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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Clients and counselors have preferences for what counselors shall do during counseling. The preferences of these two groups are often quite different (Bordin, 1955; Warman, 1958; Thrush, 1957). To what extent should counselors be guided by client preference in deciding how to counsel?

Published opinions on this question differ. Some lean toward disregarding client preference (Patterson, 1958; Danskin, 1957; Shaw, 1955); others, toward heeding it (Bordin, 1955; Seeman, 1957). There is little evidence (Danskin, 1955; Biddle, 1958) to suggest which of these two emphases is more nearly correct. Is greater adherence of counselor actions to client preferences related to greater judged "success" of counseling? This is the central question of the present study.

Answers to two other major questions are also sought:

1) What changes in client preferences occur during the period of counseling?

\footnote{Hereafter referred to as "preferences."}
2) After counseling and any accompanying client preference changes, in what ways are counselor actions seen by clients as having deviated from client preferences? These three questions will be discussed after a review of related publications. The review of the literature, which has been designed to bring these questions into focus, is divided into the following sections:

1) Differing opinions on the extent to which counselors should adhere to client preference;

2) Differing preferences of clients and counselors;

3) Changes in client preferences during counseling; and

4) Evidence on the extent to which counselors should adhere to client preference to be most effective.

Literature on the method used in the present study will be reviewed in the chapter on method, Chapter II.

**Differing Views on the Extent to Which Counselors Should Adhere to Client Preference**

Opinions differ about the extent to which counselors should follow client preference if counselors are to be maximally effective in their work. We shall present below two extremes of opinion.
Client Preference Disregarded

Patterson (1958) has reviewed some evidence that he interprets as meaning that clients may prefer other than "client-centered" approaches. He implies that we must set a firm course despite client preference. Surveying a broad cultural picture, Patterson feels that we have learned to expect the "expert" to do things for and to us. Counseling, he feels, should be a different situation in which clients must be re-trained away from such expectations. In at least one respect Patterson's position retains the "expertness" of the counselor. Like the physician who decides when to operate and what medicine to give, the counselor decides how to act with his client.

Danskin (1957, p. 43), basing his observations on his own findings (Danskin, 1955), states that "...a counselor may play a role different from that expected by the client and still retain a good working relationship," particularly when "adjustment" problems are central in the thinking of both persons.

Shaw (1955, pp. 246-247) has used rather colorful language and recommended the "up-ending" of client expectancies. Shaw is not recommending that the counselor overturn any and every client expectancy. Rather, "the counselor fosters the adopting of 'latent' constructions already entertained to a limited degree by the individual."
But unfortunately, as Appel (1959) notes,

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. (p. 26)

Client Preference Heeded

Grigg and Goodstein (1957) have presented a balanced, carefully qualified argument for respecting client judgments about counseling. Although primarily concerned with global judgments, much of their argument seems equally applicable to client judgments about more specific counselor behavior. Bordin (1955) has given us another thoughtful paper, emphasizing the attention that must be paid to client expectancies in deciding what should occur in counseling. He discusses two general types of expectancies, suggesting that when the client expects a decision-dominated interview, the counselor should not press for a mental-hygiene type of discussion.

Seeman (1957) notes that the results of Thrush's (1957) study may be construed to mean that counselors are changing their professional self-concepts. Where before they perceived themselves as helpers in vocational counseling, they now tend to perceive themselves as helpers in a personal counseling process. (p. 190)

Seeman then wonders whether clients have come
along with counselors in this change. He asks:

Do the two participants in counseling want the same thing, or something different? 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. (p. 190)

Seeman's remarks, made as a comment upon Thrush's (1957) research, can be extended to include the specific content of discussions by counselor and client: any great discordance in areas that the counselor and client prefer to discuss will have a disruptive effect on the helping process. Seeman adds that the situation is not really too bad, since the counselor does not have to choose between being either a vocational adviser or a therapist, but can suit his activity to the goals of the client. He says, "Our task, then, is to maintain fluid and perceptive communication with each client so that we may understand and facilitate the client's goals, whatever they are." (Seeman, 1957, p. 190; italics ours)

Differing Preferences of Clients and Counselors

Studies in College Settings

Warman (1958) was interested in how various campus groups perceived the counseling role of a university counseling center. The groups included (1) the counseling center's professional staff, (2) other student personnel workers, (3) teaching faculty, and (4) students before and (5) after they had been involved in counseling. Groups
were compared in respect to the client problems that each felt to be appropriate for discussion in counseling at the agency.

Warman reported that clients are much less inclined to discuss "adjustment" problems than are counselors. Instead, clients saw "college routine" and vocational problems as more appropriate for discussion.

Thrush (1957) reported the changes, after a four-year period, in the thinking of the staff of the same agency studied by Warman. While the instruments used and questions asked by the two workers were different, it is interesting to note the trend found by Thrush in comparison with the discussion areas preferred by Warman's clients. "It was found," Thrush (1957, p. 189) summarized, "that the 'agency point of view' had changed from an emphasis on vocational counseling to an emphasis on counseling for personal adjustment...."

Patterson (1958) has cited three studies (Grigg and Goodstein, 1957; Forgy and Black, 1954; Sonne and Goldman, 1957), that he interprets as suggesting that clients prefer other than "client-centered" approaches.

