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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the most common methods of evaluating college or university counseling centers is to determine how such a counseling center is perceived by those participating in counseling as well as by relevant other persons otherwise concerned with it (4, 5, 24, 60, 64). The one clear finding is that individual participants seem to be operating from differing "perceptual vantage points" (42), and hence see what transpires in somewhat different ways. Recently, Warman (64) noted considerable discrepancies among clients, counselors, student personnel workers, and administrative staff on what were legitimate problems to be taken to a counseling center. The two most discrepant groups were the client and the counselor! This finding agrees with Bordin's (5) discovery at another college counseling center that clients have a "decision-making" orientation toward what they expect of counseling while counselors have a "mental hygiene" orientation. Patterson (42) points to cultural influences that contribute to clients' adoption of a dependent, even passive-feminine-masochistic role, in contrast to the encouragement by most counselors of independent problem
solving by the client. Such discrepancies in perception of what should or does go on in counseling suggest that the counseling relationship itself may be affected.

Though evidence is limited, opinions are mixed. On the one hand, Danskin has maintained that "...a counselor may play a role different from that expected by the client and still retain a good working relationship" especially when both are discussing "adjustment" problems (15, p. 41). On the other hand, Seeman says that "it seems evident on logical grounds that any great discordance in goals between counselor and client will have a disruptive effect on the helping process" (53, p.190).

The Problem

Warman (64) has previously noted that clients and counselors in the Ohio State University Counseling and Testing Center differ in their judgments about the kinds of client problems most appropriately treated there. The writer will determine what clients at this agency expect of the counseling situation before, during, and after counseling. Moreover, he will determine whether there are discrepancies between client and counselor expectations, and what impact these have on the counseling process. To this end, five questions are answered:

1. What do clients expect of the counseling situation prior to being counseled at
the University Counseling and Testing Center?

2. Are client expectancies related to client behavior in the counseling situation?

3. Do client expectancies change over the period of counseling? In what directions?

4. To what degree are counselors aware of client expectancies for counseling?

5. How are a counselor's image of the expectancies and behavior of an "ideal" client related to the expectancies and behavior of his actual clients?

**Importance of the Study**

Several past investigations at the University Counseling and Testing Center have examined counselor perceptions of their roles (34, 60). Considerably less attention has been paid to the expectancies and general perceptions of clients of the agency. This seems characteristic not only of this agency but others as well. Previous studies of client expectancies (5, 15, 40, 42) all conclude that "much work needs to be aimed at
understanding client expectations and their effect upon the counseling process" (15, p. 43). This is particularly true in attempting to relate client expectancies to behavioral concommitants in the interview. Scott cites Katz as saying:

...the whole field of social psychology, as well as social science in general, is singularly lacking in research studies which show the relationships of people's perceptions, values, ideas and expressed motivation on behavioral outcome...(37, p. vii)

McGowan (40) has examined some of these issues, but his treatment has been limited to a consideration of happenings in the first interview. The writer has extended the analysis of client expectancies to the entire period of the counseling contact; as reflected by measurements taken before counseling, after the first interview and after the last contact. Such a study seems to be a logical extension of McGowan's (40) research.

Finally, the present study is an appropriate addition to previous studies of the University Counseling and Testing Center, which have centered on perceptions of agency functioning (34, 60, 64).

**Definition of Terms**

**UCTC.** The University Counseling and Testing Center of The Ohio State University.

**Dimension.** A term used to refer to each of the sixteen variables rated on the rating instruments.
Student Expectation Scale (SES). A ten point, sixteen dimension rating instrument designed to serve as an index of client expectancies about counseling. Three equivalent forms of the scale are used, Numbers 1, 2 and 3, corresponding to Stages 1, 2 and 3 of the study.

Counselor Evaluation Scale (CES). A ten point, sixteen dimension rating instrument developed as an index of counselor judgments about client expectancies. The instrument uses the same dimensions as the SES, with changes only in the instructions in order to make the task appropriate for the counselor. As in the SES, three equivalent forms are used.

Judges' Rating Scale (JRS). A five point, fifteen dimension rating instrument developed for use by judges to assess client behavior with the counseling interview. The dimensions are counterparts of those in the SES.

Definition of Variables
I. Independent Variables
   A. Situational Variable
      1. The counseling setting. This is the physical setting in which counseling and testing takes place. It includes the reception area, counselor's office, testing room, et cetera, of the University Counseling and Testing Center.
B. "Personal" Variables

1. **Client expectancies.** These are expecta­
tions or anticipations that clients have toward being
counseled at the University Counseling and Testing Center.
Operationally, a client's expectancies are defined by his
responses to the SES.

2. **"Ideal" client expectancies.** These are
a counselor's image of the expectations or anticipations
that his "ideal" client would have toward counseling.
Operationally, "ideal" client expectancies are defined by
the responses to the SES of a counselor adopting the "set"
of his "ideal" client.

3. **Counselor rating of client expectancies.**
This is the counselor's rating of the expectancies that
he perceives the client as having at a particular stage
in counseling. Such a rating is a measure of the coun­
selor's sensitivity to the client. Operationally, this
is defined by the counselor's responses to the Counselor
Evaluation Scale (CES).

C. Time Variables

1. **Stages of time.** The span of time from
the onset of a client's awareness of a need for counsel­
ing to the completion of the counseling contact has been
arbitrarily divided into three stages as indicated in
Figure 1.
Figure 1

The Three Stages of Counseling Organized by Events Significant for This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A student becomes aware that he has a problem (or is made aware of his problem).</td>
<td>7. There is a period of waiting until the first interview.</td>
<td>12. There is a period of waiting until the second interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The student feels unable to cope with his problem, and decides to come to the UCTC (or is referred here).</td>
<td>8. The client has a first interview with his counselor. The interview is recorded.</td>
<td>13. The client has a second interview with the counselor. If this is not the last contact, he schedules and has additional interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The client arrives at the UCTC and requests counseling (this is handled by the receptionist).</td>
<td>9. The client schedules a second interview (if not, he is disqualified from the present study).</td>
<td>14. The client holds his last interview with the counselor. The interview is recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The receptionist assigns a counselor and an appointment time to the client. She gives him two background forms and the first SES to fill out.</td>
<td>10. The client fills out a second SES.</td>
<td>15. The client fills out a third SES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The client fills out these intake materials and the first SES.</td>
<td>11. The counselor fills out a second CES.</td>
<td>16. The counselor fills out a third CES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The counselor receives the client's intake forms. He fills out the first CES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. **Stage 1.** This stage refers to the period extending from the time the client becomes aware of his need for counseling assistance to completion of the first SES and CES by the client and his counselor respectively.

b. **Stage 2.** This stage refers to the period extending from the time of completing the first SES and CES forms to completion of the second SES and CES forms at the end of the first interview.

c. **Stage 3.** This stage refers to the period extending from the time the client and counselor complete the second SES and CES forms to the completion of the third SES and CES forms after the last interview.

II. **Dependent Variables**

A. **Relationship between client expectancies and subsequent client behavior** is a measure of congruence between the client's SES ratings of his expectancies prior to an interview and the judges' JRS ratings of his behavior in the interview.
B. **Change in client expectancies** is a measure of change in the client's expectancies from Stage 1 through Stage 3 and derives from his successive ratings on the SES.

C. **Change in client behavior** is a measured change in the client's behavior from Stage 2 to Stage 3, and is inferred from judges' ratings on the JRS of interview transcriptions.

D. **Congruence of client and counselor ratings of client expectancies** is a measure at each Stage in time of the amount of congruence between client and counselor ratings of client expectancies. The measure is derived from the SES and CES, respectively.

E. **Change in counselor's ratings of client expectancies** is a measure of change in a counselor's ratings of client expectancies through the stages of time. The measure is based on responses to the CES.

F. **Congruence of client expectancies and "ideal" client expectancies** is a measure of relationship between a client's expectancies as indicated on the SES and his counselor's ratings on the SES of "ideal" client expectancies.
The present study focuses on two aspects of a counseling situation. The first is on the "counseling process," and is confined to behavior occurring entirely within the interview. This is a region of counseling investigation traditionally explored by proponents of the "Communications" approach (43, 49). The approach utilizes an intensive analysis of verbal behavior in the interview, in an attempt to isolate counselor and client remarks that enhance effective communication.

Because of the writer's concern with intra-interview behavior, he has utilized the "typescript analysis" method of this approach. More important, many of the dimensions used in the rating instruments were based upon findings derived from "Communications" research. McGowan (40), from whose work the present rating instruments were largely adapted, has indicated his indebtedness to the work of Francis P. Robinson and his students at The Ohio State University in isolating the variables used.

A second focus of the present study is on attitudes held prior and subsequent to the interview. To examine these attitudes the writer has adapted the theoretical construct of "expectancies" as a way of understanding the influence of extra-interview predispositions
toward counseling (See Kelly, 38; Pepinsky and Pepinsky, 43; Rotter, 52; and Stodgill, 57).

Pepinsky and Pepinsky (43) and Rotter (52) have been particularly helpful in providing a model for conceptualizing events occurring in time. It is possible to use this model for schematizing changes in client expectations and behavior from Stage 1 through Stages 2 and 3. These are presented in Figures 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Similar conceptualizations could be made to indicate the changes in counselor ratings of client expectancies, changes in client behavior as related to the expectancies of the "ideal" client, and others.

Rationale of the Study

The basic questions and hypotheses asked by this study, and the hypotheses derived from them, are based upon findings of previous research or assumptions used in building certain personality theories. These foundations will be described as each question is explored in turn.

1. What do clients expect of the counseling situation prior to counseling at the University Counseling and Testing Center?

This question was largely a descriptive one, and sought to determine generally what client expectancies
Figure 2
A Schematic Representation of the Relationship between a Client's Expectancies and His Behavior during Stage 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antecedent Conditions</td>
<td>Mediating Conditions</td>
<td>Consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observable</td>
<td>Observable</td>
<td>Inferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Setting of the UCTC
2. Client expectancies toward what will occur in counseling.

1. Client arrives in the setting.
2. Client engages in the intake procedure.
3. Client fills out the initial SES.

1. Client's contact with the setting strengthens and/or alters his expectancies for counseling.

1. Client's expression on the SES of his expectancies for counseling.
Figure 3
A Schematic Representation of the Relationship between a Client's Expectancies and His Behavior during Stage 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent Conditions</th>
<th>Mediating Conditions</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Observable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inferred</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Setting of the UCTC.</td>
<td>1. Interaction of client-counselor interaction in the second or subsequent interviews.</td>
<td>1. Client-counselor interaction strengthens and/or alters the nature of the client's expectancies for counseling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Client expectancies for counseling (based on initial expectancies as modified by transactions during Stages 1 and 2).</td>
<td>2. Client fills out third SES at the end of the last interview.</td>
<td>2. Using the JRS, judges rate a transcription of a tape recording of the last interview to assess client behavior in the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Counselor expectancies of the client (based on his actual contact with the client and his image of the &quot;ideal&quot; client).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4

A Schematic Representation of the Relationship between a Client's Expectancies and His Behavior during Stage 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent Conditions</th>
<th>Mediating Conditions</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Observable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inferred</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Setting of the UCTC.</td>
<td>1. Interaction of client-counselor in the second or subsequent interviews.</td>
<td>1. Client-counselor interaction strengthens and/or alters the nature of the client's expectancies for counseling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Client expectancies for counseling (based on initial expectancies as modified by transactions during Stages 1 and 2).</td>
<td>2. Client fills out third SES at the end of the last interview.</td>
<td>2. Judges' rating on the JRS of the client's behavior in the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Counselor expectancies of the client (based on his actual contact with the client and his image of the &quot;ideal&quot; client).</td>
<td>3. Using the JRS, judges rate a transcription of a tape recording of the last interview to assess client behavior in the interview.</td>
<td>1. Client's expression on the SES of his expectancies for counseling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were. The writer was particularly interested in determining whether client and counselor differed greatly in their expectations for counseling as might be inferred from Warman's (64) study. This was the basis for the first hypothesis:

**Hypothesis I:** There will be a significant difference between clients' initial expectancies and those of the counselors' "ideal" client.

Conceptually, client expectancies were seen to arise out of clients' relevant past experiences with counseling (38); and insofar as these were apt to differ widely (50), the writer expected that clients would differ widely among themselves in their initial client expectancies.

2. Are client expectancies related to client behavior in the counseling situation?

As will be seen in Chapter II, a number of theorists have postulated that expectancies have a major influence on the formulation of subsequent behavior (38, 54, 57). The writer sought to determine whether that influence was substantial enough and sufficiently apparent to warrant using client expectancies prior to an interview. To determine this, a second hypothesis was tested:

**Hypothesis II:** Prior client expectancies can be used to predict ratings of client behavior in the subsequent interview.
3. Do client expectancies change over the period of counseling? In what directions?

There was more research evidence available on initial client expectancies (13, 40) than on change in client expectancies over the period of counseling (21, 36). Although it was found that certain client expectancies at the UCTC differed from those of counselors, the writer reasoned that some rapprochement would occur as counseling progressed. This would necessitate a change in the client's (and possibly the counselor's) expectancies. Hence, a third hypothesis was derived:

**Hypothesis III:** Initial client expectancies will change significantly over the period of counseling.

The direction of change in client expectancies was as important as the degree of change, and information was sought regarding this. Butler and Haigh's (6) finding that clients tend to move toward the counselor in their orientation as counseling progressed suggested one immediate area of investigation. To maximize the information obtained, however, the writer's major efforts were directed toward describing change in each of the expectancy dimensions.

4. To what degree are counselors aware of client expectancies for counseling?
Regardless of the nature of client expectancies, effective counseling requires that counselors be sufficiently sensitive to their clients to determine what their expectancies are. This question has been investigated by so-called studies of "empathy" (35), but these provide conflicting results. This is particularly true in light of recent methodological criticism of these studies (12, 25).

In the absence of conclusive data, the writer sought to determine whether counselors at the UCTC were able to perform this task. For reasons indicated in the rationale for Hypothesis II, the value of accurate counselor perception of client expectancies would be demonstrated if a fourth hypothesis could be accepted:

**Hypothesis IV:** Counselor ratings of client expectancies can be used to predict ratings of client behavior in the subsequent interview.

Further, it seemed likely that, as the counselor became more familiar with his client, his understanding of the client's expectancies would be improved. From this it was expected that:

**Hypothesis V:** From Stage 1 to Stage 3 counselor ratings of client expectancies will become more congruent with clients' own ratings of their expectancies.
To ascertain the extent of individual differences among counselors in the relative accuracy of their ratings of clients, comparisons were sought. Past performance of persons making ratings seemed to justify the assumption that individual differences would be found among the counselors; hence, the hypothesis that:

**Hypothesis VI:** There will be differences among counselors in the degree of congruence of their ratings of client expectancies with clients' self ratings.

5. How is a counselor's image of the expectancies and behavior of an "ideal" client related to the expectancies and behavior of his actual clients?

This question recognizes the counselor's own "frame of reference" and the possibility that he may attempt, perhaps unconsciously, to mold the client into the image of his "ideal" client. The tendency for a client's behavior to move in the direction of the counselor's ideal has already been noted (6, 21).

