonal skills. A post-interview indicates the trainer's experienced empowerment in dealing with the providing of opportunities for growth amongst trainees, in all kinds of training situations. Recommendations are made to enhance facilitation development amongst trainers.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie navorsing poog om die fasiliteringsvaardighede van opleiers te ontwikkel. Fasilitering word gedefinieer vanuit die Persoonsgesentreerde benadering as die beskikbaarstelling van 'n geleentheid om persoonlike groei en leer te ervaar. 'n Fasiliteringsvaardighede werkswinkel is aangebied vir 40 opleiers, met die fokus op die stimulering van selfaktualisering, die intra en interpersoonlike kenmerke daarvan, en aandagsken- en responderingsgedrag. Meting met die Persoonlike Oriëntasievraelys en die Carkhuff skale, dui op 'n toename in kognitiewe, affektiewe en konatiewe sensitiviteit en interpersoonlike vaardighede. 'n Post-onderhoud dui op die opleier se ervaarde bemagtiging in die beskikbaarstelling van groeigeleenthede vir opleidingsituasies. Aanbevelings word gemaak om die ontwikkeling van fasiliteringsvaardighede by opleiers te verhoog.

Applied to Industrial Psychology, the origin of facilitation is twofold. Firstly, a significant amount of research was published on person centered groups from 1946 to 1952, mostly in group therapy (Raskin, 1986a, 1986b) with hospital patients (Braaten, 1986). This was later applied to education (Rogers, 1982), industry and organisations (Cilliers, 1984). Carl Rogers's visits to South Africa in the 1980's lead to an increased awareness about the application of person centered training and management (Cilliers, 1996). Secondly, facilitation has its roots within the National Training Laboratory tradition (Reddy & Henderson, 1987), referring to a specific role within staff training and development, aiming to stimulate personal growth, for example in T-groups (which were very popular in the 1970's and 1980's) (Cartwright & Zander, 1968).

Generally, facilitation refers to making easy and available (Gouws et al, 1979). From 1980 onwards, increased reference was made to facilitation as a skill in communication (Du Toit et al, 1998) and leadership training (Plas, 1996). It is defined as enhancing the group experience and enabling the followers to reach their goals (Corey, 1990:65-66). Applied to group work, facilitation is defined as opening up clear and direct communication amongst group members, helping them to assume increased responsibility for the direction of the group. In terms of peer learning it is called a process by which one group member contributes to learning through another group member (Shaw, 1981:454).

In the 1990's, literature on management development (Bentley, 1994; Forsyth, 1990:99-105; Kinlaw, 1993; Weaver & Farrell, 1997) started to refer directly to facilitation as a necessary skill for trainers and managers. According to Goldstein (1993:273-299), Gordon (1994:208-212), Nadler and Nadler (1994:4-12), and O'Connor et al (1996:320-321), facilitation refers to the providing of opportunities to acquire learning about the self, own behaviour and behaviour change. This applies to self-development, interpersonal relationships and to teamwork. Thus, the role of the facilitator (in training as well as in management), is different from and additional to the (pedagogic and sometimes autocratic) instructor (O'Connor et al, 1996:320). The facilitator is a resource or indirect guider (Patrick, 1992:331-340) in the development of (rather than to force) behavioural characteristics, skills and learning about the

self (rather than for the mastering of techniques). The focus is on empowering the trainee to make use of his/her own potential to develop his/her personality (something the instructor can not do for anyone). Exactly how facilitation leads to empowerment amongst trainees, is not explored in depth in training or management literature (Forsyth, 1990:99-105; Sklare et al, 1990; Westley & Waters, 1988). This creates the need to find answers elsewhere in applied psychology, of which the person-centered approach seems to be the most appropriate (Corey, 1990).