Bordin (1955) alludes to preliminary investigations suggesting that students frequently have an "information-seeking" or a "decision-making" orientation towards counseling; while counselors expect personal problems to be more central.
McGowan (1954) cited five references to prior research on client expectancies (Callis, Polmantier, and Roeber, 1955; Covner, 1944; Form, 1955; Grant, 1950; and Rogers, 1951). These provided evidence that clients expected the important focus of counseling interviews to be on specific decision-making, usually in respect to a vocational problem. Several of the studies indicated that clients expected their participation in the process to be minimal.

Littell (1951) developed a scale for measuring a client's expectations about 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 (1953) found that there were differences in the counselor role expected by clients with different types of problems. Clients in his "Lack of Skill" problem category tended to expect the counselor to play a considerably more active role in suggesting possible solutions than did clients in Davis' "Lack of Information" problem category.

McGowan (1954) compared client pre-interview expectations and post-interview reports of what happened during the interview. This comparison showed that clients assumed a greater degree of participation and responsibility in the interviews than they had expected. McGowan
did not ask clients whether they liked what had happened. He found clients to be reliable observers of what transpired in the interview. Their perceptions of what occurred closely approximated those of the counselor and judges rating the interview.

Friedenberg (1950, p. 549) sought, among other things, "an indication of the kind of role with respect to themselves students believe an adviser should play...." He used a lengthy questionnaire, completed by approximately half of his subjects, and concluded (p. 566) that students seemed to have a "rational picture" of the Advisory System at the University of Chicago. "They recognize that...its function is primarily academic...."

Thomas, Polansky and Kounin (1955) presented students with ten incomplete sentences about a hypothetical counselor. One group was given the set that the counselor was highly motivated to help the client; another group was given the set that he was not. Answers of the two groups were analyzed, and they suggested that the highly motivated counselor was perceived as different from the unmotivated counselor in such ways as avoiding interruptions, answering questions about his family, being tolerant when the client got off the immediate point, assigning importance to the client's stated problem, minimizing the client's embarrassment, and structuring
(either directly or non-directively) when the client had trouble making up his mind. It seems safe to assume that most subjects preferred the motivated counselor, since more of those describing him said that the client would return for further interviews and would take advice seriously from him.

**Studies in High School Settings**

Worby (1955) wondered whether the findings of Thomas *et al.* (1955) would hold for high-school students. She modified the procedures to give them greater structure; her results were closely parallel to those of Thomas *et al.* (1955). Her subjects, however, did not differentiate between the two hypothetical counselors in the extent to which counselors would (1) talk about their families or (2) limit discussion when the client got off the immediate point.

Holman (1955) drew 120 subjects from the same two classes used in the above study (Worby, 1955). Holman recognized that her sample was small and that her "focused interview" approach was subject to bias. She concluded tentatively that adolescents are most apt to seek help with problems related to school and to vocational planning and least inclined to seek help for more personal problems.

Grant's (1954a) subjects were seniors from nine
high schools. An anonymous questionnaire asked students to list three persons, in order of preference, to whom they would go for help in each of nine possible situations. Rather consistently, students felt that their high school counselor was "most able to make acceptable contributions to them in the vocational and educational planning areas. Students failed to see the counselor, or other school personnel, as playing much of a role in their personal-emotional problems" (p. 388). Trying to understand these findings, Grant (1954b) conducted another study which gave "some support" for his hypothesis that "Students' perceptions may be a reflection of a common point of view or attitude about the role of the counselor held by administrators, teachers, and by counselors themselves" (p. 74). This may be in keeping with the conclusions of Holman (1955) that many of her subjects were not aware that counselors were interested in personal problems.

Changes in Client Thinking During Counseling

No studies were found that set out to study changes in client preferences (in the sense of preferences for counselor actions) during counseling. But changes in closely related aspects of client thinking have been studied.
Holt (1950) asked each subject to pick out one photograph as being that of a counselor with whom he would like to work. She then gave the subject a questionnaire that asked for opinions on the qualities of the counselor involved. This procedure was followed before and after an initial interview. Using a control group, Holt was unable to show that the client's "image of the counselor" was modified after the interview. But she felt this hypothesis might not have been adequately tested.

Ewing (1954) used a specially constructed adjectival rating scale and asked each subject early in counseling to sort adjectives descriptive of himself, his "ideal-self," his 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. Butler and Haigh (1954) found that clients tend to move toward the counselor in their orientations as counseling progressed.

Many studies of changes in client expectations or expectancies during counseling (Appel, 1959; McGowan, 1954; Biddle, 1958; Perry and Eates, 1953) have been made. These are important enough in their own right. It seems important, however, to keep expectancies and preferences conceptually separate. If client expectancies are found to change during counseling, perhaps in the
direction of counselor expectancies, this finding is important. But it does not tell us definitely about changes in client preferences.

Although it did not involve counseling, a study by Lawlor (1955) may be suggestive of possible client preference changes. Two groups of subjects pre-ranked, discussed, and then post-ranked a series of pictures. In one of the two groups, there was an increase in the correlation of member's rankings of pictures after the discussion. The group where agreement in post-rankings was not increased had already ranked the pictures four times before any discussion occurred.