If counselors do influence client behavior, the writer felt this would be most apparent in clients whose initial "frame of reference" was the most discrepant from that of the counselor. Such clients would be likely to provoke the greatest counselor effort toward change. From this the hypothesis followed that:

**Hypothesis VII:** The greatest degree of change in client expectancies and rated behavior will occur in
those clients whose initial expectancies are most discrepant from those of their counselors' "ideal" clients.

One reason for counselor attempts to alter the client toward the counselor's "ideal" client expectancies might be the difficulty of communicating with a client of highly discrepant expectancies. The ambiguity of differing purposes and means of arriving at them and the possible misinterpretation of these, led the writer to expect that:

_Hypothesis VIII:_ The congruence of client expectancies and counselor ratings of client expectancies will improve when initial client expectancies and counselor "ideal" client expectancies approach one another.

**Summary**

In this chapter the problem has been presented, and the need for examining the question defended. The writer has indicated some of the theoretical underpinnings of the work, and has attempted to develop a rationale based upon it. He has presented certain hypotheses consistent with this rationale.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the pertinent literature will be divided into three general areas: 1) perceptual studies at the University Counseling and Testing Center, 2) studies of client expectancies for counseling, 3) status of expectancy theory.

Perceptual Studies at the University Counseling and Testing Center

The general development and operation of the UCTC, a central student counseling agency at The Ohio State University, has been carefully traced by Warman (64), and hence need not be repeated in full here. One point to be stressed, however, is the climate of the agency, which has encouraged a series of agency self-study researches (44). Some of these studies have been attempts to determine the "frame of reference" of persons occupying different positions in the agency.

In 1952, Hood (34) asked the nine members of the professional counseling staff to sort 60 counseling problems on a dimension of least to most important to determine the degree of congruence among staff in their
individual "frames of reference." In 1956 Thrush (60) did a follow-up of the study and found considerable change in the "frame of reference" of the counseling staff, both individually and collectively compared with the 1952 findings. Thrush found the most obvious difference to be a change in the "agency point of view" from an emphasis on problems having to do with vocational counseling to problems dealing with counseling for personal adjustment. Further, the within-staff differences in "frame of reference" were reduced, suggesting greater homogeneity in viewpoint.

Warman (64) was concerned with external as well as with internal "frames of reference" about the UCTC. His study sought to identify how various campus groups perceived the counseling role of the UCTC. These groups included the counseling center's professional staff, other student personnel workers, and teaching faculty and students before and after they had participated in counseling at UCTC. Each group was compared in respect to the student problems which each felt to be appropriate for discussion at the UCTC.

As might have been expected, the within-group variability was least among the counseling staff members. Further, problems concerned with vocational choice were considered by most groups to be appropriate, problems
having to do with "college routine," such as scheduling, were next most appropriate, and problems classified as "adjustment to self and others" were seen as least appropriate. An exception to this order of preference was found for the UCTC staff. It considered "adjustment to self and others" to be more appropriate than "college routine." By contrast, the group least apt to view "adjustment to self and others" as appropriate was the student group.

Warman's results suggest that clients are much less inclined to discuss "adjustment" problems than are counselors. One of the major concerns of the present study is to determine whether initial client and counselor expectancies are discrepant and whether the discrepancy is reduced as counseling progress.

Thrush (61) sought to measure counselors' allocation of their time on the job from four "frames of reference":

1. The experimenter's observation of the counselor's work behavior for an experimental time period
2. The counselor's perception of his work behavior for that period
3. The counselor's preference for the allocation of work time
4. The counselor's perception of the agency point of view (attitude or philosophy) toward the allocation of counselor time.

The relationship among all four of the "frames of reference" was determined.

Of particular interest for the present study, Thrush found that there was a moderate, though greater than chance, relationship between counselors' statements of how they spent their time and an observer's independent measure of time spent. While the comparisons made in the present study are somewhat different than those made by Thrush, his results are suggestive that common perceptions are possible among the participants in counseling.

Studies of Client Expectancies for Counseling

In his 1954 study on client expectancies and anticipations, McGowan (40) was able to cite only five pertinent references to prior research (7, 10, 24, 28, 50). These indicated that clients expected the important focus of the counseling interview to be on specific decision-making, usually in respect to a vocational problem. Also, several of the studies indicated that clients expected their participation in the process to be minimal. One discussion (50) was helpful in pointing out the wide range of expectations that clients might have.
The writer found several additional early studies pertinent to this investigation. Holt (33) asked each of a group of new clients at the Student Counseling Center at the State College of Washington to choose, from a group of photographs, the picture of the individual he would most like to have for a counselor. She found that students tended to select pictures of "fatherly" individuals. This suggested to her that students' image of the counselor was that of an individual to whom one might go for advice, a role associated with the father figure.

Littell (35) derived a scale for measuring a client's expectations regarding the amount of responsibility assumed by the counselor. He found that the majority of college students expect their problems to be solved for them by the counselor.

Davis (13) sought to determine the roles clients expected of counselors and whether client expectancies regarding counselor role could be reliably rated at the end of the first counseling interview. Davis found that counselor role could be reliably rated. Further, he observed that the counselor role expected by clients tended to differ with the nature of the client's problem. Clients whose problem was characterized by a lack of skill problem tended to expect the counselor to play a considerably more active role in suggesting possible solutions.
than did clients whose problem involved a Lack of Information type problem. The latter client tended to expect the counselor to be more of an understanding listener and a source of information.

Since McGowan's study was reported, more attention has been given to client expectancies. The emphasis, however, has been on the limitations of present information, and of the necessity for further research (4, 5, 14, 15, 54).

In preliminary investigations on client expectancies, Bordin (4, 5) found that students frequently have an "information-seeking" or a "decision-making" orientation toward counseling, while counselors predominantly hold a "mental-health" orientation toward what will occur. From the counselors' view, one would expect "personal problems" to be at the heart of counseling, while from the client's view such problems would be seen as unrelated to counseling.

In investigating counselor roles, Danskin (14, 15) has explored the role expectations clients have of their counselors. In his study of 30 clients at university counseling centers, Danskin found that the counselors tend to play the role that clients expect them to play. He indicates, however, that "it also may be partly true that clients go along with (and so seem to expect) the role the
counselor is using" (14, p. 26). In minimizing the deleterious effects that might result from role discrepancies, Danskin states that "...counselors may play a role different from that expected by the client and still retain a good working relationship (especially when discussing adjustment problems)" (14, p. 26).

Shaw (54) has gone one step further. He advocates that the counselor overturn or "up-end" the expectancies of clients as a way of bringing about a reorientation in a "hoped for" direction. This is not to say that the counselor may "up-end" any client expectancy with profitable consequences. Shaw states that

...the up-ending of expectancies spoken of here is conceived of as a kind of catalytic function...whereby the counselor fosters the adopting of "latent" construction already entertained to a limited degree by the individual (54, pp. 246-247).

Unfortunately, Shaw fails to specify how one distinguishes between counselor reinforcement of compatible but as yet undeveloped client "constructions" and undesired or otherwise incompatible "constructions" encouraged by the counselor. In short, the reorientation may be in a direction "hoped for" by the counselor but not shared by the client. Shaw does not consider what the situation might be in these circumstances.
Also, it seems desirable to determine first whether the counselor can perceive accurately what the client's expectations are before attempting to "up-end" these client expectancies. The generally positive results of "empathy" studies suggests the likelihood that competent counselors would be able to do this (35). The writer's attempt to examine counselors' judgments of client expectancies bears directly on this question.

To the degree that client attitudes about counseling reflect client expectancies, Ewing (21) has made one of the few studies of changes in client expectations over the entire span of counseling. Using a specially constructed adjectival rating scale, he asked clients early in counseling to sort adjectives descriptive of themselves, their "ideal-self," their mother, father, and counselor. Clients were asked to repeat this task at the end of the counseling contact. Changes were noted in the direction of greater client similarity to his "ideal-self," his counselor, and culturally approved individuals. Comparisons with judges' ratings of successful outcomes were made. The influence of these attitudes on the client suggests both conscious and unconscious counselor influences on the client. The writer's analysis of the counselor's "ideal" should provide a basis for comparison with the degree of counselor influence on the client found in Ewing's (21) study.
The overall importance of client expectancies is stressed by Snyder (56). In summarizing the results of the extensive psychotheraphy research program at Pennsylvania State University, he states that

...apparently it matters much less what the therapist does in therapy than what he means to the client and what the nature of the relationship is between therapist and client (56, p. 11).

To Williamson (66), these findings emphasize the prime importance of the client's perception of the counselor, in determining outcomes in adjustments, insight, and self-understanding of the counselee.

McGowan's (40) study was of particular value to the writer, because it suggested many of the dimensions which were used in the Student Expectation Scale (SES). In addition, McGowan's work provided tentative findings on initial client expectations and their relationship to subsequent behavior in the first interview. These findings were derived from an interpretation of client responses to open-ended inquiries on a questionnaire.

McGowan found that a definite relationship existed between clients' pre-interview expectancies and clients' performance in the interview. Further, he noted that clients were reliable observers of what transpired in the interview. Their perceptions of what occurred closely approximated those of the counselor and of judges rating the interview.
Generally, clients' post-interview perceptions of what happened in the interview were those which were expected. Clients discovered however, that they had assumed a greater degree of participation and responsibility than they had expected. The latter results were compatible with the findings of the earlier studies indicated above.

**Status of Expectancy Theory**

Historically, it appears that the term "expectancy" or "set" (as it has sometimes been termed) has been utilized as a post hoc explanation for otherwise unaccountable results in learning experiments (57). The value of the "expectancy" construct has been increasingly recognized, however, and it now serves as a fundamental construct in a number of theoretical systems.

Kelly states as the fundamental postulate in his theory of personality that "a person's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events" (38, p. 46). Shaw says that implicit to his position "is the idea that the organism orients itself to its environment by means of expectancies" (54, p. 43).

In their modified Hullian model of a learning approach to client behavior, Pepinsky and Pepinsky (43) include the construct of "antedating" or "anticipatory goal response," a term which incorporates some aspects of "expectancy." The theorists attribute drive reducing or drive
arousing characteristics to the term. More recently, Pepinsky and Pepinsky along with Pavlik (44) have formulated a microtheory of individual productivity within an organizational setting. A fundamental proposition of that system is that

...what an individual believes to be true of himself may be associated with the amount of success he has in completing tasks to which his personal, task-related beliefs are differentially relevant (44, p. 305).

These task relevant personal beliefs might well be viewed as self-expectancies.

In his social learning theory, Rotter (52) emphasizes expectancy as well as reinforcement to explain behavior. He maintains that

...the occurrence of a behavior of a person is determined not only by the nature of importance of goals and reinforcements, but also by the person's anticipation or expectancy that these goals will occur. Such expectations are determined by previous experiences and may be quantified (52, pp. 102-103).

Rotter continues on to say that

...it seems extremely difficult even to attempt an explanation of human learning in complex social situations without some construct that deals with the effect on behavior of the anticipation of future reinforcement (52, p. 103).

Stogdill (57) offers a similarly oriented theory to explain the nature of group structure and operation. He sees expectancy, which he defines as a readiness for reinforcement, as one of three basic input variables in his
system. He believes that expectancies provide the basic motivational or purposive quality to his system. He uses this concept as a means of explaining the basic motivational or purposive quality of behavior.

Not only have there been increasing numbers of theoretical formulations involving the concept of expectancy, but there has been a growing body of experimental data on the subject. Stogdill (57) has exhaustively reviewed research in learning and perception related to the study of expectancy. After examining studies of reinforcement, reward and punishment, betting behavior, choice making and prediction, and social perception, he concludes that the results obtained can be related to the differential expectations of outcome, which were held. He summarizes that while there is much experimental support for the expectancy construct, there are still a number of problem areas requiring further investigation. There is particular need for research on the different rates of growth and extinction of expectations under varying circumstances. The present research on the extent of change in client expectancies for counseling appears to be relevant.
Summary

There appears to be growing interest in the study of client expectancies, indicated by an increased number of current writings. There is still great need, however, for further research on this topic. At the UCTC, for example, research has been focused on the "frame of reference" of counselors in preference to that of clients.

Continuing investigation of client expectancies is made likely by the number of recent personality theories that have given an important place to the construct of "expectancy." These theoretical formulations are being accompanied by a growing body of research data.

One important result of studies on client expectancies has been the repeated finding that client expectancies tend to differ from those of counselors. Whether this is an undesirable state of affairs remains an open question.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

In this chapter, the writer describes his general method, selection of subjects for the study, construction of rating instruments, administrative procedures, statistical analysis of the data, and procedural checks.

General Method

The present study sought to measure the degree of similarity between client and counselor ratings of client expectancies prior to, during, and after counseling. This was ascertained by determining the similarity between client and counselor patterns of response to appropriate rating scales. Other comparisons related client and counselor ratings of client expectancies to judges' ratings of client behavior within the interview; evaluated the similarity of client expectancies and those of a counselor's "ideal" client; and determined changes in the ratings of each rater over three stages of time. In all cases the degree of relationship was established, and then tested to determine the significance of the result.

These procedures resulted in the consideration of 14 relationships, summarized in Figure 5. Additional
### Figure 5

**Client, Counselor, Judge and "Ideal" Client Relationships Examined by the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>&quot;Ideal&quot; Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1-C2a</td>
<td>C1-C01</td>
<td>C1-Jud2</td>
<td>C1-Co1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2-C3</td>
<td>C2-C02</td>
<td>C2-Jud3</td>
<td>C2-Co1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-C3</td>
<td>C3-C03</td>
<td></td>
<td>C3-Co1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C01-Jud2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C02-Jud3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jud1-Jud3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates the stage of the study.*
comparisons among ratings were possible, but since it was thought that other relationships were of lesser significance they were not explored.

Selection of the Subjects, Counselors and Judges

Subjects

Thirty student clients of the Ohio State University Counseling and Testing Center were used as the subjects for the study. Selection was begun during the second week of the Spring quarter, 1959, and was made from the first 30 clients to meet the criteria for participation. It was found, however, that considerably more than the initial 30 clients selected were needed, because a large number of clients had to be disqualified. Approximately six weeks and 45 additional clients were required before the criteria for participation in the study were met. Four criteria were established:

1. Clients must be first time applicants for counseling service.

2. Clients must continue their counseling contact a minimum of two interviews.

3. Clients must fill out the three rating instruments appropriately.

4. Tape recordings of clients' first and last interview must be suitable for transcription.
Counselors

Three full-time staff counselors of the UCTC were used for the study. All three were considered "experienced" counselors. One counselor was completing his doctorate in Counseling Psychology, and had been employed as a full-time staff member for a year and a half. A second counselor had had Master's level training in Counseling Psychology, supplemented by over five year's counseling experience at the agency. A third counselor was completing his doctorate in Guidance. This was his first year of employment as a full-time staff member of the agency.

Judges

Two faculty members in Counseling Psychology and one in Guidance were asked to serve as "expert" raters of the transcriptions of 60 recorded interviews. The ratings of the three judges were averaged for each dimension to enhance reliability. The resulting mean score provided the criterion of client behavior for the study.

Construction of Rating Instruments

A crucial consideration for this study was determining an adequate means for assessing each client's expectancies and behavior as he moved through the stages of his UCTC counseling contact. The measuring instrument
had to be sufficiently brief and simple so as to interfere minimally with the counseling process itself. On the other hand, the instrument had to provide reliable and comprehensive information about client expectancies.