From the above, it seems that the literature on training is clear on the place of facilitation, where the trainer can provide an opportunity for trainees to learn, in cases where there is no correct and ready made content answer to be given. Unfortunately, in practice facilitation is used as a buzz word, interchangeably with training, instructing, chairing and leadership. For example, trainers would use expressions such as "I facilitated him / her / them / the group / a course" / "The facilitator really got them" / "Go and facilitate them - and be sure to tell them exactly what I want". The assumption underlying these expressions is that facilitation is done *to* trainees from a superior, powerful and instructional, position (Corey, 1990). The danger in this view is that the trainer - while pretending to facilitate - sees him/herself as the expert, pretends to know all the answers, gives advice, diagnoses and evaluates, relies on artificial techniques and procedures of his/her own choice, structures and directs interventions, forces action and creates performance expectations (Coulson, 1970). According to the descriptions of facilitation, this behaviour can be seen as manipulative, taking responsibility for the choices, growth and learning of trainees, leaving them disempowered and dependant upon outside (and assumed) expertise, and thus slowing down the process of learning (Meador, 1975; Rogers, 1975a).

This research explores the concept and skills of facilitation from humanistic psychology (Quitmann, 1985), the Person-Centered approach (Rogers, 1975a, 1975b) and the human potential movement (Carkhuff, 1969a, 1969b, 1972, 1978, 1983; Egan, 1990a, 1990b; Ivey, 1971). Within this framework there is yielding evidence that the enhancement of quality of working life amongst trainees, is influenced directly by the level of self-actualisation of the trainer. Carkhuff (1983) describes "training for better" as a situation where the trainer functions on a high level of selfactualisation, and thus provides opportunities for personal learning and growth to take place within the trainee. "Training for worse" refers to a situation where the trainer functions on a low level of selfactualisation, which is harming

the trainee in his/her personal learning and growth. The general research hypothesis is formulated as, the trainer whose self-actualisation (including facilitation skills) is enhanced, will act in an empowered way in all training situations, and thus empower trainees towards personal growth.

Facilitation

Facilitation is conceptualised as the creation of an accommodating climate and an opportunity for the release of the actualising tendency (Carkhuff, 1983; Rogers, 1973, 1982). This depends upon the quality of the relationship between the trainer (who functions on a high level of self-actualisation with its accompanying intra and interpersonal characteristics) and the second person (trainee or group), who as a result, learns how to learn and thus experiences personal growth.

The personality characteristics of the facilitator

These characteristics are knowledge and self actualisation (Brazier, 1993; Hekmat, 1975; Kirschenbaum & Heneron, 1993; Maslow, 1954, 1971; Rogers, 1973, 1975a, 1975b, 1982, 1985; Segre & Araza, 1993:83; Thorn, 1992).

Knowledge

Knowledge refers to insight into and understanding of individual and group behaviour (Rogers, 1975a, 1975b). The facilitator uses this to understand the nature of the self, interactions between persons as well as the facilitation process.

Selfactualisation

Selfactualisation is defined as a natural, dynamic and creative growth process, in which the person, while fully acknowledging own responsibility, gradually develops a unique sense of integration and wholeness through selfdefinition and the optimisation of all psychological potential, and in whom the expression of the actualising tendency leads to enhancement and enrichment of life, intrapersonally as well as interpersonally (Kirschenbaum & Henderon, 1993; Maslow, 1971; Rogers, 1982, 1985; Rogers & Stevens, 1967).

Intrapersonal characteristics

Intrapersonally the facilitator is able to become aware of his/her own feelings and perceptions and to deal with this information respectfully, honestly and responsibly. This is supported by the following cognitive, affective and conative behaviour (Kirschenbaum & Henderon, 1993; Rogers, 1973, 1982, 1985; Rogers & Stevens, 1967).

- * On the cognitive level, the facilitator thinks in a realistic, objective and flexible way and does not allow inappropriate feelings such as guilt, shame, inferiority or superiority to influence the thinking process.
- * Affectively the facilitator is mature, as indicated by sensitivity and awareness of own feelings and emotions (yet neither hypersensitive nor insensitive). These are recognised, taken responsibility for and expressed in a natural, independent and autonomous way. This stimulates his/her selfknowledge, insight and a realistic selfconcept, characterised by self-respect, acceptance, confidence and a sense of own worth. Consequently the facilitator purposefully seeks involvement in meaningful life situations to enhance own self-actualisation.
- * Conatively the facilitator acts from an internal locus of control, in a self-directed way, experiencing freedom of choice and does not feel victimised by external forces.