Evidence of the Extent to which Counselors Should Adhere to Client Preference

Only two or three studies bear on the extent to which a counselor should adhere to client preference if he is to be maximally effective.

In his study of counselor roles, Danskin (1955) had judges decide whether the counselor was playing the role the client would prefer. He found no significant difference between independent ratings of relationship in those units where counselors were judged to be conforming to client expectations for roles, and in those where they were not. Danskin (1957) and Patterson (1958) have gingerly cited this in support of their argument that
the counselor can vary from client preference and still preserve a good counseling relation. Although Danskin's finding is suggestive, it was based on only seven of the total of 112 role units studied. Judges might not know what roles clients wanted in given units. Even if they did, they might not know whether clients felt counselors were adhering to their wishes.

Biddle (1958) studied the counseling interview from the perspective of social psychology and of influence processes. He drew upon earlier findings that A will have greater influence over B when A conforms to role-expectations held for A's behavior by B than when A does not so conform. Biddle had three independent variables: (1) counselor behavior as focusing upon either (a) problem-solving or (b) relationship; (2) "client" expectations for counselor behavior; (3) relative power of the counselor to punish the "client." Dependent variables included "client" reactions to the initial interview, change in "client" expectations, and perceived behavior of the counselor. Biddle's method involved presenting to class groups a skit in which a counselor conducted a fraction of an initial interview with a client with whom students were expected to identify. Student expectations for problem-solving vs. relationship-building were varied by two procedures, used separately with different subjects. In one procedure, subjects were
separated into two groups according to existing expectations; in the other, subjects were given slanted information tending to induce subjects' perceptions of the expectations of the client. Four hypotheses were supported:

(1) Non-conformity by the counselor to perceived norms of the client for the counselor leads to less progress in all phases of the initial interview than does conformity. (2) Non-conformity by the counselor to expectations of the client for the counselor leads to less progress in the initial interview only if the counselor has high punishing power over the client. (3) The counselor who focuses on the establishment of the relationship will be more successful in the initial interview than the counselor who focuses on problem-solving. (4) The counselor with high punishing power will be less successful in the initial interview than the counselor with low punishing power. (Biddle, 1958, p. 186)

Biddle's findings, particularly pertaining to his first hypothesis, may be seen as supporting the central prediction of the present study. The "clients" in his study were students watching a play and then giving their reactions; the present study predicts somewhat similar results when subjects actually participate in counseling. In Biddle's (1958) study, two types of expectations were differentiated: for problem-solving and for relationship-building counselor roles. In the present study, counselor adherence to a variety of client preferences is studied.

Grigg and Goodstein (1957) and Forgy and Black (1954) both found that methods of counseling that are not characteristic of the client-centered approach tend
to be associated with client judgments of greater success-
fulness of counseling.

If clients in these two studies preferred "non-
client-centered" counseling, then it could be said that
methods of counseling that adhered to client preference
were associated with greater judged success. We do not
know whether these clients preferred "non-client-centered"
counseling, although evidence reviewed earlier suggests
that many clients prefer a somewhat directive, advice-
giving counselor role.

If it could be shown that client preferences change
during counseling to come into line with what the counselor
actually does, this might be used as an argument that we
need not worry about initial discrepancies in preferences,
since they will be modified anyway. So far there appears
to be little evidence on this point, as noted in the
preceding section.

The Major Hypotheses

The major hypotheses of the present study are
stated below, with an attempt to show how they are related
to the discussions and finding reviewed above. This task
may be easier after a brief summary of the preceding
literature review:

1) Opinions differ about the extent to which
counselors should adhere to client preference if they are to be most effective.

2) Clients and counselors frequently disagree in their preferences. Specifically, clients seem to prefer a more directive, advice-giving counselor role, and discussions of other than "mental hygiene" types of problems.

3) Changes in clients' expectancies and various attitudes have been studied, but no studies of changes in client preferences for counselor actions in counseling were found.

4) There is little evidence concerning the degree to which counselors should adhere to client preference if they are to be most effective.

The Major Hypotheses: Statement

H₁. There will be a positive association between greater degrees of counselor adherence to client preference for counselor behavior and greater "success" of counseling, as judged by clients, counselors, and an informed, independent observer.

H₂. There will be significant item differences between client post-counseling statements of what counselors did and of what clients would like them to have done, consistent in directions predicted for each item.
H_3. There will be a significant over-all change in client preferences as stated before and after the period of counseling. (In H_3 and H_4 the direction of change was not specified.)

H_4. There will be significant item differences between the statements of their preferences that clients make before and after the period of counseling.

H_5. After counseling, clients will state preferences that are closer to reported counselor behavior than were the preferences stated before counseling.

The Major Hypotheses: Rationale

We predict that counselor adherence to client preference will be related to greater judged "success" in counseling. If the client's preference is A and the counselor's preference is B, there are at least two possible reasons why a choice of A might be associated with better counseling outcomes:

1) Perhaps the client somehow knows best what he needs, and A is "really best" even though the counselor thinks B is best.

2) Perhaps the counselor's preference, B, is "really best," but choosing B may disrupt the client-counselor relationship. Most of the discussion has centered around the second of these arguments. There is some background for H_1 in the writings of Bordin (1955)
and Seeman (1957), and in the findings of Biddle (1958).