The writer first attempted to find an appropriate instrument already in use. McGowan's (40) sentence-completion questionnaire, while encompassing a number of dimensions relevant to the present study, was rejected in that its form was not readily amenable to quantification and subsequent statistical analysis. Further, his questionnaire seemed to be too long to administer on three occasions. Ewing's (21) Adjectival Rating Scale, or a form thereof, was also considered. It was discarded because its format limited the type of questions which could be asked. Since there appeared to be no other appropriate rating scale available, the writer decided to construct his own instrument, drawing heavily from the variables examined by McGowan.

After experimenting with several possible forms for the rating instrument, a ten point, descriptive rating scale was adopted. The dimensions to be rated were defined by brief statements at the poles of each dimension. Figure 6 illustrates a sample of these dimensions.
A Sample Question on the Student Expectation Scale

1. How important a role do you think that tests will play in your counseling?

They will be the basis on which I'll reach a decision. I do not think they'd be any help with my problem.

Ultimately, sixteen dimensions were selected for the rating scale. The dimensions were stated in the form of questions:

1. How important a role do you think tests will play in your counseling?

2. Whom do you expect to do most of the talking during the interview?

3. How do you feel about coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center for assistance?

4. To what degree do you expect that your counselor will take the initiative in directing the course of the interview?

5. To what degree do you feel that you have explored your problem on your own prior to coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center?

6. To what extent do you think that your counselor will be interested in other problems than the one you present initially?
7. How easily do you feel that you will be able to express yourself to your counselor?

8. To what degree do you expect that discussion of your "personal" feelings or problems will enter into the interview?

9. To what extent do you expect that the final decision-making about your problem will be left to you?

10. How well do you expect that you will get to know your counselor as a person?

11. How do you expect that your counselor will react to you as an individual?

12. To what extent do you think that you will be able to understand what your counselor says?

13. To what extent do you think that your counselor has had past experience with cases similar to yours?

14. To what degree do you think that your counselor will be able to understand what your problem is?

15. To what extent do you expect that your counselor will be able to help you in solving your problem?

16. How long do you expect that your contact with your counselor will last?

As a procedural check on the validity of the instrument, one additional dimension was added. "How well equipped do you feel that you are to answer the above questions regarding your expectations for counseling?" This item was intended to check the degree to which clients felt they could respond meaningfully to the dimensions above. Subsequent administration of the initial SES at Stage 1 revealed that clients did report themselves as having a relatively adequate basis upon which to respond
to the questions. As might have been expected, this "index" improved significantly upon retest at Stage 2 and again at Stage 3. Insofar as this question did not relate directly to expectancies, the ratings based upon it were evaluated separately.

From the basic ratings scale of 16 dimensions, six different forms were constructed (Appendices A, B, C, D, E, and F). Three, termed Student Expectation Scales (SES), were made appropriate to the expectancies of clients at each of the three stages of time. The three other forms, called Counselor Evaluation Scales (CES), were adapted for use by counselors to evaluate their client expectancies at equivalent stages. All forms were intended to provide ratings of the current expectancies held at a particular stage in time.

A somewhat different form of the rating scale, termed Judges' Rating Scale (JRS), was required for use by the judges (Appendix G). Although the same dimensions were evaluated, ratings were based upon behavioral manifestations of the expectancies rather than upon the expectancies themselves. For example, on the JRS, the dimension concerned with the importance of tests read, "How important a role did tests play in counseling?"

To facilitate rating of this variable on the JRS, each point along the dimension was described. This is in
contrast with the SES and CES instruments which limited description to the extremities of the dimension. Since the judges felt that their estimations of behavior could be gauged no more accurately than this, a five point rather than a ten point scale was used. Ratings from the JRS were later converted to make them equivalent to those on the other ten point rating scales. An illustration of a dimension on the JRS is given in Figure 7.

**Figure 7**

A Sample Question on the Judges' Rating Scale

1. How important a role did tests play in counseling?

| Very important | Important | Neither important nor unimportant | Unimportant | Very unimportant |

As indicated above, the averaged ratings of the three judges provided a criterion of "actual" client behavior in counseling. Because the behavioral concomitants of all of the client expectancy dimensions could not be rated, otherwise appropriate dimensions of expectancies could not be incorporated into the JRS.
Revision of the Rating Scales

In the development of the rating scales several preliminary forms were tested by including them with the customary background information forms filled out by all persons requesting counseling. These trial ratings were helpful in providing data about clients' response to filling out the form, the time required by clients to complete the forms, and, particularly, the variability of response among clients for each of the dimensions included. These checks revealed some piling up of responses at the extremes of certain dimensions, rather than the hoped for distribution of scores over the whole range of the dimension. Appropriate changes in the descriptions of the poles of the dimensions were made in an attempt to spread the clients' responses.

Administrative Procedures

Assignment of Clients to Counselors

Commencing the second week of the Winter Quarter, all new clients of the UCTC were automatically assigned to one of the three counselors participating in the study. Assignment was carried out in accordance with a pre-designated randomizing procedure. The counselors were listed in an order derived from the table of random numbers. As clients arrived they were assigned to the counselor next on the list. The only limitation in the randomization
procedure was that additional clients were not given to a counselor, after he had obtained the requisite number of clients.

Because of the large number of additional clients required to obtain the sample, selection of additional subjects had to be re-opened at several times during the quarter. The same randomization procedure was followed.

An indication of the success of the procedure may be inferred from Table 1. The Stage 1 expectancies of the ten clients assigned to Counselor I were not significantly different from those of the ten clients assigned to Counselors II and III, when compared by the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance Ranks Test (55, pp. 184-193). The H value obtained of .911 was far below the critical value of 5.99 required for significance at the .05 level of probability. It may be inferred from these data that all three samples are sufficiently similar to assume that they came from the same parent population.

A further indication of the similarities among the three samples may be seen by inspection of the means and standard deviations of client ratings, shown in Table 5. On a scale from one to ten the mean of the mean ratings was 5.7, 5.5 and 5.3 for the ten clients of Counselors I, II and III respectively. The mean standard deviation for each was 1.7, 2.2 and 2.0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Counselor I</th>
<th>Counselor II</th>
<th>Counselor III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of counselor inquiry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of personal feelings</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients of Counselor I</td>
<td>Clients of Counselor II</td>
<td>Clients of Counselor III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's remarks</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Counselor's awareness of client's problem</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor I</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor II</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of counseling contact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R_1 = 420 )</td>
<td>( R_1 = 407 )</td>
<td>( R_1 = 349 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( H = .911^b )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Tabular scores represent a ranking in order of magnitude from smallest to largest of the mean ratings of the clients of each counselor for all dimensions.

\(^b\)Critical value of \( H \) required at .05 level = 5.99 or greater.
Orientation Procedure

To acquaint the various participants in the study with their particular roles, the writer met with the counselors, judges, and receptionists to review their particular responsibilities. At these meetings the writer explained previously distributed written instructions, and discussed questions arising from them. These meetings were particularly important to the counselors and the receptionists, in that these persons had to become familiar with a new procedure relative to clients. Occasional slip-ups occurred in carrying out the new routine, despite the orientation given; an indication of the difficulty apt to be encountered in doing such research.

To familiarize the clients with the purpose of the study, an appropriate written statement accompanied the first form of the SES (Appendix A). Further information about the study was given by the counselors during the interviews. Only one instance of resistance to participation in the study was voiced. (One subject did not want her interviews recorded.) This student was excluded from the study.

Special mention should be made of the attempt throughout the study to assure clients that ratings and other information about them would not be made available to their counselors. To divorce counselors from the
evaluative portion of the study, the SES forms were distributed and collected by the receptionists.

**Rating Procedures for Client and Counselor**

Each client filled out the first form of the SES as part of the background materials routinely given to new clients when assigned appointments with counselors. Upon completion, the SES along with the other background materials was returned to the receptionist.

In the week or two prior to the scheduled first interview, the usual background materials (without the first SES form) were given to the counselor involved. After inspecting the materials, the counselor filled out the first CES form, indicating his impressions of the client at that point. The form was returned to the receptionist.

After the completion of the first interview, the counselor requested the client to take the second form of the SES (unless the contact was terminated at that point). On returning to his office the counselor filled out the equivalent form of the CES. Counselors were requested to reduce the length of the counseling interview with the client to 40 minutes to allow both individuals sufficient time to complete their forms by the close of the hour.

After the completion of the second interview, if no future contacts were scheduled, the counselor and client
filled out the last form of their respective rating scales. If further interviews were scheduled, no action was taken by either.

After the completion of the last interview, or if the contact was not terminated by the end of the quarter, then, by the last interview scheduled for the quarter, the client was requested to fill out a third and last form of the SES. The counselor was requested to complete a corresponding form of the CES scale.

Rating Procedure for Judges

Prior to rating the first typescripts the judges met for two training sessions. These enabled the judges to familiarize themselves with the rating instruments and to attempt trial judgments. The judges made suggestions for improving the descriptions of the dimensions to be rated (Appendix H).

Each of the three raters was given the typescripts in accordance with a predetermined, random ordering of them. Each received ten interviews in each of six stages or rotations of the protocols of each set. As ratings were completed judges moved to the next designated rotation. In this way all three judges rated all 60 interviews.

A number of precautions were taken. Except by chance, the first and last interviews of a particular counseling contact were not rated simultaneously. To
avoid bias, names of client and counselor were removed from the protocols.

Transcription of the Tape Recordings

The transcription of the 60 tape recordings of the interviews was a major task in carrying out the research. The writer found that considerable time was required by a skilled typist to complete a single transcription. The average, for a tape of about 45 minutes' duration, was seven hours.

To facilitate the task, several precautions were used. The use of quality microphones and tape recorders was found to be essential in insuring adequate reproduction and corresponding ease in transcription of the interviews.

Also, insofar as several interviews were often scheduled concurrently or during consecutive hours, the writer assumed the responsibility of setting up and maintaining the recording equipment for the counselors. Control of the equipment by a single individual to assure maximum coordination and correct usage is to be recommended.

Statistical Analysis

The design of this study required a means of comparing the degree of congruence or similarity between
the ratings of two classes of observers (or the same class of observers at two points in time) on the same or similar behaviors. Basically, this design was not unlike an increasing number of studies in which congruence has been assessed. In the area of counseling at least five other recent studies (21, 31, 32, 34 and 50) have made such an assessment. Only one of these, however, has utilized Cattell's (8) Coefficient of Pattern Similarity ($r_p$) statistic, the statistic used in this study.

Hoffman (32) used the $r_p$ in assessing qualitatively different sub-roles in counseling. He attempted to compare the number of times a given sub-role was used by a particular counselor when counseling with different clients. The writer saw his task as somewhat different. Rather than dealing with qualitative differences, the writer used common qualitative measures (dimensions) which he desired to measure quantitatively. In the absence of other precedents, the writer had no basis for assessing the adequacy of the $r_p$ statistic for his purpose directly.

However, the statistic appeared to be appropriate in providing a single, overall measure to represent all 10 of the component expectancy dimensions used in the rating instruments. At the same time, because the statistic was derived from the individual differences of patterns with
respect to each category, all components affected the results. A standardizing procedure assured that each of the dimensions would contribute equally to the correlation obtained.

The formula for the statistic is

\[ r_p = \frac{2k - \sum d^2}{2k - \sum d^2} \]

where

- \( k \) = the median \( \chi^2 \) on a sample of size \( n \) dimensions.
- \( d \) = the difference between the two values of dimension or category in the profile pattern.
- \( \sum d^2 \) = the sum of the squared differences for all dimensions.

For example, if

- \( k = 12 \)
- \( \sum d^2 = 34 \)

\[ r_p = \frac{2(11.34) - 34}{2(11.34) + 34} \]
\[ r_p = \frac{22.68 - 34}{22.68 + 34} \]
\[ r_p = \frac{-11.32}{56.68} \]
\[ r_p = -0.20 \]

Several other supplementary statistics were used. These were measures of the significance of the results obtained. The significance tests were the Spearman rank
correlation coefficient (52, pp. 202-213), the Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance (52, pp. 134-193), Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test (55, pp. 75-33), Spearman rank correlation (55, pp. 203-213), and the Mann trend T test (39). These will be described below in the context of the situations in which they are used.

Finally, because the distribution of \( r_p \) approaches that of the Pearson product-moment correlation, the significance of individual \( r_p \) values could be assessed from significant tables for the product-moment correlation (3). Hence, the significance of certain obtained \( r_p \) values were determined by this means.

**Reliability of Rating Scales**

**Reliability of Counselor Ratings on the Counselor Evaluation Scale**

To test the reliability of counselor ratings on the CES, each of the counselors was informed of the "loss" of one of his ratings of a client and asked to re-rate this individual. The re-test CES was then compared by means of the \( r_p \) with the original ratings. The results, as reported in Table 2, were all reliable at a significant level of probability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>$r_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{r}_p$</td>
<td>.72**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

**Reliability of Client Ratings on the Student Expectancy Scale**

To test the reliability of client ratings on the SES, five individuals were selected at random to serve as reliability checks. These individuals were assigned to the researcher for counseling. They filled out the rating instruments as did the other subjects, but their participation in the study was limited to their use in the reliability check.

The procedure followed was that of having three of the subjects informed by the receptionist at the beginning of Stage 2 of the "loss" of their SES #1. This was the form they had filled out when applying for counseling. The
remaining two subjects were told of the "loss" of their SES #2 when they returned for their second interviews. All five were asked to re-rate the form. No objections to repeating the task were encountered. The re-test SES scores were then correlated with the original ratings. Again the $r_p$ method was used to determine the reliability coefficients. The statistically significant results are reported in Table 3.

**TABLE 3**

RETEST RELIABILITY OF CLIENT RATINGS ON THE STUDENT EXPECTATION SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>$r_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.54a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\overline{r_p}$</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

$a$ critical value for $r_p$ at .05 level = .56

Reliability of Judges' Ratings of Client Behavior

After the judges completed ratings of the 60 interviews, it was necessary to assess the reliability of the
ratings of client behavior. Kendall's coefficient of Concordance $W$ was used (19, pp. 409-430). The researcher needed a statistic to indicate the degree of agreement among three judges, based upon their subjective judgments of a situation. This measure seemed particularly appropriate for the task required. Kendall's $W$ enabled a single reliability coefficient to be derived from "the community of agreement" among judges. Also, the statistic permitted determination of the reliability of each of the 15 dimensions of the JRI individually as well as providing an overall coefficient of concordance. The results of the reliability check are reported in Table 4. They may be interpreted as indicating that generally raters were operating from the same viewpoint in their ratings. Only one of the three non-significant ratings indicated sizeable disparity among the raters.

**Procedural Checks**

As a trial run of the procedures and rating instruments used in the study, a pilot study was conducted during the Fall quarter, 1958. Each of the three counselors was assigned two clients. To acquaint himself better with the counseling phase of the investigation, the writer assigned himself two clients as well.