Interpersonal characteristics

Interpersonally the facilitator shows an optimistic and unconditional acceptance of and respect towards the trainee, a preference for qualitative, intimate, deep, rich and rewarding interpersonal relationships, and sensitivity, consideration and love towards others (Kirschenbaum & Henderon, 1993; Maslow, 1971; Rogers, 1985; Rogers & Stevens, 1967). This allows non-verbal and verbal contact with the trainee and to do so genuinely, spontaneously, non-exploitably and responsibly, in terms of the unique demands of each situation. This ability to form relationships sensitively involves the initiation of facilitative interpersonal processes or the creation of a relational climate that can stimulate constructive processes between the

self and the trainee, irrespective of differences in gender, race or anything else (Cilliers, 1984).

The facilitation process

This process consists of two phases, namely attending leading to involvement, and responding leading to exploration. Within each, the facilitator exhibits the skills of respect, realness, concreteness and empathy, referred to as the core facilitative dimensions (Cilliers, 1984; Cilliers & Wissing, 1993; Corey, 1990; Lieberman et al, 1973; Meador, 1975; Rogers, 1957, 1973, 1982)

- * Respect is defined as a profound recognition and appreciation of and regard for the value of the trainee as a unique person and for his/her rights as a free individual, irrespective of race, colour or creed. Respect is manifested in warmth, unconditional positive regard and in the quality of the attention given to the trainee.
- * Realness involves the degree of correspondence, congruence and transparency between what the facilitator says or does, and what he/she truly feels and means. This is done in an honest and sincere way without affectations.
- * Concreteness refers to the extent to which the personal or task-related information that is reflected back to the trainee, is specific and factual rather than vague or over-generalised. Concreteness aids accurate and clear communication.
- * Empathy refers to the ability of the facilitator to transcend his/her own self-consciousness in order to arrive at a conscious and accurate understanding of the trainee's deepest feelings and intentions, in terms of the latter's own frame of reference, and to explicitly communicate this understanding to the trainee (without prescription, evaluation or assessment).

Attending with respect leading to involvement

The facilitator attends to the verbal (listening to what is said and how) and non-verbal (looking at body language) behaviour of the trainee, with respect (unconditional acceptance) for the trainee's right to experience what ever he/she is going through (in stead of wanting the trainee to be or experience something different). This stimulates him/her to become involved in the here-and-now of the experience, instead of in an outside situation.

Responding with realness, concreteness and empathy leading to exploration

The facilitator responds, by reflecting back the trainee's observed behaviour by means of content and feeling reflections, such as "what I hear you say is . . .", "you seem to feel . . .", "you experience . . . and that makes you feel . . .". In this mode the facilitator is firstly as real as he/she can possibly be (in stead of being phony, dishonest or manipulative), facilitating an opportunity for the trainee also to be real. Secondly, the facilitator phrases the experience concretely (specifically in stead of generally) to facilitate getting to the core of the experience. Thirdly the facilitator reflects with empathy from the frame of reference of the trainee (in stead of the own) in "you"-language, to facilitate the trainee's identification with the experience. This stimulates the trainee's awareness of own subjective experiencing and the urgings of inner feelings, the incongruities between beliefs and behaviours, the willingness to listen to the self, to trust the inner promptings, to rely on them as a basis for own behaviour, and to get in touch with the incongruities within the self, and between the self and others - a growth process of self expansion and selfactualisation. The trainee's identification with the response gives the facilitator's feedback on the accuracy of his/her listening and looking.

Research question, aim and design

From the above, the research question can be stated as follows. Can the above facilitation characteristics, skills and process be operationalised in a workshop and what effect will that have on the participant's experienced training performance? The aim is firstly to evaluate such a workshop in facilitation skills and secondly to ascertain its effect on the participant's experienced performance.

Quantitative research is undertaken to evaluate the workshop and qualitative research to ascertain the trainer's experienced difference in performance. The workshop is seen as the independent variable and the resulting difference in skills as the dependant variable.

METHOD

The workshop in facilitation skills

• Aim of the workshop

The aim is to provide an opportunity to trainers to gain knowledge about, experience in and skills of facilitation, according to the above definitions and characteristics.