The other major hypotheses, if supported, would also stress the importance of counselor adherence to client preference, by showing that changes in client preferences during counseling still do not bring them completely into line with counselor preferences. Most of the studies showing discrepancies between client and counselor preferences have involved client pre-counseling preferences. If it could be shown that client preferences change during counseling to come into line with what the counselor actually does, this might be used as an argument that we need not worry about initial discrepancies in preferences, since they will be modified anyway. We predicted that client preferences would indeed change during counseling (H 3, H 4, H 5), but not to conform completely with counselor preference (H 2). Studies of changes in other areas of client thinking (Perry and Estes, 1953; Appel, 1959; Ewing, 1954; Butler and Haigh, 1954) prompted the prediction of change in client preference (H 3 and H 4), and of change toward counselor preference (H 5).

Studies reviewed earlier have suggested certain directions in which client and counselor preferences differed. We predict (H 2) that differences in these directions will be present after counseling between client preferences and counselor actions. Four areas of
predicted client preference are

1) For counselors to do more advice-giving and decision-making;

2) For counselors to use techniques involving more "lead";

3) For counselors to be more "friendly fellow-humans" than "efficient superiors";

4) For less discussion of "mental hygiene" problems and more concern with vocational choice and "college routine." Items were developed to represent these areas of prediction.

Levels of Consciousness of Client Preferences

Clients may have unconscious preferences that are different from conscious ones. The concepts of reaction formation and repression suggest that what takes place nearer the surface may give inaccurate indications of what goes on below the surface. Leary (1957) wrote in terms of five "levels" of personality. In his study of Adler's "social interest" construct, Shafer (1958) did not find a general consistency across the five levels of personality presented by Leary. The present study deals only with clients' expressed preferences, which are thought of as expressions of conscious preferences.
Summary of Chapter I

Evidence has been marshalled in support of four points:

1) Clients seem to differ from counselors in their preferences for what happens in counseling.

2) Published opinions differ about the extent to which counselors should be guided by client preferences.

3) There is little empirical evidence on the effects of varying degrees of counselor adherence to client preference.

4) Client preferences have not been shown to fall into line with counselor preferences during counseling.

Five major research hypotheses were stated, and the procedures used to test them will be taken up next.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

The hypotheses stated in the last chapter call for two kinds of measures: (1) measures of the correspondence between the actions of a counselor in a counseling situation and the way his client would have preferred the counselor to act, and (2) measures of counseling outcome. The central prediction of this study is that measures of these variables will be positively related to each other. After describing the setting of this study, the writer will tell how the two sets of measures were obtained.

The Setting

The introductory counseling practicum at The Ohio State University involves clients drawn from the how-to-study course. The intermeshing of these two courses has been described by Robinson (1945). This setting seemed advantageous for at least two reasons:

1) Some of the beginning counselors under close supervision may be expected to act at variance with client preferences (Bordin, 1955); this would permit observation of the effects of varying degrees of conformity to client preferences.
2) The practicum teacher listens and watches the counseling interviews intensively and extensively, thus providing an informed, independent observer of the counseling situation.

A pilot study was conducted in this setting during the Winter Quarter, and the study itself during the Spring Quarter, of the 1960 academic year. The counselors and the practicum teacher seemed particularly willing to cooperate since preceding groups of trainees had expressed the need for some information about expectancies and preferences of clients in this specific situation. A good case might be made for the present study as filling the needs of a practical, local situation; it is felt that the study also has a more general interest and applicability. But it is well to bear in mind the particular aspects of the setting in which the study was conducted; findings are most relevant to comparable introductory practica.

**Measures of Counselor Adherence to Client Preference**

Some method was needed to measure the correspondence between counselor activity in a counseling situation and counselor activity that the client would have preferred. Danskin (1955) had typescript readers judge whether the counselor was playing the role the client would prefer.
But judges may not know what clients would prefer or whether clients feel counselors are adhering to these preferences.

Biddle (1958) varied subjects' expectancies by two methods. In one, subjects were given slanted information to create a desired set. This laboratory approach would not have been appropriate in the present study. Biddle's other method was to secure client reports of their existing expectancies, and then compare (1) subjects whose expectancies were met with those (2) whose preferences were not met. One method used in the present study was similar to this in that it relied upon clients for information about their preferences.

Our approach involved asking two questions about a specific counselor action: (1) How often did it occur? (2) How often would the client have liked it to happen? After the completion of counseling, both clients (Appendix III) and counselors (Appendix VIII) answered these two questions about each of 30 items describing counselor actions. Also, clients had indicated before counseling how often they would like the actions in question to take place (Appendix I).

The Three Measures

From the above ratings, three estimates of the adherence of counselor actions to client preferences were
computed for each client-counselor team. They can be represented thus:

1) client/pre/want—client/post/got
2) client/post/want—client/post/got

These three measures are plotted across the top of Table 1.

**Item Format and Weighting**

To permit quantification, each rater indicated for each item his opinion of the frequency with which it was "wanted" or "got" by checking one of five frequencies: "almost always," "frequently," "sometimes," "seldom," or "almost never" (e.g., Appendix I). For each item, an identical "want" and "got" rating was weighted zero, a difference of 1 step weighted 1, and so on. For example, if client A made a "want" rating of "frequently" and a "got" rating of "seldom" on Item 1, the weight assigned was 2.