This study proved helpful in several ways. It yielded information confirming the applicability of the
**TABLE 4**

KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE WAS A MEASURE OF RELIABILITY OF JUDGES' RATINGS OF CLIENT BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>$\chi^2_r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>144.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>123.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>91.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>128.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>80.42a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of inquiry</td>
<td>118.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>108.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>122.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>128.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>49.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor's reaction to client</td>
<td>98.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's remarks</td>
<td>119.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>79.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Counselor's awareness of client's problem</td>
<td>115.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>118.59*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.**

*Significant at .05 level.

aCritical value for $\chi^2_r$ at the .05 level = 89.45.
statistical procedures, planned in analyzing the data. Tape recordings of eight interviews yielded typed protocols, which were used in training the judges for the rating of client behavior and in the determination of the appropriateness of the JRS. Also, the pilot study served as a "dry run" on the workability of the procedures employed in assigning subjects and in having counselors and clients fill out rating instruments.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study are presented in five major sections:

1. Initial expectancies of UCTC clients
2. The relationship between client expectancies and client behavior
3. The nature of change in client expectancies
4. Perception of client expectancies by counselors
5. The relationship of a counselor's "ideal" client expectancies to the expectancies and behavior of actual clients

Initial Expectancies of University Counseling and Testing Center Clients

Equivalency of Client Groups

The three groups of clients of each of the counselors were examined to determine the equivalency of the initial expectancies of each group.

When the mean ratings of each dimension were compared among the groups and analyzed by the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance (55, pp. 183-194), there was
an insignificant difference among the three samples. The writer was able to accept the hypothesis that the samples were sufficiently similar to belong to the same population. These results are summarized in Table 5.

A further check on the equivalency of the three groups was obtained by comparing the relative naiveté of each group as to how much each knew about what would take place in counseling. This measure was inferred from the clients' response to item 17 of the SES, "How well equipped do you feel you are to answer the above questions (about your expectations for counseling)?" The mean ratings of the first, second and third groups were 5.1, 5.2 and 5.0 respectively. These near identical results were interpreted as further support for the assumption of the equivalence of the three groups, and for the adequacy of the procedure for selecting them.

Initial Client Expectancies

The initial expectancies of clients at the UCTC are summarized in Table 6. The scores given indicate the mean client rating for each dimension along with its standard deviation. In interpreting these figures, it should be remembered that ratings varied from a possible one through ten, within a range limited by the descriptions given at the extremes of the dimension. Generally speaking, high mean scores on a dimension indicate the position which
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor I</th>
<th>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor II</th>
<th>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative taking</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of counselor inquiry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor I</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor II</td>
<td>Rankings of Mean Ratings of Clients of Counselor III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's remarks</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Counselor's awareness of client's problem</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Length of contact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R_1 = 420 \quad R_2 = 407 \quad R_3 = 349$

$K = .911^a$

---

$^a$ The critical value for $K$ at the .05 level of probability with $df = 2$ was 5.99 or greater.
## TABLE 6

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF RATINGS OF CLIENT EXPECTANCIES AT STAGE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Clients of Counselor I</th>
<th>Clients of Counselor II</th>
<th>Clients of Counselor III</th>
<th>&quot;Mean&quot; Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>3.6 ± 1.1</td>
<td>3.1 ± 1.2</td>
<td>4.2 ± 1.5</td>
<td>3.6 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>5.5 ± 1.7</td>
<td>5.5 ± 2.3</td>
<td>5.0 ± 1.9</td>
<td>5.4 ± 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client’s willingness to participate</td>
<td>8.5 ± 1.8</td>
<td>8.2 ± 2.7</td>
<td>6.4 ± 3.1</td>
<td>7.7 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>5.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>5.4 ± 2.4</td>
<td>5.0 ± 2.0</td>
<td>5.3 ± 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client’s exploration of his problem</td>
<td>7.2 ± 1.8</td>
<td>7.6 ± 1.9</td>
<td>8.0 ± 1.0</td>
<td>7.6 ± 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of counselor inquiry</td>
<td>6.5 ± 2.1</td>
<td>6.3 ± 2.9</td>
<td>5.5 ± 2.5</td>
<td>6.1 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client’s ease of expression</td>
<td>8.3 ± 1.9</td>
<td>7.5 ± 2.9</td>
<td>7.2 ± 2.4</td>
<td>7.7 ± 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>8.0 ± 1.2</td>
<td>7.6 ± 1.6</td>
<td>7.8 ± 2.5</td>
<td>7.8 ± 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>5.7 ± 2.0</td>
<td>5.5 ± 2.6</td>
<td>4.9 ± 2.1</td>
<td>5.4 ± 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>7.0 ± 2.2</td>
<td>4.5 ± 3.5</td>
<td>6.8 ± 1.9</td>
<td>6.1 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Clients of Counselor I</td>
<td>Clients of Counselor II</td>
<td>Clients of Counselor III</td>
<td>&quot;Mean&quot; Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>7.3 ± 2.2</td>
<td>7.6 ± 2.7</td>
<td>7.5 ± 2.0</td>
<td>7.5 ± 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's re-</td>
<td>7.8 ± 1.3</td>
<td>8.5 ± 2.1</td>
<td>7.2 ± 1.5</td>
<td>7.8 ± 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>8.7 ± 1.7</td>
<td>9.5 ± 1.0</td>
<td>7.9 ± 2.6</td>
<td>8.7 ± 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Counselor's awareness of client's problem</td>
<td>6.8 ± 1.9</td>
<td>7.3 ± 2.2</td>
<td>7.0 ± 1.6</td>
<td>7.0 ± 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>7.0 ± 2.3</td>
<td>7.7 ± 1.3</td>
<td>6.9 ± 2.4</td>
<td>7.2 ± 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Length of contact</td>
<td>3.9 ± 1.2</td>
<td>2.7 ± 1.4</td>
<td>3.3 ± 1.9</td>
<td>3.3 ± 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>± 1.7</td>
<td>± 2.2</td>
<td>± 2.0</td>
<td>± 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would be valued by experienced counselors.

The interpretation of the results in Table 6 can best be made by referring to the SES (Appendix A), where the dimensions are stated in full, and where the extremes of the dimensions are described. With this aid, the following inferences can be drawn:

1. Tests were important, but were not a sole basis upon which decisions in counseling were to be made.

2. The amount of talking in the interview was expected to be shared equally between client and counselor.

3. Clients looked forward to coming to the UCTC.

4. Clients expected to share equally in assuming the initiative in directing the course of the interview.

5. Clients felt they had given considerable thought to their problem(s) prior to coming to the UCTC.

6. Clients recognized that problems other than the one presented initially might be discussed.

7. Clients felt they would be able to express themselves quite freely in the counseling interview.

8. Clients felt that there would be considerable discussion of their "personal" feelings or problems in the interview.

9. Clients expected that they would share equally with the counselor in the final decision-making about their problem.
10. Clients felt that they would get some idea of the kind of individual their counselor was apart from his professional role.

11. Clients expected that the counselor would be quite friendly and understanding.

12. Clients expected that counselor remarks would be relatively easy to understand.

13. Clients felt very certain that the counselors were experienced in dealing with problems such as theirs.

14. Clients were confident that their counselors would be able to understand the nature of their problem.

15. Clients expected that their counselors would be able to help them materially in solving their problems.

16. Clients expected that the counseling contact would last approximately three interviews.

From the above it is apparent that clients held optimistic expectations regarding what would take place in counseling. They had great confidence in the counselors, felt that they would be able to participate freely and easily, and were willing to share equally with the counselor in assuming the responsibility for the interview. These favorable attitudes toward the UCTC are similar to those reported by Form (23) at another university counseling center.
Congruence of Counselor's "Ideal" Client Expectancies with Initial Expectancies of Actual Clients

Considerable evidence existed (4, 5, 7, 14, 15, 50) to suggest that clients and counselors differ in their expectancies for counseling. Warman's (64) study at the UCTC was particularly important and basic to the inference that the discrepancies noted elsewhere existed for this population as well.

To test this assumption empirically, the writer compared the initial expectancies of the "mean" client (Table 6) with those of the "mean" counselor "ideal." The Wilcoxon Matched-Pair Signed-Ranks Test (55, pp. 75-83) permitted a comparison to be made with respect to each of the 16 dimensions on the SES. The results, as indicated in Table 7, revealed differences in the expected direction, but these were not sufficiently pronounced to be considered statistically significant.

These results may be interpreted as suggesting either that the differences between clients and counselors were not as great as had been originally supposed, or that utilizing "means" for comparison cancelled out whatever significant differences may have existed.

Some support was obtained for the last interpretation, in light of the results of individual comparisons of counselor "ideal" and initial client expectancies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Client Ratings at Stage 1</th>
<th>Mean Counselor &quot;Ideal&quot; Ratings</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of counselor inquiry</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 7 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Client Ratings at Stage 1</th>
<th>Mean Counselor &quot;Ideal&quot; Ratings</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's remarks</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Counselor's awareness of client's problem</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Length of counseling contact</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T = 39.5^a \]

---

^a Critical value of T significant at the .05 level = 30 or less.
indicated in Table 8, line 12. These findings state that only one client initially had expectancies significantly similar to those of the counselor "ideal." Further, as is indicated in line 13, this degree of relationship was not significantly altered for any individual by the last stage of the counseling contact. At that point there was still only one client whose expectancies were significantly related to those of the counselor's "ideal."

A group analysis of the data revealed a quite different and striking result. Although individual initial client expectancies showed no significant movement toward the counselors' "ideal" client expectancies, the overall trend was clearly toward a greater congruence between these two relationships. This can be noted in Table 9, where the "mean" client expectancies at Stage 3 were shown to be sufficiently similar to counselor "ideal" to reject with considerable confidence the hypothesis of significant differences between the two. When the results of Table 9 were compared with those of Table 8, it was seen that "mean" client expectancies clearly moved in the direction of the counselor "ideal." A direct indication of this greater rapprochement was indicated by the smaller difference score between the two relationships at Stage 3 compared with Stage 1.
TABLE 8

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT COEFFICIENTS OF PATTERN SIMILARITY (rD) OBTAINED FOR FOURTEEN CLIENT, COUNSELOR AND JUDGE RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Counselor I</th>
<th>Counselor II</th>
<th>Counselor III</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cl₁ - Jud₂</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cl₂ - Jud₃</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Co₁ - Jud₂</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Co₂ - Jud₃</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cl₁ - Cl₃</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cl₁ - Cl₂</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cl₂ - Cl₃</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Co₁ - Co₃</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cl₁ - Co₁</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cl₂ - Co₂</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cl₃ - Co₃</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cl₁ - CoId</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cl₃ - CoId</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jud₂ - Jud₃</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Derived from .05 probability tables for r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Client Ratings at Stage 3</th>
<th>Mean Counselor &quot;Ideal&quot; Ratings</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>- 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>- .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>- .5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of counselor inquiry</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>- 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>- 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Client Ratings at Stage 3</th>
<th>Mean Counselor &quot;Ideal&quot; Ratings</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's remarks</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Counselor's awareness of client's problem</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Length of counseling contact</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>- .6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T = 51.5^a \]

^a Critical value of T significant at the .05 level = 30 or less.
The writer concluded from these data that client expectancies did move in the direction of the counselor "ideal" client expectancies, but that this movement was not sufficiently great in any one interaction to indicate a larger number of individual significant relationships. The overall movement toward the counselor "ideal" was an important indication of the influence of the counselor in the interview.

Relationship between Client Expectancies and Independent Ratings of Client Behavior

The degree of relationship between client expectancies and rated client behavior in the subsequent interview was examined individually for each of the 30 clients. The writer checked the pattern similarity of client responses to the SES at Stage 1 with judges' responses to the JRS at Stage 2 (the first interview). A similar comparison was made between the client's stated expectancies at Stage 2, and judges' ratings of his behavior at Stage 3 (last interview). Cattell's (8) coefficient of pattern similarity, \( r_p \), yielded almost no significant associations between client expectancies and his rated interview behavior. Only three of the 60 possible relationships yielded a significant coefficient at the \( .05 \) level. All three were clients seen by Counselor I. These results are summarized in Table 8, lines 1 and 2.
Counselors' ratings of client expectancies were somewhat better predictors of rated client behavior than were the above client ratings. As shown in lines 3 and 4 of Table 8, counselors' predictions of client expectancies were significantly related to subsequent client behavior eight times out of a possible 60 - still a rather poor performance.

The writer concludes that neither client nor counselor ratings are sufficiently accurate to be reliably used to predict independent ratings of subsequent client behavior.

**Change in Client Expectancies**

The writer analyzed change in client expectancies at two levels. Considering each client individually, eight were found whose expectancies remained significantly unchanged from the first to the last stage of counseling. The expectancies of the remaining 22 clients changed appreciably over that period. These results are reported on line 5 of Table 8.

When the change in client expectancies was investigated for the group as a whole, using the Wilcoxon matched-pair signed-ranks test (Table 10), the change in client expectancies was found to be significant at the .01 level. This indicated a highly probable change in
TABLE 10

WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIR SIGNED-RANKS TEST OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEAN CLIENT EXPECTANCIES AT STAGES 1 AND 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Client Ratings at Stage 1</th>
<th>Mean Client Ratings at Stage 3</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 10 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Client Ratings at Stage 1</th>
<th>Mean Client Ratings at Stage 3</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's remarks</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Counselor's awareness of client's problem</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Length of counseling contact</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T = 9** \]

**Significant at the .01 level.**
the expectancies of the client population as a group from the beginning to the end of counseling.

Table 8 also revealed that client expectancies seemed to remain more stable between Stages 2 and 3 than between Stages 1 and 2. As seen on lines 6 and 7, 8 clients remained essentially unchanged in their expectancies from Stage 1 to 2, compared with 12 from Stages 2 and 3. One might speculate that client expectancies underwent greater change during the earlier two stages because of the necessity of altering relatively naive, preconceived ideas formulated prior to actual counseling in order to adjust to the real situation encountered at Stage 2. In contrast, both Stages 2 and 3 were rated after contact in the counseling interview, and would be expected to be more similar.

In contrast with the self-ratings of clients, counselors felt that greater changes in client expectancies had occurred over the period of counseling than had been indicated. As shown in line 8 of Table 8, counselors rated only four clients as having remained significantly similar from Stage 1 to Stage 3.

Changes in client expectancies were examined in still another way. Some changes were noted in individual dimensions of the rating scale. The Mann (39) Trend test
(Table 11) was employed to determine whether any consistent trends existed in the ratings of particular dimensions from Stage 1 to Stage 3. For example, it might be possible that clients would see tests as being of decreasing importance as counseling progressed; hence, they would mark that category progressively closer to the right extremity ("I don't think they'd be any help with my problem.") of the dimension.

Actually 5 of the 16 dimensions evidenced a statistically significant trend:

1. Dimension 6 (Breadth of Counselor Inquiry). Ratings on this dimension indicated an increasing awareness that the content of the interviews would not remain focused on the immediate problem presented.

2. Dimension 9 (Division of Decision-Making). Rating on this category indicated that clients were increasingly expectant that counselors would not give them much advice about final decision-making. The fact that clients originally expected the counselor to share at least equally in this may explain the fact that responses to this dimension underwent the greatest degree of change of any of the dimensions.

3. Dimension 10 (The Extent the Counselor Reveals Himself). Ratings in this category evidenced considerable change. Clients seemed to be finding, to their surprise,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>( T_t ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>1.430*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>1.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>.6674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>.2860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of counselor inquiry</td>
<td>2.479*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>.6350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>.4769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>3.1426*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>-2.768*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's remarks</td>
<td>1.964*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>-2.711*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Counselor's awareness of client's problem</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Length of counseling contact</td>
<td>1.552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \) Critical value of \( t \) at the .05 level = 1.7.*

* Significant at the .05 level.
that they did not get much of a picture of what the counselor was really like; the latter was too well-concealed behind his "professional role."