• Module 1 - Knowledge

A short instructional, self study and examination method in the form of a handout is used. The aim is to study literature on facilitation, selfactualisation with its intra- and interpersonal characteristics, as well as the facilitation process from the Person-Centered approach (Rogers, 1975b, 1982) and encounter group movement (Rogers, 1975a).

• Module 2 - Intrapersonal awareness

Encounter group experiences with one facilitator are used (Rogers, 1975a). The aim is to provide an opportunity at the beginning of the workshop to experience the facilitation process as well as to enhance intrapersonal awareness. These experiences are scheduled in between other workshop modules, in order to provide opportunities to reflect on personal learning during the workshop.

• Module 3 - Interpersonal skills

The above-mentioned facilitation process is operationalised (Carkhuff, 1978, 1983; Egan 1990a, 1990b). The aim is to practice attending and responding behaviour and to master the interpersonal skills using role-play as facilitator in one-to-one and group situations, with feedback from the trainer/facilitator and self measurement according to the Carkhuff (1969b) scales for respect, realness, concreteness and empathy.

• Module 4 - Revision and application

An open discussion with one facilitator is used. The aim of revision is to ascertain the level of learning taking place, and of application, to process the workshop experience and to support the transfer of learning to the work situation.

• Administration of the workshop

A small group format with between eight and twelve participants and one facilitator is used. To ensure enough time for intensive personal and interpersonal experiences, the workshop lasts 24 hours (excluding tea and lunch times), and is spread out over three working days. Figure 1 contains the workshop programme.

The population and sample

The population consist of 240 volunteering trainers in 24 large organisations - ranging from steel manufacturing to banking, in the metropolitan areas of Gauteng, with at least a Bachelor's degree in Psychology / Industrial Psychology and at least 5 years technical and management training experience. Their biographical profile is as follows: 65% white Afrikaans and English speaking, 16% black, 11% coloured and 8% Indian; 62% male and 38 % female, ages between 24 and 65. A random sample of 80 was drawn, and individuals were paired off according to race, gender and age into an experimental (N=40) and a control group (N=40). Both groups were divided again into small workshop groups of between eight and twelve to accommodate the individual trainer's work schedule.

Quantitative measurement

Knowledge was not measured. Measuring instruments were chosen according to the personality characteristics of the facilitator. For the intrapersonal characteristics the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom, 1974; Knapp, 1990) and for the interpersonal skills, the Carkuff scales (1969b) were

FIGURE 1
Workshop programme

TIME	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 3
08:00-09:00	Module 1 - Knowledge (an introduction)	Module 4 - Revision	Module 4 - Revision
09:00-10:30	Module 2 - Intrapersonal awareness	Module 2 - Intrapersonal awareness	Module 3 - Interpersonal skills
10:30-10:45	Tea	Tea	Tea
10:45-12:15	Module 2 - Interpersonal awareness	Module 3 - Interpersonal skills	Module 3 - Interpersonal skills
12:15-12:45	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
12:45-14:15	Module 3 - Interpersonal skills	Module 3 - Interpersonal skills	Module 2 - Intrapersonal awareness
14:15-14:30	Tea	Tea	Tea
14:30-16:00	Module 2 - Intrapersonal awareness	Module 2 - Intrapersonal awareness	Module 4 - Application
16:00-17:00	Module 4 - Revision	Module 4 - Revision & application	Module 4 - Revision

used. Both instruments correspond conceptually with the above definitions and characteristics and are seen as the most appropriate available for measuring these behaviours (Cilliers & Wissing, 1993). Cilliers (1984) reports high reliability and validity for the POI and Carkhuff scales in a similar training scenario. The empirical hypothesis can be formulated as, participation in the workshop in facilitation skills, does not enhance any intra or interpersonal characteristics associated with selfactualisation.

Qualitative measurement

A voluntary 30-minute, phenomenological, semi-structured, tape-recorded, interview was conducted by the researcher with each participant, and transcribed. The aim of the interview was to ascertain the long-term effect of the workshop on training performance. A single question was asked, namely: "How did the workshop effect your performance as a trainer?". Hereafter the interviewee was encouraged to give more responses by the interviewer summarising and reflecting on already given material according to the person-centered approach (Rogers 1975b, 1982). The interview was analysed by means of content analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and specifically open coding (a process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualising and categorising of data). Thus the main and sub themes and their relationships were determined (Jones, 1996; Kerlinger, 1986). Reliability was ensured by having the results checked by a psychologist, to whom these techniques are well known. It was declared correct.