The weights representing differences between two

---

1Hereafter, we shall use the following symbols: "want"—a rating of how often the client would have liked actions to occur; "got"—a rating of how often actions did occur; "pre" and "post"—ratings made before and after counseling; "Co"—the counselor; "D-score"—a quantification of the difference between any two sets of ratings; and "H"—hypothesis number.
### TABLE 1
Survey of Measures Used to Test the Central Hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of &quot;Success&quot;</th>
<th>Measures of Counselor Adherence to Client Preferences for Counselor Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated in terms of differences scores, larger difference scores indicating smaller degrees of adherence to client preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/post/want--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/post/got</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| #1 Client ratings (One-way analysis of variance)                  | x | x | x |
| #2 Counselor ratings (One-way analysis of variance)               | x | x | x |
| #3 Counselor rankings (Binomial Test)                            | x | x | x |
| #4 Supervisor division into "more" and "less successful"—first half a | x | x | x |
| #5 Supervisor division into "more" and "less successful"—second half a | x | x | x |
| #6 Supervisor division into "more" and "less effective" counselors a | x | x | x |

aT test, with corrections for small numbers.
ratings on all items as rated by any given subject could then be totalled. In this case it made no difference whether an item was wanted more often than it was got or just the reverse; the important thing was that presumably the smaller the total D-score for a particular subject, the greater the degree of counselor adherence to client preference.

For some hypotheses (see H 2 and H 4, Chapter I, pp. 16, 17), however, there was an interest in combining ratings by all subjects on a given item to see whether there were consistencies in the direction of differences. For this purpose, weights were not used. The total number of subjects whose first ratings of Item X were for greater frequency than their second ratings of Item X was computed. This was compared with the total number of subjects whose two ratings on Item X showed differences in the reverse direction, and the two numbers were checked to see whether the larger was significantly greater than the smaller number.

One feature of the instrument used to secure want-got ratings was that it did not take at face value a rater's statement about how often a thing occurred or how often a client would have liked it to occur. All estimates of the extent of counselor adherence to client preference were in terms of the differences between two ratings by the same person. This would seem to reduce
the error arising because "often" or "almost never" might mean something different to different raters. Of course, extreme bunching of ratings would still affect the D-scores.

Of two raters rating the same situation, conceivably both would agree that the counselor performed the act more often than the client wanted it; yet one rater might use two steps of difference between his "want" and "got" ratings to represent this situation; another might use only one step. If this occurred with sufficient frequency, it would affect the measurement. An analysis based on approximately half of the client/post/want—client/post/got and half of the Co/post/want—Co/post/got ratings revealed that 83 per cent of the D-scores were confined to weightings of zero or one step difference in either direction, and that 97 per cent were confined to two step differences in either direction. Thus most of the raters confined themselves to three kinds of ratings: (1) client got it about as often as he wanted it; (2) client got it one step more often than he wanted it; or (3) client got it one step less often than he wanted it.

The Items

A pool of items was built up in three ways: (1) some clients had pointed to counselor behaviors that were not in keeping with their preferences; they were asked
to record these behaviors. (2) Items were selected from the longer instrument used in an earlier study of client preferences (Pohlman and Robinson, 1960), the construction of which is described there. (3) Teachers in the course, graduate students, and persons with Ph.D. degrees in counseling psychology were asked to look over the items; they suggested additions and corrections.

The instrument was modified on the basis of a pilot study. The writer wished to include in the final instrument only items in which there was a definite disparity between what clients "wanted" and "got". In the pilot study, as in the final study, we predicted that for each item there would be significant differences between what clients "wanted" and "got," in directions stated for each item. The machinery by which this prediction was tested for each item is described later, in connection with the presentation of H 2.

After the pilot study, two items showed a significant difference in the direction opposite to that predicted were retained for the final instrument, together with most of the items that supported our prediction. Items that failed to show significant differences in either direction between "want" and "got" ratings were either revised drastically or discarded. All items were re-examined, and a number were re-written; in some cases two items were combined, and in other cases one item was
developed into two. The final blank was built to represent four areas of predicted client preferences (Sonne and Goldman, 1957; Forgy and Black, 1954; Grigg and Goodstein, 1957; Bordin, 1955; Warman, 1958; and Pohlman and Robinson, 1960):

1) Preferences for counselors to do more decision-making and advice-giving;

2) Preferences for counselors to use techniques involving more "lead";

3) Preferences for more of a "friendly equal" than an "efficient superior" counselor role; and

4) Preferences for less concern with "mental hygiene" problems and more concern with vocational matters and "college routine."

The last prediction is based particularly upon the findings of Warman (1958). There was an attempt to include two items to represent each of the three major factors emerging from Warman's factor analysis. These items were adapted from items of his that had high loadings on the factors in question. Because of changes made in the items and the different context in which they occurred, they cannot be equated with the items used by Warman.