4. Dimension 12 (Client's Understanding of Counselor's Remarks). Ratings on this dimension moved in the direction of an increase in communication between counselor and client. The clients seemed to find that counselors' remarks were not as difficult to understand as they had expected.

5. Dimension 13 (Counselor's Experience). Ratings on this dimension moved appreciably in the direction of a decreased expectation of the experience which UCTC counselors had.

When the five significantly shifting dimensions were considered, it appeared that movement came with respect to characteristics of the counseling relationship that clients found contrary to their expectations. One may infer that clients were surprised to find themselves being given a greater degree of responsibility in decision-making than they had anticipated, or finding the counselor "probing" more than they had expected. Similarly, the clients may have been disappointed to find that their relationship with their counselor was not as "personal" as they would have liked, and that the UCTC counselors whom the clients dealt with were not as experienced as
they had hoped. The latter may even be interpreted as indicating some degree of dissatisfaction with the counseling agency.

The fact that greatest change seemed to accompany situations where expectations were the most discrepant will be observed again later in the chapter in examining change in clients whose expectancies differ widely from those of the counselor's "ideal."

**Perception of Client Expectancies by Counselors**

It has already been established that counselors' ratings of client expectancies were somewhat better predictors of independently rated client behavior than were clients' own estimates (see lines 1 through 4 of Table 8). Counselor's estimates of client expectancies were predictive of rated client behavior in a subsequent interview eight times out of a possible 60, in contrast to three successful predictions by clients. The criterion used was the .05 level of significance for an $r_p$ derived from the pattern similarities of client and counselor ratings at a given stage. The writer concluded that neither clients nor counselors could be considered reliable predictors of independently rated client behavior.

Next, the extent to which counselor ratings of client expectancies were congruent with clients' own ratings of their expectations was examined. As shown on
lines 9, 10 and 11 of Table 8, counselors were only slightly better at predicting client expectancies than client behavior. Using the same criterion as was used in predicting client behavior, it was found that counselors' ratings were congruent with client self-estimates 10 times out of a possible 60 interactions. The writer was particularly interested to note that seven of the 10 congruent relationships were obtained at Stage 2, indicating that counselors were more accurate in rating clients after the first interview than after the last. Only one counselor was able to rate a single client accurately prior to meeting with him, using background data about him. More striking, after completing a counseling contact only two client-counselor ratings were significantly congruent out of a possible 30 relationships.

Next, the writer sought to determine whether there were differences between counselors in their ability to perceive the expectations of their clients accurately. Two levels of analysis were used. First, the writer compared the three counselors at each stage with respect to the absolute number of clients each was able to rate with a significant degree of accuracy. These results are shown, also, on lines 9, 10 and 11 of Table 8. By inspection it can be seen that counselors were almost equally able in performing the task. Line 10 indicates that Counselors I,
II and III were able to rate two, two and three clients, respectively, at a significant level of accuracy at Stage 2. Line 11 of Table 7 shows that collectively they were able to rate only two clients accurately at Stage 3.

The second level of analysis involved comparison of all of the ratings of all of the counselors over all three stages of time. The data lent themselves to an analysis by means of the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks Test (55, pp. 184-193). This test permitted a comparison of the three samples, composed of the clients of each counselor. By combining the total population of ratings into a single distribution ranked from most to least congruent counselor-client ratings, it was possible to test the null hypothesis that there were no significant differences among the counselors in the accuracy of their ratings. The results, as indicated in Table 12, supported this hypotheses of no significant differences among the raters.

Using the same non-parametric test of significance, the writer was able to test the related hypothesis that counselors would improve in their ratings of clients over time. For this analysis, all the ratings of each counselor were ranked from most to least congruent with client over all three stages of time. The results of the ratings of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Number</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings by Counselor I</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings by Counselor II</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings by Counselor III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 1</td>
<td>19.5a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 23</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 26</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 51</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 54</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 14</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 22</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Number</td>
<td>Rankings of Ratings by Counselor I</td>
<td>Rankings of Ratings by Counselor II</td>
<td>Rankings of Ratings by Counselor III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-17</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-72</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R_1 = 1299.0 \quad R_2 = 1526.0 \quad R_3 = 1270 \]

\[ H = 2.07^b \]

---

\[ a \] Tabular scores indicates ranking of the relative accuracy of all counselors in rating client expectancies at all stages.

\[ b \] Critical value of H at the .05 level of significance = 5.99 or greater.
Counselor I, II and III are indicated in Tables 13, 14 and 15 respectively.

Despite a trend in the desired direction, the results for all three counselors were not statistically significant. The hypothesis that counselor ratings would improve significantly over time must be rejected.

**Relationship of Counselor's "Ideal" Client Expectancies to Client Expectancies and Independently Rated Behavior**

**Client Expectancies**

The writer expected that whatever the degree of similarity between counselor "ideal" and client, there would be considerable differentiation within the sample. This assumption was the basis for two hypotheses. The first hypothesis stated that there would be greatest change in the expectancies of clients over the stages of counseling for those clients whose initial expectancies were most discrepant from those of their counselor's "ideal" client. Correspondingly, there would be least change for clients whose initial expectancies were similar to those of the counselor's "ideal."

The hypothesis was tested by using Spearman's rank correlation method (55, pp. 203-213). By ranking the clients in descending order of similarity of initial client expectancies with those of the counselor's "ideal" and comparing this with the degree of change in client
### TABLE 13

**Kruskal-Wallis Test of the Differences Among Ratings of Client Expectancies by Counselor I Over Stages of Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Number</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage 1</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage 2</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R_1 = 160.5 \]
\[ R_2 = 130 \]
\[ R_3 = 174.5 \]

\[ H = 1.34<sup>b</sup> \]

<sup>a</sup> Tabular scores indicate ranking of the relative accuracy of Counselor I's ratings of client expectancies at Stage 1 compared with Stages 2 and 3.

<sup>b</sup> Critical value H at the .05 level of significance = 5.99 or greater.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Number</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage 1</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage 2</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II- 2</td>
<td>5(^a)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-14</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-16</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-58</td>
<td>30(^a)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R_1=175.5)</td>
<td>(R_2=142.0)</td>
<td>(R_3=147.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(H^a = 3.24^b\)

\(^a\)Tabular scores indicate ranking of the relative accuracy of Counselor II's ratings of client expectancies at Stage 1 compared with Stages 2 and 3.

\(^b\)Critical value of \(H\) at the .05 level of significance = 5.99 or greater.
### TABLE 15

KRUSKAL-WALLIS TEST OF THE DIFFERENCES AMONG RATINGS OF CLIENT EXPECTANCIES BY COUNSELOR III OVER STAGES OF TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Number</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage 2</th>
<th>Rankings of Ratings at Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III-17</td>
<td>4.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-25</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-50</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-75</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-76</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R<sub>1</sub>=186  
R<sub>2</sub>=143.5  
R<sub>3</sub>=135  

H= 0.900<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Tabular scores indicate ranking of the relative accuracy of Counselor III's ratings of client expectancies at Stage 1 compared with Stages 2 and 3.

<sup>b</sup>Critical value of H at the .05 level of significance = 5.99 or greater.
expectancies from Stage 1 to Stage 3, the degree of association between the two relationships was determined. Symbolically stated, the relationship examined was $C_{11} - CoId$ compared with $C_{11} - C_{13}$.

These relationships are summarized in Table 16. The resulting rho coefficient was significant at the .01 level of probability. This may be interpreted to mean that clients whose initial expectancies vary most greatly from the counselor may be expected to undergo greater change over the period of counseling in their expectancies than will clients whose initial expectancies more nearly approximate those of the counselor's "ideal."

A second hypothesis examined was that relative similarity of initial client expectancies and counselor "ideal" have a differential effect upon the accuracy of counselors' ratings of client expectancies. This hypothesis involved a comparison by ranks of the $C_{11} - CoId$ relationship with the $Co - C_{11}$. Using the same rank correlation coefficient, rho, a significant relationship was found. The results, as indicated in Table 17, were somewhat less conclusive than those resulting from a test of the previous hypothesis, but nonetheless were statistically significant at the .05 level. These findings may be interpreted as indicating that counselors are able to rate more accurately clients who resemble themselves
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Number</th>
<th>Rankings of the Congruence of Initial Client Expectancies and Counselor &quot;Ideal&quot;</th>
<th>Rankings of Degree of Client Change in Client Expectancies</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>d²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>182.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>380.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-16</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-56</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-58</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>342.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 16 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Number</th>
<th>Rankings of the Congruence of Initial Client Expectancies and Counselor &quot;Ideal&quot;</th>
<th>Rankings of Degree of Client Change in Client Expectancies</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>d²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-72</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>210.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-74</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-75</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>52.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ d^2 = 2,393.25 \]

\[ r_s = .47** \]

**Significant at the .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Number</th>
<th>Rankings of the Congruence of Initial Client Expectancies and Counselor &quot;Ideal&quot;</th>
<th>Rankings of Congruence of Counselor Rating of Client Expectancies with Client's Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II- 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-16</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-56</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-58</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Number</td>
<td>Rankings of the Congruence of Initial Client Expectancies and Counselor &quot;Ideal&quot;</td>
<td>Rankings of Congruence of Counselor Rating of Client Expectancies with Client's Ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-72</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-74</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-75</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$d^2=2,957.25$

$r_s = .34^*$

*Significant at the .05 level.
(their image of an "ideal" client) than they are able to rate clients holding widely discrepant expectancies for counseling.

The writer believes the two hypotheses above attest to the importance of the "frame of reference" of both client and counselor in counseling.

**Client Behavior**

One of the most apparent results suggested by Table 8 seemed to be the relative stability or lack of change in the client's interview behavior, as inferred from judges' ratings. As can be seen from line 14 of Table 8, 20 of a possible 30 clients showed a significant similarity in their rated behavior from first to last interview.

Surprisingly enough, when client behavior for all 30 clients as a group was considered, a relatively small but rather consistent shift in the direction of the left extremity of dimensions on the rating scale was noted. This shift in client behavior in the counseling interview was found to be significant at the .01 level of probability. The results are shown in Table 18. These results may be interpreted as indicating a strong likelihood that a "true" change in client behavior did occur.

Recalling that mean rating scores are derived from a range of scores from one to ten, and that generally
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Ratings at First Interview (Stage 2)</th>
<th>Mean Ratings at Last Interview (Stage 3)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>5.941\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>4.566</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>5.814</td>
<td>4.977</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>7.173</td>
<td>7.022</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>4.574</td>
<td>3.988</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>6.086</td>
<td>5.900</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>6.796</td>
<td>6.719</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>5.586</td>
<td>5.866</td>
<td>-.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>4.329</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>-.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>5.040</td>
<td>5.089</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Mean Ratings at First Interview (Stage 2)</td>
<td>Mean Ratings at Last Interview (Stage 3)</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>6.186</td>
<td>5.688</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor's remarks</td>
<td>6.486</td>
<td>5.760</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>6.774</td>
<td>6.611</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>6.041</td>
<td>5.570</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Length of contact by client</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.740</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T=16**

**Significant at the .01 level.

*Tabular scores are means of ratings on the JRS that had a possible range of one to ten.
speaking higher scores would be viewed by experienced
counselors as preferable to low ones, the most significant
changes in behavior noted in Table 18 are qualitatively
described below. Listed in order of magnitude of change,
these were:

1. Dimension 1: "The importance of tests"
changed more markedly than any other dimension. Movement
was in the direction of giving tests greater importance.
Even with the greater emphasis, tests were seen as rela-
tively moderate in importance; that is, neither important
nor unimportant.

2. Dimension 2: "The division of talk" moved in
the direction of greater participation by the counselor,
and less by the client. Even with the new positioning,
effectively speaking, talk was equally shared.

3. Dimension 12: "Client understanding of coun-
selor's remarks" declined, though communication may still
be considered neither difficult nor easy.

4. Dimension 4: "Division of initiative-taking"
became increasingly weighted in the direction of the
counselor, confirming the slightly greater initiative
assumed by the counselor in the first interview. Inter-
estingly enough, one of the few dimensions to show a
contrary trend to the above was "division of decision-
making." The findings suggest that, though counselors
take greater initiative generally, they attempt to provide less direction in the final decision-making.

The writer was struck by the general tendency for mean client behavior to fall at the midpoint (five) of the scale. Such results could be an artifact of the ratings rather than representative of actual moderate or indifferent client or counselor behavior.

The writer also desired to explore the relationship of the Counselor "ideal" to rated client behavior. He wished to determine whether there were behavioral differences between clients whose expectancies were highly discrepant from those of the counselor's "ideal," as compared with those whose expectancies were more nearly congruent with the counselor's "ideal."

By ranking the 30 clients with respect to the degree of relationship between initial client expectancies and counselor "ideal," it was possible to determine the 15 clients most and least congruent with the counselor "ideal." These were termed "congruent" and "discrepant" groups. The mean client behavior for the 15 clients in each group was computed with respect to each behavior dimension on the JRS.

Using the Wilcoxon-Matched-Pair Signed-Ranks test of significance (55, pp. 75-83), the significance of the difference between the mean rating of the "congruent" and
"discrepant" groups for each dimension was determined. From this, an overall measure of significance was derived. This was carried out for both the first and the last interviews.

The results of the comparison between "discrepant" and "congruent" clients in the first interview are reported in Table 19. No significant differences between the two groups were found. By the last interview, however, differences between the two groups had emerged (Table 20). The rated client behaviors of "congruent" and "discrepant" groups were significantly different at the .01 level of probability. Surprisingly, the "discrepant" group at Stage 3 gave evidence of behaviors that were more preferable to an experienced counselor than did the "congruent" group. This suggested to the writer that counselor influence on the "discrepant" group had been greater than on the "congruent" group. This result was compatible with the finding that "discrepant" clients' expectancies change most.

Generally, it appeared that all of the ratings of client behavior at Stage 3 had shifted to the left of ratings made at Stage 1, that is, in the direction of less client responsibility and participation. Insofar as the shift seemed equally prevalent for both groups, it appeared that this was due to influences common to both. For
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Behavior Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Client Behavior of &quot;Congruent&quot; Group</th>
<th>Mean Client Behavior of &quot;Discrepant&quot; Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>5.796&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.086&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>5.909</td>
<td>5.730</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>7.241</td>
<td>7.106</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>4.728</td>
<td>4.419</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of counselor inquiry</td>
<td>5.797</td>
<td>5.885</td>
<td>-.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>7.064</td>
<td>6.618</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>5.309</td>
<td>5.863</td>
<td>-.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>4.862</td>
<td>3.796</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>5.062</td>
<td>5.018</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Behavior Dimension</td>
<td>Mean Client Behavior of &quot;Congruent&quot; Group</td>
<td>Mean Client Behavior of &quot;Discrepant&quot; Group</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>6.286</td>
<td>6.086</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>5.085</td>
<td>4.351</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>5.086</td>
<td>6.174</td>
<td>-1.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T = 39^c \]

^a Tabular scores are derived from ratings that had a possible range of one to ten.