Procedure

A brochure, explaining the aims and administration of the workshop, was sent to the training departments of each organisation, asking for volunteering participants amongst trainers who fit the above requirements of qualification and experience. Four workshop events were scheduled.

Four weeks prior to each workshop, the handout was given to every participant in the experimental group. At the start of each workshop, the quantitative instruments were administered as a pre-measurement to both the experimental and the control groups. Then the control group went on with their daily activities while the workshop was presented to the experimental group. Immediately after each workshop, the instruments were administered again as a postmeasurement to both groups.

The Carkhuff (1978) scales were administered in two situations. The first was a written communication situation containing typical verbal training room questions of a challenging nature on which the respondent has to react and record his/her own spontaneous verbal reaction. The second is an individual role-play recorded on video, with the respon-

dent as acting trainer in a five minute interaction with a second person in the role of trainee, who threatens to leave the training event because his/her supervisor nominated him/her and he/she doesn't want to be part of the event.

The quantitative data was processed collectively for all the experimental and all the control groups. The significance of differences between pre and post-measurement (t-test) were calculated by means of the SAS Computer package (SAS Institute, 1985).

Each workshop participant (in the experimental group) was contacted three months after the workshop, ensuring that he/she had at least presented two training events since. Then the interview was conducted and analysed.

RESULTS

Quantitative measurement

The results of the measured intrapersonal characteristics are presented in table 1.

TABLE 1
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRE AND POST SCORES FOR THE INTRAPERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FACILITATION AS MEASURED BY THE POI

Itemno	Item name	Exper Gr		Contr Gr		t-value
POI 1	Time competence	17,35	02,59	15,56	02,52	0,0150 *
POI 2	Inner-directedness	89,50	08,46	78,46	09,64	0,0057 *
POI 3	Self-actualising values	21,07	03,92	19,88	02,38	0,0034 *
POI 4	Existentialism	19,56	05,08	16,25	04,27	0,0046 *
POI 5	Feeling reactivity	16,86	02,32	14,64	02,89	0,0018 *
POI 6	Spontaneity	13,68	02,64	10,83	02,04	0,0064 *
POI 7	Self-regard	13,78	03,05	12,05	03,68	0,0012 *
POI 8	Self-acceptance	16,69	05,13	14,97	04,93	0,0008 *
POI 9	Nature of Man	11,86	02,84	11,04	02,34	0,0864 *
POI 10	Synergy	07,35	01,94	06,18	01,84	0,0187 **
POI 11	Acceptance of aggression	17,48	05,08	15,55	04,08	0,0048 *
POI 12	Intimate contact	20,05	05,82	16,65	02,85	0,0052 *

* P < 0,01 ** P < 0,05

The POI results indicate that the workshop stimulated the following characteristics significantly: time competence focussing on the here and now, behaviour motivated from a sense of inner-directedness, living according to the values of self-actualisation, flexibility in the application of values, sensitivity towards own feelings and needs, and the spontaneous expression thereof, self-regard and acceptance in spite of weaknesses, the acceptance of opposites (for example good/bad, masculine/feminine social roles) as non antagonistic, acceptance of own anger and aggression in an interpersonal situation, and the capacity to form warm and intimate interpersonal relationships.

The results of the measured interpersonal characteristics are presented in table 2.

TABLE 2
SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRE AND POST SCORES FOR THE INTERPERSONAL SKILLS OF FACILITATION AS MEASURED BY THE CARKEHUFF SCALES IN THE WRITTEN COMMUNICATION AND ROLE-PLAY SITUATIONS

Itemno	Item name	Exper gr		Contr gr		t-value
		X	S	X	S	
1	Respect	01,72	00,52	00,18	00,31	0,0009 *
2	Realness	01,46	00,47	00,06	00,05	0,0026 *
3	Concreteness	01,57	00,46	00,07	00,19	0,0008 *
4	Empathy	01,38	00,58	00,13	00,39	0,0079 *

* P < 0,01

The Carkehuff scales result indicates that the workshop lead to the significant improvement in performance on all four the

core facilitative dimensions respect, realness, concreteness and empathy.