In keeping with these four areas of prediction, for every item a prediction was made of the direction of the differences between means of "want" and "got" ratings by all clients after counseling. This comprises H 2. In
the pilot study two items showed significant differences in the direction opposite to that predicted. Predictions for these items were re-examined and seemed to rest logically upon findings of Warman (1958) and Bordin (1955), which have been discussed earlier. It was felt that perhaps the pilot study findings were the result of chance. We wanted to check out our original hypotheses for sure before discarding them. Therefore the original predictions for these two items were retained unaltered.

The Choice of Measures of Counseling Outcome

In the preceding section we described three estimates of the degree of counselor adherence to client preference, which were computed for each counseling series. Our central hypothesis predicts that smaller D-scores (representing closer conformity to client preference) will be associated with greater judged "success" of counseling. What were some of the possible criteria for evaluating counseling, and why were judgments chosen?

Some Possible Criteria

Internal criteria. A number of internal variables based upon typescript study have been reliably rated, related to one another, and used as criteria (Robinson, 1950; Danskin, 1954; Cartwright, 1957a). Cartwright (1957b, p. 265) says that the "beauty of interview
material is that it provides frozen behavior." This behavior may be studied at the investigator's leisure and in many different ways. Internal criteria, especially working relationship, would have been valuable in the present study. Working relationship has been studied repeatedly, rated reliably, and shown to be a sensitive measure (Danskin, 1954). It is one of two measures that Robinson (1950, p. 118) felt "can most effectively be used in research studies." The discussion of how much to heed client preference has centered around one question: If client preference is not heeded, will this influence the client-counselor working relationship adversely? (Chapter I, pp. 17, 18) Attempts to answer this question empirically would seem important.

Relationships between internal criteria and external outcome measures have not been clearly indicated. Also, in the present study the preparation of a pool of type-scripts would have been necessary. This is a costly and taxing task, as Appel (1959) reports. And Seeman (1954, p. 100) argues from the results of studies he has reviewed that "counselors can make accurate shorthand descriptions of client process in their ratings...."

Tests. Tests of various kinds represent another approach to counseling evaluation. Projective tests are thought to by-pass client defenses that sometimes block other personality measurement. Some feel that they give
a more meaningful picture of personality dynamics than do other approaches. Projective tests have in general not been clearly validated. Another type of test, widely used in evaluating client-centered therapy, is the Q-sort (Cartwright, 1957a). Both projective tests and Q-sorts are related to theoretical assumptions to which not all psychologists agree.

"Objective" personality tests may be used as criteria. These have generally been validated in some way. Robinson (1950) notes that personality tests can be made to sample a wide range of pertinent situations, and that norms make possible a comparison with other individuals' reactions. But subjects are sometimes not certain when to answer an item in a personality test in a given way; the resulting ambiguity permits a variety of factors to influence answers. Also, "effective counseling may actually cause a greater awareness of one's problems, whereas an ineffective approach...may cause temporary feelings of well-being" (Robinson, 1950, p. 16). When personality tests are given before and after counseling to experimental and control groups, problems of matching and control are encountered (Pepinsky and Pepinsky, 1954).

The use of physiological measures in client-centered research (e.g. Anderson, 1956) has been summarized by Cartwright (1957a) in his section on tests; researchers of other theoretical orientations have also used this
criterion. Pepinsky and Pepinsky (1954) note the possibility that physiological measures may be related to the reduction of "irrelevant drive," thus indicating "response availability." It would have been interesting to know what happened to client anxiety as counselors adhered more or less to client preference; physiological measures might have been used to throw light on this.

Measures from every-day life. A third approach to evaluation of counseling is to get measures of the client's every-day life adjustment and effectiveness. Significant others may express opinions about the client. Q sorts by clients' friends (Rogers and Dymond, 1954), rating scales, and Guess Who and Sociometric tests have been used. Measures may be secured of job satisfaction, grades, earnings, marital adjustment, etc. Williamson and Bordin (1941) have pointed out some inadequacies of several criteria of this type. Also, they have spoken of them as "part-criteria," where any one alone is incomplete and the statistical combination of all is still open to criticism. Extra-counseling criteria have the advantage of checking to see whether benefits of counseling transfer beyond the counseling and testing situations. They also entail complications in research design. Measures from the client's every-day life may be made soon after counseling; they are often thought of as delayed criteria.
Additional advantages and complications of delayed measurement will be discussed later.

**Judgments.** A fourth type of criteria includes judgments of the "success" or "effectiveness" of counseling, or of the "adjustment" of the client, made by counselors, clients, supervisors, or other non-participating observers of counseling. Grigg and Goodstein (1957) have presented a thoughtful rationale for the use of clients as judges of the counseling process. They qualify their arguments and recognize many limitations. But a basic point is that clients "may be viewed as observers of the counseling situation, observers who have had an opportunity to see the counselor perform and hence should be able to make some judgment of the counseling process" (p. 31). There is some precedent for the use of clients to provide judgments of the effectiveness of counseling (Porter, 1957; Grigg and Goodstein, 1957; Forgy and Black, 1954). Client judgments have not been validated and are subject to various distortions such as Hathaway's (1948) "hello-goodby" phenomenon; inter-rater reliability of client judgments has not been shown.