^b Figures are carried out three places to avoid tied ranks.

^c Critical value significant at the .05 level = 25.
TABLE 20

WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIR SIGNED-RANKS TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CLIENT BEHAVIOR OF "DISCREPANT" AND "CONGRUENT" CLIENTS IN THE LAST INTERVIEW
(Stage 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Behavior Dimension</th>
<th>Mean Client Behavior of &quot;Congruent&quot; Group</th>
<th>Mean Client Behavior of &quot;Discrepant&quot; Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of tests</td>
<td>3.798&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.332&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of talk</td>
<td>4.684</td>
<td>5.130</td>
<td>-.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client's willingness to participate</td>
<td>7.018</td>
<td>7.242</td>
<td>-.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of initiative-taking</td>
<td>3.686</td>
<td>4.240</td>
<td>-.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client's exploration of his problem</td>
<td>5.908</td>
<td>6.242</td>
<td>-.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breadth of counselor inquiry</td>
<td>5.485</td>
<td>5.997</td>
<td>-.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client's ease of expression</td>
<td>6.664</td>
<td>6.463</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussion of &quot;personal&quot; feelings</td>
<td>5.596</td>
<td>6.174</td>
<td>-.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Division of decision-making</td>
<td>4.640</td>
<td>4.820</td>
<td>-.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extent counselor reveals himself</td>
<td>4.841</td>
<td>5.330</td>
<td>-.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Behavior Dimension</td>
<td>Mean Client Behavior of &quot;Congruent&quot; Group</td>
<td>Mean Client Behavior of &quot;Discrepant&quot; Group</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Counselor reaction to client</td>
<td>5.907</td>
<td>5.464</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Client's understanding of counselor remarks</td>
<td>5.663</td>
<td>5.864</td>
<td>-.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor's experience</td>
<td>6.663</td>
<td>6.598</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Client's satisfaction with counseling</td>
<td>5.330</td>
<td>5.685</td>
<td>-.355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T = 13.5^{**} \]

**Significant at the .01 level.

\(^{a}\)Tabular scores are derived from ratings that had a possible range of one to ten.

\(^{b}\)Figures are carried out three places to avoid tied ranks.
example, the results may be attributed to greater severity of judges' ratings in the last interview or to characteristics inherent in the third interview. The writer favored the second possibility. He felt the first interview may have involved a greater degree of client participation, in that it had been necessary for the client to present his problem. In the last interview, opportunities for participation would have been reduced.

Summary of Results

1. The writer examined initial client expectancies in terms of the mean scores for each dimension, and ascertained the qualitative description equivalent of the ratings. The equivalency of the three sample groups of clients was demonstrated. Clients' initial expectancies were not significantly different from counselors' "ideal" expectancies.

2. Clients' ratings of their expectancies were not significantly related to independent ratings of their subsequent behavior in the counseling interview.

3. Initial client expectancies did change significantly over the period of counseling. More change took place from Stage 1 to Stage 2 than from Stage 2 to Stage 3. There was a significant shift in five specific dimensions of client expectancies. These five dimensions...
seemed to be areas about which most clients would have little basis for estimation. Perhaps then expectations were contrary to the situation encountered.

4. While counselors' estimates of client expectancies were somewhat better than those of the clients themselves, client expectancies were not sufficiently accurate to warrant their use in the prediction of rated client behavior in the subsequent interview. Counselors' ratings of client expectancies did not improve significantly over time toward congruence with clients' ratings of these expectancies. Considering the ratings of all the counselors over all stages of time, there were no significant differences among counselors in their relative accuracy of rating client expectancies.

5. Clients whose initial expectancies were most widely discrepant from those of the counselor "ideal" changed more significantly in their expectancies than did those whose expectancies initially resembled those of the counselor's "ideal." Also, counselors were able to rate more accurately those clients whose expectancies were more congruent with those of their client "ideal" than those whose expectancies were at greater variance with their client "ideal" expectancies. In addition, rated client behavior of the "congruent" and "discrepant"
groups was significantly different in the last interview. This relationship did not hold true for the first interview.

Discussion and Implications of the Results

1. The initial expectancies of clients were somewhat surprising. They were less discrepant, on the whole, from those of counselors' "ideal" clients than one would have expected from the results of previous studies. Rather than assuming the more traditional view of counseling, in which counselors are seen as having the responsibility for solving problems for the client and in directing the interview; the clients in the present study tended to enter counseling as willing and active participants. They seemed to expect that they themselves would be an important resource in arriving at a solution to their problems.

This development suggested that the UCTC has in some measure succeeded in communicating to the University community the role that clients should play. Still, clients do see tests as important. However, there seems to be some recognition that other "tools" than mental tests are to be used in counseling.

Initial client expectancies reflected an optimistic, almost over-confident view of counselors' capabilities to
help deal with client problems. For example, clients' ratings of Dimension 13 on the SES seemed to attribute a greater degree of experience to the counselors than they subsequently found warranted. One may speculate about the affects which resulted when clients' high expectations were not confirmed in the interview.

2. The apparent difficulty of both clients and counselors in predicting client interview behavior successfully requires explanation. Several interpretations are possible. Clients may not have had the opportunity to act in accordance with their expectations because the counselor did not give them the opportunity to do so. Also, the unreliability of judges' and clients' ratings must be considered as possible sources of error.

Perhaps more significantly, client expectancies and client behavior may not be equated on a one-to-one basis. That is, a particular client expectancy may not have just one counterpart in client behavior, but several. Judges who rated the client behavior, found that it was difficult to define the expectancy dimensions narrowly enough to permit only one possible interpretation of client behavior to be made.

A fourth possible explanation, there may have been differences due to the differing classes of observers involved. Expert judges may have seen the same behavior
as clients, but placed a different interpretation upon it. Some support of this possibility is suggested by the fact that counselors, a class of observers more nearly like the judges than the clients, did a better job of rating client expectancies in accordance with subsequent interview behavior than did clients.

3. While a number of clients did not alter their expectancies during the period of counseling, they showed sufficient movement as a group to indicate significant change. This finding is important in suggesting that the expectancy construct is sufficiently sensitive to show variability during the typically short-term counseling relationship. The fact that there tended to be a common direction of change for all dimensions suggests that the movement was not merely the result of unreliability of ratings.

The individual dimensions that underwent significant change should also be examined because they were the most sensitive indices. For example, the dimensions that changed the most were those that were contrary to client expectancies. This seemed in keeping with Shaw's (54) contention that client behavior is changed by counselors "up-ending" client expectancies. Also, this served as an indication that client expectancies could be altered, and
that counselors need not necessarily conform to client expectancies.

One important implication was derived from the ratings themselves. While the rating instruments were not intended to be primarily evaluative, the ratings appeared to serve that function also. For example, in one dimension, the movement in ratings suggested that clients' confidence in counselors' past experience with similar problems was lowered as counseling progressed. This could be interpreted as a degree of dissatisfaction with counseling.

4. The counselors' seeming inability to rate client behavior accurately underlines the difficulty of assuming the frame of reference of another. Counselor ratings at Stage 1, based merely on a "blind analysis" of background information and responses to an occupational attitude scale, were particularly inaccurate. Only one client out of 30 could be described at a significant level of accuracy. It appeared that the initial impressions which counselors take into the first interview cannot be relied upon.

It would have been helpful prior to the study to have asked counselors to indicate what their expectancies for the "typical" client were, as well as their expectancies for their "ideal." This would have enabled the
writer to assess the similarity of counselor ratings at the first stage to the counselor's stereotypic view of clients in general. From this result one could determine the extent to which a counselor's stereotype of clients was similar to his judgment about a particular individual.

Also, the information on a counselor's stereotype would have enabled the writer to compare the counselor's "ideal" client expectancies with those expectancies held for his stereotypic client. The degree of relationship found would have provided a helpful index of the extent to which the counselor was seeing clients whom he preferred to work with.

The writer was particularly interested in the degree of improvement evidenced by counselors in accurately assessing clients as counseling progressed. While counselors improved, as expected from Stage 1 to Stage 2, comparable improvement was not made from Stage 2 to Stage 3. In fact, two of the three counselors rated more poorly at Stage 3 than at Stage 2. Several factors may account for the difference. During the first interview counselors actively seek to understand the client and his problem; and hence, are more oriented toward evaluation. At the last interview the discussion tends to become more content-oriented, with the counselor much less concerned with
evaluating the client's feelings about what is going on. Because of this, the task of rating interview behavior may have become more difficult at Stage 3 than at Stage 2.

A second interpretation is possible. The last interview may have been more difficult for both client and counselor to assess, insofar as it required the two to make projected judgments about client expectancies. The writer asked both to rate what client expectancies would be if the client were to return for counseling at some future time with respect to a similar problem. Though intending to get at the client's present frame of mind, the task may have been too abstract.

It is possible that counselors did, in fact, improve in their ratings at Stage 3, but that error on the part of the client in making his rating reduced the degree of congruence obtained. Unfortunately, here, as elsewhere, it is difficult to determine client or counselor responsibility for a lack of relationship in a congruence measure.

It seems most appropriate to accept the results as indicating a lesser degree of accuracy in assessment at Stage 3 for the reasons given.

The finding that counselors were equally poor in the accuracy of their ratings indicated that greater skill in rating was needed, and that the writer might have
profitably provided training sessions for all counselors in assessing client expectancies. Common ratings of "pilot study" clients, as was tried by judges, might have been helpful in providing practice in the task, and in reducing the limited unreliability of counselors' ratings which was found.

The counselors' relatively poor performance must be attributed partially to the rating instruments used. Counselors' day to day assessments of clients may be more accurate than was suggested by the study. The task, however, required that counselors fit their impressions into the dimensions used in the rating scales. While these dimensions were meaningful to the writer, perhaps they were less meaningful to counselors than their own bases for assessment.

5. The finding that "discrepant" clients' expectations changed more than those of "congruent" clients gives support to the belief that clients vary in the degree to which their expectancies for counseling change. This characteristic of individual differences among clients with respect to the construct of "expectancy" is, in itself, an indication of the utility of the concept for differentiating clients engaged in short-term counseling.
The results not only demonstrate that client expectancies are differentially altered, but that this differentiation is related to the counselor and his "frame of reference." This finding is supported by the observation (Table 8) that as a group clients' expectations move in the direction of the counselors' "ideal" as counseling progresses. These results underline the importance of the counselor's impact upon the client.

The finding that counselors were able to rate client expectancies of "congruent" clients more accurately than those of "discrepant" ones has implications for the quality of counseling provided. If it can be reasoned that accuracy of rating may be indicative of the adequacy of communication within the interview, it may be inferred that the more accurately rated interviews were the ones in which the more effective communication took place; and further, that the communication occurred in interviews where the client and counselor were the most compatible.

Of considerable importance was the finding that the client and counselor "frame of reference" not only affected client expectancies differentially, but affected client behavior differentially as well. While "client behavior" was more stable than any of the other thirteen relationships examined, the changes that did occur in client behavior were sufficiently uniform in direction to indicate
that, overall, a significant degree of change had occurred.

The study showed that by the last interview it was possible to differentiate the behavior of "congruent" and "discrepant" clients. This gross differentiation provided some basis for optimism that behavioral concommitants of expectancies could be determined, even though the writer was unsuccessful in doing this for individual cases in the present study.

Finally, some explanation seems necessary for the finding that from first to last interview judges' ratings of clients' self-estimates of their expectancies generally moved in the opposite direction; that is, toward more active participation and responsibility on the part of the client.

A possible interpretation may be that clients felt they had participated more actively after completing counseling, based on their overall impression of the entire counseling contact. On the other hand, this was not evident to judges basing their ratings on specific behaviors evidenced in the last interview. This could be related to the fact that the opportunities for client initiative in the last interview tend to be less than the opportunities found in the first interview. For example, the situation
requires that the client participate at least to the extent of stating the nature of the problem he has. The last interview has no such counterpart.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study attempted to examine the expectations of 30 clients seen at the University Counseling and Testing Center of The Ohio State University, during the Winter quarter, 1959. The study was concerned with five general questions. (1) What do clients expect of the counseling situation prior to being counseled at the University Counseling and Testing Center? (2) Are client expectancies related to client behavior in the counseling situation? (3) Do client expectancies change over the period of counseling? In what directions? (4) To what degree are counselors aware of client expectancies for counseling? (5) How are a counselor's image of the expectancies and behavior of an "ideal" client related to the expectancies and behavior of his actual clients?

From these questions the following hypotheses were derived:

1. There will be a significant difference between clients' initial expectancies and those of the counselors' "ideal" client.

2. Prior client expectancies can be used to predict client behavior in the subsequent interview.
3. Initial client expectancies will change significantly over the period of counseling.

4. Counselor ratings of client expectancies can be used to predict client behavior in the subsequent interview.

5. Counselor ratings of client expectancies will improve from Stage 1 to Stage 3 in congruence with clients' own ratings of their expectancies.

6. There will be differences among counselors in the degree of congruence of counselor ratings of client expectancies with clients' ratings.

7. The greatest degree of change in client expectancies and behavior will occur in those clients whose initial expectancies are most discrepant from those of their counselors' "ideal" client.

8. The congruence of client expectancies and counselor ratings of client expectancies will improve as initial client expectancies and counselor "ideal" client expectancies increase in congruence.

Primarily, the study attempted to measure the degree of similarity between client and counselor ratings of client expectancies prior to counseling, after the first and after the last interviews. This was ascertained by determining the degree of similarity of response
patterns of client and counselor to the Student Expectation Scale (SES) and Counselor Evaluation Scale (CES) respectively.

Client behavior in the interview was also assessed. This was done by three "expert" judges independently rating transcriptions of each first and last interview. Ratings were made on the Judges' Rating Scale (JRS). The average of the three ratings constituted the criterion of client behavior. These data permitted the writer to make important comparisons regarding the degree of similarity between certain client expectancies and their behavioral concomitants in the interview.

To ascertain the "frame of reference" of each counselor, the writer asked each to indicate on the SES the expectancies which he felt his "ideal" client would have for counseling. This rating, termed the counselor's "ideal" client, provided a fourth class of data.

Client expectancies, client behavior, counselor ratings of client expectancies, and counselor's "ideal" client expectancies served as four "perceptual vantage points" from which client expectancies were considered. Taken two at a time, fourteen relationships between these "vantage points" were examined. Comparisons were based on the similarity of response patterns of ratings on the
appropriate rating scale(s).

Cattell's Coefficient of Pattern Similarity ($r_p$) was the primary statistic used to derive the relationship between the two "vantage points" being considered. The significance of the obtained correlation was tested by several non-parametric tests of significance.

The results of testing the hypotheses are summarized below:

**Hypothesis I** is rejected. The differences between clients' initial expectancies and those of counselors' "ideal" clients were not significantly different.

**Hypothesis II** is rejected. Prior client expectancies were not usable as predictors of client behavior in the subsequent interview.

**Hypothesis III** is accepted. Initial client expectancies did undergo significant change over the period of counseling.

**Hypothesis IV** is rejected. Prior counselor ratings of client expectancies were not usable as predictors of client behavior in the subsequent interview.

**Hypothesis V** is rejected. Counselor ratings of client expectancies did not improve significantly in congruence with clients' own ratings of their expectancies from Stage 1 to Stage 3.
Hypotheses VI is rejected. There were no significant differences among counselors in the degree of congruence of counselor ratings of client expectancies with clients' ratings.