Thus the empirical hypothesis was rejected.

Qualitative measurement

During the interview there was no audible or visible resistance to being part of the measurement. Most participants were excited about the interview as well as the learning acquired during the workshop. The interview brought the following themes to the fore.

1. The roles of instructor and facilitator differs, each with its application

On a knowledge level, it became clear to the participants that the instructor focuses on content, the mechanistic level of training and requires knowledge to impart knowledge to the trainee. The facilitator on the other hand, focuses on behavioural processes, interpersonal relationships and requires a high level of selfactualisation (defined as intra and interpersonal sensitivity, awareness and facilitating skills) to provide the learning opportunity which enhances learning and growth in the trainee. It was also called "using the self as instrument" instead of audio visual equipment, training techniques and games.

2. Selfactualisation is a life long process

Although this workshop is too short to get to grips with all growth aspects within the self, the participants realised that they can not turn back to "where they were". Participants are increasingly and actively searching for more opportunities to develop the self, their quality of life and their facilitation skills.

3. The facilitator listens to and responds from the framework of the trainee

If a trainee asks a question about knowledge or content (for example, "How do you enter this computer programme?"), the trainer answers the question from the instructor role by giving the correct solution. If a trainee asks a question about him/herself, own feelings or career issues, the trainer in role of the facilitator (because there is no correct answer) reflects the content and feelings back, providing an opportunity for the trainee to explore his/her own answer. For example, "What do you do when you don't want to go on with this course?", is reflected by the facilitator as "You seem to feel unsure about your immediate future".

4. The different roles elicit different reactions from the trainee

The instructor answering the trainee's questions gives information on the cognitive level, which makes the trainee dependant on the trainer. He/she often continues in this mode by asking more questions and does not learn to do it him/herself. The facilitator neutrally reflecting what the trainee is experiencing, makes the trainee become aware of and think about his/her own issues and what to do about it. Participants reported that their trainees did not like this style initially because it was uncomfortable and implies hard work on their behalf. The test of the facilitator role is to not give in to the pressure to give solutions, but to trust the facilitation process and to stay in role. Trainers reported that their trainees said afterwards, that the experience offered a great learning opportunity about themselves, their feelings and problem solving style. They added that this made the training event worthwhile, because the learning about themselves, had more impact on them and was remembered for a longer time, than the contents of the course. This in turn empowered the trainers because they can see that they make a difference in trainee's development.

5. Facilitation leads to problem solving without becoming part of the problem

Many participants reported that they were becoming aware of not reacting to conflict (within individual trainees and between them) from a personal level, but rather from a neutral, empathic stance, thus enhancing the insight of the trainees into themselves. Again, the trainers found this new growth enriching skill as powerful to the self and a relieve of own stress levels.

DISCUSSION

The workshop stimulated the level of selfactualisation in terms of its intrapersonal awareness and interpersonal skills of respect, realness, concreteness, empathy, as well as attending and responding behaviour. This corresponds with research findings by Rogers (1982), Meador (1975), Cilliers (1996) and Rothman et al. (1998).

The enhanced awareness of the self, own and other's interpersonal relationships, could be interpreted as an increase in personal maturity, personality integration and selfactualisation.

Intrapersonally the facilitation workshop lead to enhanced awareness in terms of cognitive, affective and conative behaviour.

- * Cognitive level. The trainer is more inclined to listen objectively, to focus on the task of responding to a trainee, without own emotional involvement.
- * Affective level. The trainer's emotional maturity and ego-strength are enhanced, as well as autonomy and independence. This facilitates greater sensitivity and awareness of own needs and feelings, a stronger self image based upon self knowledge, insight, respect, confidence and acceptance in spite of weaknesses, the acceptance of own feelings (especially aggression) and the spontaneous and natural expression thereof, a moving away from rule boundness, self defeat, moralising, rigidity, inhibition and self laid restrictions. These changes may in future lead to more acceptance of responsibility for own behaviour, heightened sensitivity in the handling of own and other's affective behaviour in a facilitating situation and the modelling of flexibility.
- * Conative level. The trainer's internal locus of control is enhanced, including self motivation, inner-directedness with own integrated values, needs and feelings, in stead of taking responsibility for the needs of others, flexibility according to the demands of the situation in stead of rigid, compulsive and dogmatic behaviour. These changes may in future lead to stronger self motivation in decision making and the modelling there-of in a facilitation situation.