Seeman (1954) has provided a helpful chapter supporting the use of counselors' judgments as criteria. He presents a number of logical reasons why such judgments have merit. Then he reviews studies that compare counselor judgments with internal measures. These studies show a
rather general agreement between the two criteria. One such study (Raskin, 1949), involving five internal measures, found an average correlation of .70. Seeman concludes (1954, p. 100), "We can argue from these results that counselors can make accurate shorthand descriptions of client process in their ratings, but we cannot make validity arguments from these data alone." Turning therefore to studies comparing counselor judgments with independent outcome measures, Seeman cites five studies (Carr, 1949; Haimowitz, 1948; Jonietz, 1950; Mosak, 1950; Muench, 1947) employing the Rorschach in one way or another. Two of these noted some relationship between Rorschach material and counselor judgments; the other three did not. One study (Mosak, 1950) included the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, and revealed a correlation between it and counselor judgments. Seeman seems optimistic when he speaks of these five studies as showing "On the whole, promising results" (1954, p. 100).

Delayed measurements. All of these types of criteria, except internal criteria, might have been used as delayed measures. Delayed measurement "insures that more-or-less permanent outcomes are measured" (Robinson, 1950, p. 24). But predicted relations may also be harder to demonstrate with delayed measures. Pepinsky and Pepinsky (1954, p. 270) observe that as "inquiry is extended into the client's present and future everyday living situ-
ations.... Problems of research design also become more complex, and the accuracy of prediction into the remote future may be disappointing low." Williamson and Bordin (1941) feel that "The question of the optimum time interval for evaluation is one that needs further investigation before much progress can be made in evaluation experiments...perhaps the longer the intervening time, the greater the possibility for the intrusion of other influences that may tend to minimize the effects of counseling" (pp. 7, 8).

Choosing Among Possible Criteria

Cartwright (1957b) notes that if all the many possible criteria were perfectly correlated there would be no problem. But a widespread lack of correlation between criteria, despite high reliability, was noted by Rogers (Rogers and Dymond, 1954, pp. 431, 432). He hypothesized differing perceptual vantage points of client and therapist. Such vantage points were the two factors found by Cartwright and Roth (1957) in a factor analysis of measures of change during therapy, designed to check Roger's hypothesis. The two factors ran through several instruments. The hypothesis of differing perceptual vantage points also receives support from the factor analyses of Gibson, Snyder, and Ray (1955); and of Nichols and Beck (1960). It seemed important to include
both the client's and the counselor's perceptual vantage point in our criteria. There is some suggestion in the above factor analyses that each of the first four types of criteria discussed above, if used alone, would have represented either the client's or counselor's perceptual vantage point, but not both. Thus, for example, if typescripts had been prepared and internal criteria used, these might not have represented the client's perceptual vantage point (Gibson, Snyder, and Ray, 1955).

Which of the many possible criteria should be used, and at what times? In the present exploratory study, the first aim was to see whether there was any support for H 1. An attempt was therefore made to select criteria (1) that were comparatively economical of man-hours and (2) that were judged most likely to show the relationship predicted. If these crude criteria showed the relationship that H 1 predicted, this would give some encouragement to test the hypothesis with other criteria. In keeping with these aims, for example, it was decided to use what Seeman (1954) called "accurate shorthand descriptions" of client process instead of internal criteria. Similarly, measures made just after counseling were used instead of delayed measures. Post-counseling measures were judged more likely to support the prediction of H 1. It is recognized, however, that these measures might not show
a relationship of the predicted type, which might still be revealed by delayed measures.

Judgments by clients, counselors, and the teacher-supervisor of the practicum were selected as criteria. These have some advantages for the present study: (1) Both clients' and counselors' perceptual vantage points were included. (2) The prediction of H 1 seemed more likely to be supported with these than with some other criteria. (3) The measures were relatively simple and economical to obtain. (4) Estimates of client-counselor working relationship were secured. (5) Global judgments used might avoid the difficulties of "part-criteria" discussed by Williamson and Bordin (1941).

But these judgments also had disadvantages: (1) No clear validity has been shown for any of the types of judgments. (2) Client judgments are subject to various distortions such as the "hello-goodbye" effect (Hathaway, 1948). (3) Counselors' judgments might be affected because counselors were too self-lenient or too self-critical (Williamson and Bordin, 1941). (4) Counselor and client judgments might be affected by rater knowledge of the very variable for which judgments were being used as criteria—the degree of counselor adherence to client preference. Thus judgments, the criteria used, are recognized as being rough measures with many weaknesses, and as being suitable only for exploratory study.
The "Success" Judgments Used

Six kinds of measures were secured from clients, counselors, and the teacher-supervisor of the practicum. They are plotted down the left of Table 1.

1. Clients were given a rating scale (Appendix IV) soon after the completion of counseling, in which they checked one of seven statements about the success of the counseling experience.

2. Each counselor was asked to list the three clients whom he had seen for the greatest number of interviews during the quarter. The counselor was then given the same seven statements used in Measure #1 and asked to check one statement concerning the series of interviews held with each client (Appendix VII).

3. Immediately after making the above rating, each counselor was asked to rank the success of the counseling experience for each of the three clients (Appendix VII). The method of selecting these three clients has been described in the preceding paragraph. The counselor listed the name of the client with whom counseling had been most successful, the name of the client with whom counseling had been second most successful, and the name of the client with whom counseling had been third most successful. It was felt that one counselor might rate all three of his interview series high on the
seven-fold scale of measure 2, and another rate all of his interview series low, because of different frames of reference. The ranking was an attempt to get around this difficulty.