Hypothesis VII is accepted. The greatest degree of change in client expectancies and behavior did occur in those clients whose initial expectancies were most discrepant from those of their counselors' "ideal" client.

Hypothesis VIII is accepted. The congruence of client expectancies and counselor ratings of client expectancies did improve as initial client expectancies and counselor "ideal" client expectancies increased in congruence.

Conclusions

1. Despite limitations in the equivalence of client expectancies and client behavior, the construct of "expectancy" is useful in assessing short-term counseling in a university counseling center.

2. Overall, the University Counseling and Test Center has succeeded in communicating to students in significant measure "appropriate" expectancies for counseling.

3. The rating scales used in this study should be refined further. A factor analysis of the scales would
permit the elimination of some of the present dimensions without loss.

4. The writer can give only limited endorsement to the utility of the Coefficient of Pattern Similarity ($r_p$) as a measure of the congruence of ratings on the rating scales. It was necessary to have almost perfect congruence of the ratings before a significant correlation could be obtained. This stringent requirement of the statistic was hard to attain with the type of ratings that were made.

5. Greater attention should be given to the "longitudinal" study of specific variables operative throughout the period of counseling. These variables should be related to specified conditions antecedent to the interviews and subsequent to the termination of counseling.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. A logical follow-up of this research would be the comparison of an experimental group of clients who had been given an understanding of the functioning and purposes of the UCTC with a control group who had not. The study would compare the outcomes of counseling with the two groups to determine whether structuring "appropriate" expectancies for counseling affects the outcomes of counseling.
2. A future study should examine the nature of counselor expectancies for counseling. To what degree are they changed in the direction of their clients?

3. A study should be made of the influence of the "discrepancy-congruence" dimension in counseling expectancies to investigate whether the optimal level of congruence can be determined.
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APPENDIX A

STUDENT EXPECTATION SCALE #1
To Our Student Clients:

We are finding that students coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center tend to have varying expectations about what will occur in counseling. We feel that if we knew more about these expectations we would be able to work more effectively. As a result, we are asking that you answer the questions which follow. This will give us a way of determining what your expectations for counseling are. We will ask for your cooperation again later on in your counseling. You may wish to know that your individual results will not be shown to your counselor.
STUDENT EXPECTATION SCALE #1

Directions: Below are some questions regarding student expectations about counseling. For each question a scale is provided on which a rating is to be made. In order to help you make your selection of the appropriate rating more easily, a brief description is provided of the extremes in the scale. Check the box which corresponds most nearly to your expectations in the matter. Even if you have not thought very much about the question, give your best guess as to your feelings. Be sure that you have answered every question.

1. How important a role do you think tests will play in your counseling?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

They will be the basis on which I'll reach a decision

I don't think they'll be any help with my problem

2. Whom do you expect to do most of the talking during the interviews?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

The counselor will

I will
3. How do you feel about coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center for assistance?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I have mixed feelings about coming. I am looking forward to the experience.

4. To what degree do you expect that your counselor will take the initiative in directing the course of the interview?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

The counselor will take the initiative - that's his function. I will take the initiative - it's my problem.

5. To what degree do you feel that you have explored your problem on your own prior to coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I've given it some thought. I've gone as far as I can by myself in my thinking.
6. To what extent do you think that your counselor will be interested in other problems than the one you present initially?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

He'll probably stick to the immediate problem I tell him

He'll find other matters of importance to talk about

7. How easily do you feel that you will be able to express yourself to your counselor?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

It will be difficult to express myself

I will feel perfectly free to speak

8. To what degree do you expect that discussion of your "personal" feelings or problems will enter into the interview?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Not at all - I don't think they have anything to do with it

To a great extent - "personal" matters are at the heart of the problem
9. To what extent do you expect that the final decision-making about your problem will be left to you?

- [ ] The counselor will prescribe the right course of action
- [ ] The counselor will not give me much advice about this decision

10. How well do you expect that you will get to know your counselor as a person?

- [ ] I won't get much of a picture of what he's really like
- [ ] I'll get a pretty good idea of what kind of a person he is

11. How do you expect that your counselor will react to you as an individual?

- [ ] In an objective and business-like manner
- [ ] In a friendly and understanding manner
12. To what extent do you think that you will be able to understand what your counselor says?

- He may have some difficulty understanding what I mean
- He'll be able to put his finger right on the crux of the matter
- He occasionally gets cases similar to mine
- He probably deals with this type of situation every day
- Some of what he says may be too technical
- It will be easy to understand what he says

13. To what extent do you think that your counselor has had past experience with cases similar to yours?

14. To what degree do you think that your counselor will be able to understand what your problem is?
15. To what extent do you expect that your counselor will be able to help you in solving your problem?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

He may be of some help to me. I feel sure that he will be able to help me.

16. How long do you expect that your contact with your counselor will last?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

One interview Three Five Seven Ten or more interviews

17. How well equipped do you feel that you are to answer the above questions regarding your expectations for counseling?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I have little information on which to base my answers. I think I have a pretty good idea of what will occur, so I can answer confidently.

Comments:
APPENDIX B

STUDENT EXPECTATION SCALE #2
STUDENT EXPECTATION SCALE #2

Directions: You will recall that when you applied for counseling you filled out a rating scale indicating your expectations for counseling. At that time we indicated that we would ask for your cooperation again later in your counseling. As a second part of that work, now that you have completed your first interview, we request that you fill out a similar scale.

As before, you will find some questions regarding your expectations for counseling. You are to rate each question by checking the box which corresponds most nearly to what your expectancies now are in the matter. Even if you have not thought very much about the question, give your best guess as to your feelings. Be sure that you have answered every question. Please return the rating scale to the receptionist when you have finished.

1. How important a role do you think tests will play in your counseling?

[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []

They will be the basis on which I'll reach a decision

I don't think they'll be any help with my problem
2. Whom do you expect to do most of the talking during the interviews?

| The counselor | I will |

3. How do you feel about coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center for assistance?

| I have mixed feelings about coming | I am looking forward to the experience |

4. To what degree do you expect that your counselor will take the initiative in directing the course of the interview?

| The counselor will take the initiative - that's his function | I will take the initiative - it's my problem |
5. To what degree do you feel that you have explored your problem on your own prior to coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center?

| ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |   |   |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|   |   |
| I've given it some thought | I've gone as far as I can by myself in my thinking |

6. To what extent do you think that your counselor will be interested in other problems than the one you present initially?

| ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |   |   |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|   |   |
| He'll probably stick to the immediate problem | He'll find other matters of importance to talk about |

7. How easily do you feel that you will be able to express yourself to your counselor?

| ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |   |   |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|   |   |
| It will be difficult to express myself | I will feel perfectly free to speak |
8. To what degree do you expect that discussion of your "personal" feelings or problems will enter into the interviews?

☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

Not at all -
I don't think they have anything to do with it

To a great extent - "personal" matters are at the heart of the problem

9. To what extent do you expect that the final decision-making about your problem will be left to you?

☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

The counselor will prescribe the right course of action

The counselor will not give me much advice about this decision

10. How well do you expect that you will get to know your counselor as a person?

☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐

I won't get much of a picture of what he's really like

I'll get a pretty good idea of what kind of a person he is
11. How do you expect that your counselor will react to you as an individual?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

In an objective and business-like manner

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

In a friendly and understanding manner

12. To what extent do you think that you will be able to understand what your counselor says?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Some of what he says may be too technical

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

It will be easy to understand what he says

13. To what extent do you think that your counselor has had past experience with cases similar to yours?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

He occasionally gets cases similar to mine

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

He probably deals with this type of situation every day
14. To what degree do you think that your counselor will be able to understand what your problem is?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

He may have some difficulty understanding what I mean. He'll be able to put his finger right on the crux of the matter.

15. To what extent do you expect that your counselor will be able to help you in solving your problem?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

He may be of some help to me. I feel sure that he will be able to help me.

16. How long do you expect that your contact with your counselor will last?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

One interview Three Five Seven Ten or more interviews.
17. How well equipped do you feel that you are to answer the above questions regarding your expectations for counseling?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I have little information on which to base my answers. I think I have a pretty good idea of what will occur, so I can answer confidently.

Comments:
APPENDIX C

STUDENT EXPECTATION SCALE #3
STUDENT EXPECTATION SCALE #3

Directions: This is the last step in our efforts to find out what your expectations about counseling are. Now that you have completed your last interview with your counselor, we would like to know what your expectancies are at this point. Since you probably will not be seeing your counselor again, answer the questions this time in terms of what your expectations would be if you were to return to see your counselor at some future date regarding a similar problem.

As before, you will find some questions regarding your expectations in counseling. You are to rate each question by checking the box which corresponds most nearly to your present expectancies in the matter. Even if you are not sure about the answer, give your best guess as to your feelings. Be sure that you have answered every question. Your counselor will not be told how you have rated this form. Please return it to the receptionist when you have finished. Thank you for your cooperation.

1. How important a role do you think that tests would play in your counseling?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

They would be the basis on which I'd reach a decision

I do not think they'd be any help with my problem
2. Whom do you expect would be doing most of the talking during the interviews?

The counselor would
I would

3. How do you think that you would feel about coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center for assistance?

I would have mixed feelings about coming
I would look forward to the experience

4. To what degree do you expect that the counselor would take the initiative in directing the course of the interview?

The counselor would take the initiative - that's his function
I would take the initiative in the interview - it's my problem
5. To what degree do you think that you would explore your problem on your own prior to coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center?

I would give it some thought. I would go as far as I could by myself in my thinking.

6. To what extent do you think that your counselor would be interested in other problems than the one you presented initially?

He'd probably stick to the immediate problem I'd tell him. He'd find other matters of importance to talk about.

7. How easily do you feel that you would be able to express yourself to the counselor?

It would be difficult to express myself. I would feel perfectly free to speak.
8. To what degree do you expect that discussion of your "personal" feelings or problems would enter into the interviews?

- [ ] Not at all -
- [ ] I don't think they would have anything to do with it
- [ ] To a great extent - "personal" matters would be at the heart of the problem

9. To what extent do you expect that the final decision-making about your problem would be left to you?

- [ ] The counselor would prescribe the right course of action
- [ ] The counselor would not give me much advice about this decision

10. How well do you expect that you would get to know your counselor as a person?

- [ ] I wouldn't get much of a picture of what he's really like
- [ ] I would get a pretty good idea of what kind of a person he is
11. How do you expect that your counselor would react to you as an individual?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

In an objective and businesslike manner

In a friendly and understanding manner

12. To what extent do you think that you would be able to understand what your counselor says?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Some of what he says might be too technical

It would be easy to understand what he says

13. To what extent do you think that your counselor would have past experience with cases similar to yours?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

He occasionally would get cases similar to mine

He probably would deal with this type of situation every day
14. To what degree do you think that your counselor would be able to understand what your problem is?

He might have some difficulty understanding what I mean. He'd be able to put his finger right on the crux of the matter.

15. To what extent do you expect that your counselor would be able to help you in solving your problem?

He might be of some help to me. I feel sure that he would be able to help me.

16. How long do you expect that your contact with your counselor would last?

One interview, Three, Five, Seven, Ten or more interviews.
17. How well equipped do you feel you are to answer the above questions regarding your expectations for counseling?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I have little information on which to base my answers

I think I have a pretty good idea of what will occur, so I can answer confidently

Comments:
APPENDIX D
COUNSELOR EVALUATION SCALE #1
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COUNSELOR EVALUATION SCALE #1

Directions: The rating scale below is intended to give information about the expectations and anticipations which your clients have, and how apparent these are to you, their counselor. We are asking that you fill out this rating scale as you think your counselee would do so. This rating would be made on the basis of the information provided by the client's Vocational Planning Form and the Occupational Attitude Rating Scales - the usual intake information - and the inferences which you are able to draw from these data.

For each of the questions below a brief description is provided for the extremes of the dimension. You are to rate each question by checking the box along the dimension which corresponds most nearly to your view of your client's expectations in the matter. Be sure to complete your ratings before you see your client in the first interview.

1. How important a role do you think tests will play in your counseling?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

They will be the basis on which I'll reach a decision

I don't think they'll be any help with my problem
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2. Whom do you expect to do most of the talking during the interviews?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
The counselor
will

I will

3. How do you feel about coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center for assistance?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
I have mixed feelings about coming

I am looking forward to the experience

4. To what degrees do you expect that your counselor will take the initiative in directing the course of the interview?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
The counselor
will take the
initiative - that's his function

I will take the initiative - it's my problem
5. To what degree do you feel that you have explored your problem on your own prior to coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
I've given it some thought. I've gone as far as I can by myself in my thinking.

6. To what extent do you think that your counselor will be interested in other problems than the one you present initially?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
He'll probably stick to the immediate problem I tell him. He'll find other matters of importance to talk about.

7. How easily do you feel that you will be able to express yourself to your counselor?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
It will be difficult to express myself. I will feel perfectly free to speak.
8. To what degree do you expect that discussion of your "personal" feelings or problems will enter into the interviews?

[Blank]

Not at all -
I don't think they have any-
thing to do with it

To a great ex-
tent - "per-
sonal" matters are at the heart of the problem

9. To what extent do you expect that the final decision-
making about your problem will be left to you?

[Blank]

The counselor will not give me much advice about this decision

The counselor will prescribe the right course of action

10. How well do you expect that you will get to know your counselor as a person?

[Blank]

I won't get much of a picture of what he's really like

I'll get a pretty good idea of what kind of a person he is
11. How do you expect that your counselor will react to you as an individual?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

In an objective and business-like manner

In a friendly and understanding manner

12. To what extent do you think that you will be able to understand what your counselor says?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Some of what he says may be too technical

It will be easy to understand what he says

13. To what extent do you think that your counselor has had past experience with cases similar to yours?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

He occasionally gets cases similar to mine

He probably deals with this type of situation every day
14. To what degree do you think that your counselor will be able to understand what your problem is?

He may have some difficulty understanding what I mean.

He’ll be able to put his finger right on the crux of the matter.

15. To what extent do you expect that your counselor will be able to help you in solving your problem?

He may be of some help to me.

I feel sure that he will be able to help me.

16. How long do you expect that your contact with your counselor will last?

One interview

Three Five Seven Ten or more interviews
17. How well equipped do you feel that you are to answer the above questions regarding your expectations for counseling?

[ ] I have little information on which to base my answers
[ ] I think I have a pretty good idea of what will occur, so I can answer confidently

Comments:
APPENDIX E
COUNSELOR EVALUATION SCALE #2
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COUNSELOR EVALUATION SCALE #2

Directions: As before, the rating scale below is intended to give information about the expectations which clients have, as perceived or evaluated by you, their counselor. Having seen your client in the initial interview, rate your client as you think he now feels about the questions indicated below.

For each of the questions below a brief description is provided for the extremes of the dimension. You are to rate each question by checking the box along the dimension which corresponds most nearly to your view of your client's expectations in the matter.

1. How important a role do you think tests will play in your counseling?

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They will be the basis on which I'll reach a decision  I don't think they'll be any help with my problem
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2. Whom do you expect to do most of the talking during the interviews?