Interpersonally the skill of the trainers to respect and accept the trainee as a human being, was enhanced (which implies the awareness of the own frame of reference, ideas, stereotypes, prejudices and the skill to temporarily put this aside). Secondly, the skill to move into the second person's frame of reference in an honest and genuine way, to have more awareness, sensitivity, understanding and acceptance of the trainee's ideas, needs and feelings, and to communicate this understanding and acceptance in a concrete way by means of reflecting, was enhanced. This own empowerment facilitates empowerment and the stimulation of growth within the trainee. The tendency at the beginning of the workshop (in the premeasurement) to play games, manipulate and prescribe his/her own solution, diminished significantly. This will possibly lead in future to more respectful, real and emphatic interactions in the training situation.

Conclusion limitations and recommendations

This research highlights the difference between the roles of instructor and facilitator. The workshop helped the participant to distinguish between the roles on a cognitive level as well as in the practical training situation. It suggests that facilitation skills, with its focus on selfactualisation, can be significantly enhanced amongst trainers. After the application of the learned self-awareness and skills in the presentation of their own training events, the trainer feels empowered to facilitate opportunities for learning and growth amongst trainees, which again empowers the trainee to learn about him/herself and to grow towards own selfactualisation.

It is important to note that the choice of the research design could have influenced the results. The sample is small in terms of the national training and development fraternity and the absence of a post-post measurement for the quantitative as well as the qualitative instruments, makes it unsure whether the results will be sustained over a longer period. It is recommended

that the research design be extended to include more varied samples, as well as a post-post measurement, including real classroom situations.

Management, training managers and trainers should be enlightened about the difference between instructing and facilitation, each with its application and different effect on learning and the learner. Facilitator development should be included in all trainer's education and on the job development, in order to ensure a constant level of awareness and sensitivity towards the dynamic intra and interpersonal behaviour in any training situation. On a broader level, the organisation can make effective use of facilitation and its values and principles to empower its workforce.

REFERENCES

- Bentley, T. (1994). *Facilitation. Providing opportunities for learning*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Braaten, L.J. (1986). Thirty years with Rogers' necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change: A personal evaluation. *Person-Centered Review*, 1(1), 37-50.
- Brazier, D. (1993). *Beyond Carl Rogers*. London: Constable.
- Carkhuff, R.R. (1969a). Helper communication as a function of helpee effect and content. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 14(2), 126-131.
- Carkhuff, R.R. (1969b). *Helping and human relations Vol. 2. Practice and research*. London: Holt, Rineholt & Winston.
- Carkhuff, R.R. (1972). New directions in training for the helping professions: Toward a technology for human and community resource development. *Counselling Psychologist*, 3, 12-30.
- Carkhuff, R.R. (1978). *The art of helping. Trainer's manual*. Amherst: Human Resource Development Press.
- Carkhuff, R.R. (1983). *The art of helping V*. Amherst: Human Resource Development Press.
- Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (1968). *Group dynamics*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Coulson, W.R. (1970). Major contribution: Inside a basic encounter group. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 2(2), 1-27.
- Cilliers, F. (1984). *A developmental programme in sensitive relationship forming as managerial dimension*. Potchefstroom (Doctorate thesis (PhD) - Potchefstroom University).
- Cilliers, F. (1996). Facilitator training in South Africa (chapter in *Client Centred and Experiential Psychotherapy*. Ed Hutterer, R., Pawlowsky, G., Schmid, P.F. & Stipsits, R.). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Cilliers, F. & Wissing, M.P. (1993). Sensitive relationship forming as managerial dimension: The evaluation of an developmental programme. *Journal for Industrial Psychology*, 19(1), 5-10.
- Corey, G. (1990). *Theory and practice of group counselling*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Du Toit, A.S., Grobler, H.D. & Schenk, C.J. (1998). *Person-Centered communication*. Johannesburg: International Thomson.
- Egan, G. (1990a). *Exercises in helping skills. A training manual to accompany the skilled helper*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Egan, G. (1990b). *The skilled helper*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Forsyth, D.R. (1990). *Group dynamics*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Goldstein, I.L. (1993). *Training in organizations*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Gordon, S.E. (1994). *Systematic training program design. Maximizing effectiveness and minimizing liability*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Hekmat, H. (1975). Some personality correlates of empathy. *Journal of Counselling and Clinical Psychology*, 43(1), 89.
- Ivey, A.E. (1971). *Microcounselling: Innovations in interviewing training*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Jones, R.A. (1996). *Research methods in the social and behavioural sciences*. Sunderland: Sinauer.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioural research*. New York: Rinehart & Winston.
- Kinlaw, D.C. (1993). *Team-managed facilitation: Critical skills for developing self-sufficient teams*. Amsterdam: Pfeiffer.
- Kirschenbaum, H. & Henderson, V.L. (1993). *The Carl Rogers Reader*. London: Constable.
- Knapp, R.R. (1990). *Handbook for the Personal Orientation Inventory*. San Diego: Edits.