[Blank space for selection]

The counselor will

I will

3. How do you feel about coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center for assistance?

[Blank space for selection]

I have mixed feelings about coming

I am looking forward to the experience

4. To what degree do you expect that your counselor will take the initiative in directing the course of the interview?

[Blank space for selection]

The counselor will take the initiative - that's his function

I will take the initiative - it's my problem
5. To what degree do you feel that you have explored your problem on your own prior to coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center?

I've given it some thought. I've gone as far as I can by myself in my thinking.

6. To what extent do you think that your counselor will be interested in other problems than the one you present initially?

He'll probably stick to the immediate problem I tell him. He'll find other matters of importance to talk about.

7. How easily do you feel that you will be able to express yourself to your counselor?

It will be difficult to express myself. I will feel perfectly free to speak.
8. To what degree do you expect that discussion of your "personal" feelings or problems will enter into the interviews?

- [ ] Not at all - I don't think they have anything to do with it
- [ ] To a great extent - "personal" matters are at the heart of the problem

9. To what extent do you expect that the final decision-making about your problem will be left to you?

- [ ] The counselor will prescribe the right course of action
- [ ] The counselor will not give me much advice about this decision

10. How well do you expect that you will get to know your counselor as a person?

- [ ] I won't get much of a picture of what he's really like
- [ ] I'll get a pretty good idea of what kind of a person he is
11. How do you expect that your counselor will react to you as an individual?

- [ ] In an objective and business-like manner
- [ ] In a friendly and understanding manner

12. To what extent do you think that you will be able to understand what your counselor says?

- [ ] Some of what he says may be too technical
- [ ] It will be easy to understand what he says

13. To what extent do you think that your counselor has had past experience with cases similar to yours?

- [ ] He occasionally gets cases similar to mine
- [ ] He probably deals with this type of situation every day
14. To what degree do you think that your counselor will be able to understand what your problem is?

He may have some difficulty understanding what I mean

He’ll be able to put his finger right on the crux of the matter

15. To what extent do you expect that your counselor will be able to help you in solving your problem?

He may be of some help to me

I feel sure that he will be able to help me

16. How long do you expect that your contact with your counselor will last?

One interview

Three

Five

Seven

Ten or more interviews
17. How well equipped do you feel that you are to answer the above questions regarding your expectations for counseling?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

I have little information on which to base my answers

I think I have a pretty good idea of what will occur, so I can answer confidently

Comments:
APPENDIX F

COUNSELOR EVALUATION SCALE #3
COUNSELOR EVALUATION SCALE #3

Directions: Having completed your last interview with your client, we are asking that you fill out the rating scale indicating how you think your client now feels about the questions asked on the rating scale. Since this client has terminated the contact, it will be more meaningful for you in answering the questions to adopt the "frame of reference" which you think your client would have if he were to return for counseling at some future date regarding a similar problem.

For each of the questions below check the box which corresponds most nearly to your view of what the client's expectancies in the matter would be. This ends your participation in the study regarding this client.

1. How important a role do you think that tests would play in your counseling?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ You would be the basis on which I'd reach a decision

I do not think they'd be any help with my problem
2. Whom do you expect would be doing most of the talking during the interviews?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

The counselor
would

I would

3. How do you think that you would feel about coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center for assistance?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I would have
mixed feelings
about coming

I would look
forward to
the experi-
ence

4. To what degree do you expect that the counselor would take the initiative in directing the course of the interviews?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

The counselor
would take the
initiative -
that's his
function

I would take
the initia-
tive in the
interview -
it's my
problem
5. To what degree do you think that you would explore your problem on your own prior to coming to the University Counseling and Testing Center?

I would give it some thought

I would go as far as I could by myself in my thinking

6. To what extent do you think that your counselor would be interested in other problems than the one you presented initially?

He'd probably stick to the immediate problem I'd tell him

He'd find other matters of importance to talk about

7. How easily do you feel that you would be able to express yourself to the counselor?

It would be difficult to express myself

I would feel perfectly free to speak
8. To what degree do you expect that discussion of your "personal" feelings or problems would enter into the interviews?

Not at all -
I don't think they would have anything to do with it

To a great extent - "Personal" matters would be at the heart of the problem

9. To what extent do you expect that the final decision-making about your problem would be left to you?

The counselor would prescribe the right course of action

The counselor would not give me much advice about this decision

10. How well do you expect that you would get to know your counselor as a person?

I wouldn't get much of a picture of what he's really like

I would get a pretty good idea of what kind of a person he is
11. How do you expect that your counselor would react to you as an individual?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an objective and business-like manner

In a friendly and understanding manner

12. To what extent do you think that you would be able to understand what your counselor says?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of what he says might be too technical

It would be easy to understand what he says

13. To what extent do you think that your counselor would have past experience with cases similar to yours?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He occasionally would get cases similar to mine

He probably would deal with this type of situation every day
14. To what degree do you think that your counselor would be able to understand what your problem is?

He might have some difficulty understanding what I mean He'd be able to put his finger right on the crux of the matter

15. To what extent do you expect that your counselor would be able to help you in solving your problem?

He might be of some help to me I feel sure that he would be able to help me

16. How long do you expect that your contact with your counselor would last?

One interview
Three Five Seven
Ten or more interviews
17. How well equipped do you feel you are to answer the above questions regarding your expectations for counseling?

I have little information on which to base my answers. I think I have a pretty good idea of what will occur, so I can answer confidently.

Comments:
APPENDIX G

JUDGES' RATING SCALE
JUDGES' RATING SCALE

Directions: Your task is to rate what happened in the interview as reflected by direct or indirect behaviors evidenced in the protocol. The rating will be based on your assessment of the dimensions indicated below. In order to specify clearly the nature of the dimensions, a suggestive description is included with this rating form. This should be helpful as a guide in making the ratings.

For each dimension simply check the position which corresponds most nearly to your assessment of the situation.

1. How important a role did tests play in counseling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. To what extent did the counselor dominate the talking during the interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The counselor did virtually all the talking</th>
<th>The counselor did most of the talking</th>
<th>Counselor and client shared equally in the talking</th>
<th>The counselor did little of the talking</th>
<th>The counselor did virtually none of the talking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3. How did the client seem to feel about participating in counseling at the UCTC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unresponsive</th>
<th>Unresponsive</th>
<th>Neither receptive nor unresponsive</th>
<th>Receptive</th>
<th>Very receptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. To what degree did the counselor attempt to take the initiative in directing the course of the interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The counselor attempted to take virtually all of the responsibility</th>
<th>The counselor and client attempted to share equally in the responsibility</th>
<th>The counselor attempted to take a little of the responsibility</th>
<th>The counselor attempted to take virtually none of the responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. How much effort did it appear that the client had exerted in trying to explore his problem on his own?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A very small degree of effort</th>
<th>A small degree of effort</th>
<th>Some degree of effort</th>
<th>A considerable degree of effort</th>
<th>A very great degree of effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6. To what extent did the counselor attempt to probe for problems other than the client's presented problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a very small extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a considerable extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. How easily did the client express himself to the counselor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With great difficulty</th>
<th>With difficulty</th>
<th>Neither easily nor with difficulty</th>
<th>Easily</th>
<th>Very easily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. To what degree did discussion of "personal" feelings or problems take place during the interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a very small degree</th>
<th>To a small degree</th>
<th>To some degree</th>
<th>To a considerable degree</th>
<th>To a very great degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. To what extent did the locus of responsibility for determining a course of action fall on the client?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a very small extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a considerable extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10. To what degree did the client act as if he were perceptive of the counselor's personality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very small degree</th>
<th>To a small degree</th>
<th>To some degree</th>
<th>To a considerable degree</th>
<th>To a very great degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. How did the counselor react to the client as an individual?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In a very detached manner</th>
<th>In a detached manner</th>
<th>Neither in a friendly nor a detached manner</th>
<th>In a friendly manner</th>
<th>In a very friendly manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. To what extent was the client able to understand what the counselor said?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very small extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a considerable extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. To what degree did the counselor act as if he had had previous experience with the type of problem presented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very small degree</th>
<th>To a small degree</th>
<th>To some degree</th>
<th>To a considerable degree</th>
<th>To a very great degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
14. To what degree was the counselor sensitive to what the client was trying to say?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very small degree</th>
<th>To a small degree</th>
<th>To some degree</th>
<th>To a considerable degree</th>
<th>To a very great degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. To what degree did the client see the counselor as being of help to him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very small degree</th>
<th>To a small degree</th>
<th>To some degree</th>
<th>To a considerable degree</th>
<th>To a very great degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
APPENDIX H

CLARIFICATION OF DIMENSIONS USED IN JUDGES' RATING SCALE
CLARIFICATION OF DIMENSIONS USED
IN JUDGES' RATING SCALE

(The descriptions are suggestive, not inclusive)

I. Importance of Tests Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree of emphasis placed on tests in the counseling interview.

The Judges might consider:

1. Were any tests assigned?
2. Did the client ask to take tests?
3. Did the counselor spend time explaining the function or nature of certain tests?
4. Did the client relate his decision-making to the tests results?

Note: The appropriateness of the tests assigned should not be considered in making the judgment.

II. Division of Talk Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the comparative verbal participation of client and counselor irrespective of the quality or character of what was said.

The Judges might consider:

1. The sheer volume of talk output, and the percentage contributed by the client and by the counselor.
2. The relative contribution of each may vary during the interview, hence it may be necessary to arrive as a "mean" rating.

Note: What was said or who initiated the remark is not relevant here.
III. Client's Willingness to Participate Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the client's willingness to participate in counseling, apart from what influence the counselor has on this.

The Judges might consider:

1. Does it appear that the client is self-referred or "pressured" into coming for counseling?
2. Does the client seem eager, motivated to investigate his problem?
3. Does the client evidence reluctance in presenting his problem?

Note: Try to disassociate your judgment about the client from the counselor's impact upon the client's behavior.

IV. Division of Initiative-Taking Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the extent to which the counselor attempted to direct the "flow" of the interview.

The Judges might consider:

1. To what extent did the counselor attempt to "lead" the client?
2. How much responsibility did the counselor assume in the interview?
3. Did the counselor assume a question and answer role?
4. Did the counselor try to keep the client on the track (of the discussion)?
5. Did the counselor introduce new areas of discussion or inquiry?
6. Did the counselor usually pick up the conversation after long pauses?

V. Degree of Client Exploration of His Problem Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree of client efforts to solve his problem alone, quite apart from the success of his efforts.
The Judges might consider:

1. Is there evidence of prior client efforts to work out the problem before coming to the UCTC?
2. Does the client seem concerned about his problem?
3. Has the client taken any steps to deal with the problem by himself?

VI. Breadth of Counselor Inquiry Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the extent to which the counselor seemed to probe beyond the problem presented by the client.

The Judges might consider:

1. Does the counselor do much probing of the client for information?
2. Does the counselor limit his inquiry to issues introduced by the client?
3. Does the counselor seem to interpret material not otherwise available to the client?

VII. Ease of Expression of Client Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree to which the client seems able to express himself in the interview; that is, his verbal facility.

The Judges might consider:

1. Did the client seem free and open with the counselor?
2. Did it seem difficult for the client to speak?
3. Did the client volunteer information about himself readily?
4. Did the client "defer" to the counselor?
VIII. Discussion of "Personal" Feelings Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree to which material about which the client was affectively involved was discussed in the interview.

The Judges might consider:

1. To what degree did the interview include material about which the client was affectively involved as opposed to material about which the client was relatively emotionally detached.
2. Did the interview include material which needed confidential safeguards, or would the client have been apt to discuss the matter with anyone.

IX. Locus of Responsibility Dimension

A. We are trying to determine where the locus of the responsibility was for determining the course of action taken in the interview.

The Judges might consider:

1. Does the client seem to take a dependent role in the interview?
2. Does the client state an inability to decide upon a plan of action, or inability to decide between alternative plans?
3. Does the counselor propose appropriate procedures to be followed or a possible course of action to be taken?
4. Does the counselor refuse to take the responsibility for decision-making?

Note: No prognosis should be made as to the impact of this interview on the probable locus of responsibility in subsequent interviews. You are to judge simply where the locus of responsibility was in this interview.
Awareness of Counselor Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree to which the client is able to perceive something of the counselor's personality, values or feelings.

The Judges might consider:

1. How good a picture does the client have of what the counselor would probably be like outside of the counseling setting?
2. To what degree are there indications of client response to counselor idiosyncracies?

Counselor Reaction to Client Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree to which "friendliness" is reflected in the counselor's attitude toward the client.

The Judges might consider:

1. Does there seem to be good rapport between the client and counselor?
2. Does the relationship between counselor and client suggest a warm regard for the client by the counselor?
3. Does the relationship between counselor and client reflect a cool, emotionally distant view of the client by the counselor?

Note: Judges should consider whether outward overtures of cordiality are a mask for covert negative or even hostile feelings toward the client by the counselor.

Counselor Communication with Client Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree to which the client is able to understand what the counselor said.
The Judges might consider:

1. Is the counselor able to communicate at the client's level?
2. Does the counselor use a lot of psychological terminology without making its meaning clear?
3. Does the client ask for explanations of certain counselor remarks?
4. Are the counselor's remarks too indirect or abstract for the client to relate meaningfully to the discussion?

XIII. Apparent Adequacy of Counselor in Handling the Problem Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree to which the counselor gives the impression of having had experience in handling the client's problem or similar cases.

The Judges might consider:

1. Does the counselor seem "at home" with the problem?
2. Does the counselor seem to know where he is going with the problem?
3. Does the counselor seem threatened by the problem?
4. Does the counselor refer the client to a more appropriate person?

Note: We are not concerned with actual competence in handling the problem, but rather the effectiveness of the counselor's presentation in the client's view.

XIV. Counselor Understanding of the Problem Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree of counselor sensitivity to what the client is trying to say.

The Judges might consider:

1. Does the counselor seem to be missing the point that the client is trying to make?
2. Is the counselor responding to the "core" of the client's remarks?
3. Are the counselor's responses close in meaning and intensity to what the client has been saying?
4. Does the counselor seem preoccupied with his own needs or ideas to the exclusion of the client's?

XV. Client Satisfaction Dimension

A. We are trying to tap the degree to which the client appears to be satisfied with the counselor's assistance in counseling.

   The Judges might consider:

   1. Has there been an apparent resolution of the client's problem or apparent progress in that direction?
   2. Is there evidence of resistance by the client in continuing?
   3. Does the client appear to feel helped?

Note: The "success" of the counseling should not be interpreted outside of the context of the client's view of the situation. This should be a phenomenal view, not a clinical evaluation.

XVI. Comments

A. We are trying to leave room for you to make any comments relevant to the client's expectancies which seem not provided for above.
AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Victor Harold Appel, was born in Mexico City, Mexico, June 28, 1930. I received my secondary education in the public schools of Long Beach, California. After the completion of my undergraduate work at the University of California at Berkeley, I received the degree Bachelor of Arts in 1951. For the following two years, I served in the United States Army. Upon discharge, I enrolled in The Ohio State University in the Department of Psychology. I received the degree Master of Arts from that institution in December, 1955.

While completing the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree, I have been employed as an assistant instructor in the Department of Education, teaching and research assistant in the Department of Psychology, and interne at the University Counseling and Testing Center. Since August, 1958, I have held an appointment as a full-time staff member of that agency.