- Lieberman, M.A., Yalom, I.D. & Miles, B.B. (1973). *Encounter groups: First facts*. New York: Basic Books.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper.
- Maslow, A.H. (1971). *The Farther reaches of Human Nature*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Meador, B.D. (1975). Client-centered group therapy. In G. Gazda (Ed.), *Basic approaches to group psychotherapy and group counselling* (2nd ed.). Springfield: Charles C Thomas.
- Nadler, L. & Nadler, Z. (1994). *Designing training programs*. Houston: Gulf.
- O'Connor, B.N., Bronner, M. & Delaney, C. (1996). *Training for organizations*. Cincinnati: South-Western Educational Publishing.
- Patrick, J. (1992). *Training: Research and practice*. London: Academic Press.
- Plas, J.M. (1996). *Person-Centered leadership. An American approach to participatory management*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Plug, C., Meyer, W.F., Louw, D.A. & Gouws, L.A. (1986). *Psigologiewoordeboek*. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill.
- Quitmann, H. (1985). *Humanistische Psychologie*. Göttingen: Verlag für Psychologie.
- Raskin, N.J. (1986a). Client-centered group psychotherapy, Part 1: Development of client-centered groups. *Person-Centered Review*, 1(3), 272-290.
- Raskin, N.J. (1986b). Client-centered group psychotherapy, Part 2: Research on client-centered groups. *Person-Centered Review*, 1(4), 389-408.
- Reddy, W.B. & Henderson, C.C. (1987). *Training theory and practice*. San Diego: University Associates.
- Rogers, C.R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 95-103.
- Rogers, C.R. (1973). *Client-centered therapy*. London: Constable.
- Rogers, C.R. (1975a). *Encounter groups*. London: Penguin.
- Rogers, C.R. (1975b). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. London: Constable.
- Rogers, C.R. (1982). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Rogers, C.R. (1985). *Carl Rogers on Personal Power*. London: Constable.
- Rogers, C.R. & Stevens, B. (1967). *Person to Person: The Problem of being human*. Moab: Real People Press.
- Rothman, S., Sieberhagen, G.v.d.W. & Cilliers, F. (1998). The qualitative effect of a group facilitation course. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 24(3), 7-13.
- SAS Institute. (1985). *SAS user's guide: statistics, version 5 edition*. Cary: SAS Institute.
- Segrera, A.S. & Araiza, M. (1993). Proposals for a Person-Centered model of Social conflict resolution. *The Person-Centered Approach and Cross-Cultural Communication - An International Review*, 2, 77-86.
- Shaw, M.E. (1981). *Group dynamics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Shostrom, E.L. (1974). *Manual of the Personal Orientation Inventory*. San Diego: Edits.
- Sklare, G., Keener, R. & Mas, C. (1990). Working with groups. Preparing members for "here-and-now" group counseling. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 15(1), 141-148.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Thorn, B. (1992). *Carl Rogers*. London: Sage.
- Weaver, R.G. & Farrell, J.D. (1997). *Managers as facilitators*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Westley, F. & Waters, J.A. (1988). Group facilitation skills for managers. *Management Education and Development*, 19(2), 134-143.