4. The teacher-supervisor of the practicum listened to four interviews with one client for each of the 11 counselors in the practicum during the first half of the quarter. She then divided these 11 client-counselor teams into the six which were the most, and the five which were the least "successful."

5. The same procedure was followed for another set of 11 clients, who had been having interviews earlier but to whom the teacher listened for four interviews apiece during the last half of the quarter. One client dropped out of school, making a division into the more successful and the less successful five.

6. A third division was made by the teacher, this time comparing the general "effectiveness" of each counselor, rather than the success of the counselor in working with any particular client or clients.¹

In the above paragraphs we have only listed the six types of judgments secured. How they were used and the statistical procedures associated with each judgment

¹Hereafter, we shall use the general term "success" to refer not only to the five judgments where judges were asked to rate "success," but also to this particular case, in which the rating was of "effectiveness."
will be treated in the discussion of H 1, in the section "Hypotheses and Statistical Tests."

**Defining "Success"**

The basic procedures involved allowing the rater to use his own definition of "success," with certain definitional restrictions imposed by the researcher. Appendix IV illustrates the wording of the instructions. In each case the rater was assured that his ratings would not be known by anyone except the one research worker. This assurance was made more specific by statements such as, "What you say here will not be given to your counselor, ...It will not be given to your teacher either, or affect your grade." In each case the rater was told that this was to be his own rating and his own opinion, not his guess of the ratings of the other participants involved—clients, counselors, or supervisors, as the case might be. In each case the "stem" of the rating sentence began, "In the number of interviews spent together,..." This was an attempt to remind raters that perhaps not as much could be gained in one interview as in three years on the couch. Raters were told concerning the first five measures that the rating of "success" was not to be a rating only of the counselor's skillfulness in using certain techniques, although this might enter into the picture.
Rather, it was to be a rating of the results achieved by counselor and client working together.

As a means of channeling thinking about the definition of "success" used, counselors were given a checklist (Appendix VI) of areas of possible client change, which they completed immediately before they made their ratings. Their checking of this sheet was not used in any of the measures, but served only as a guide to counselor thinking.

Concerning the supervisor's ratings, it was felt here that whatever definitions this "expert witness" employed were relatively constant for all the cases she judged, so that allowing her to pick her own definitions (Appendix IX) resulted in a relatively consistent measure. She chose to rate in terms of the relationship between the client and the counselor. In Chapter 1 we noted that the discussion of whether counselors should adhere to client preference has generally been couched in terms of the possible influence of such adherence upon the client-counselor relationship. We argued that it would therefore be particularly helpful to use the judgment of this relationship as a criterion in the present study.

The writer agrees with the teacher-supervisor that the quality of the client-counselor relationship can be viewed as one aspect of "successful" counseling. Neither the "expert" rater nor the writer regards this relationship as the only possible measure of "successful"
counseling, or as a measure that would be perfectly correlated with other measures. Conceivably a good relationship might obtain during counseling, while the long-range effectiveness of counseling was slight; the reverse might also occur.

Reiability of Measures

Fourteen clients were selected at random from among those who had completed both the post-test and the rating form before the end of the quarter. A letter (Appendix X) was sent to each, informing him of the "loss" of his instrument and enclosing additional blanks to be filled out and returned in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Nine students responded to this request. They completed the reliability forms approximately two weeks after the originals. These two weeks represented the eventful period between the examination week at the University and the start of the summer vacation back home. Their material was used to estimate the reliability of the two types of measures used.

The reliability coefficient for the client/post/want--client/post/got D-scores was computed as follows. It will be recalled that, for each item as rated by each client, the difference between want and got ratings was weighted. All these item weights for a given client were totaled to make a total D-score representing the degree
of counselor adherence to that client's preference. For the nine students in the reliability study, we computed each client's total D-score. These total D-scores were then compared with the original total D-scores for these nine clients. The Pearsonian product-moment correlation coefficient was used, and revealed a correlation of .75, significant at the .05 level.

The coefficient for the scale used to secure judgments of success, computed by the same procedure, was .70. This is also significant at the .05 level of probability. In computing the coefficient for the success rating scale, the seven steps were treated as interval measurements—an assumption which was not made when these ratings were used as criteria, since the one-way analysis of variance requires only ordinal measurements. As a result, the estimate of reliability secured for the success rating scale was on the conservative side.

**Administrative Procedure**

A pilot study was carried out during the Winter Quarter, and the study itself during the Spring Quarter, of the 1960 school year. A flow chart of various events is presented as Figure 1. One of the hypotheses (H 3) required a control group to indicate at the start and end of the quarter how often they would prefer each of the 30 items to occur, if they were to see counselors.
## FIGURE 1
Flow Chart to show Timing of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Controls (Students)</th>
<th>Experimentals (Clients)</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter, 1960</td>
<td>P I L O T S T U D Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter, 1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st week</td>
<td>Pre-test (Appendix I)</td>
<td>Pre-test (Appendix I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd week</td>
<td>C O U N S E L I N G B E G I N S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eleven client-counselor teams who have been listened to for four weeks, divided into "more successful" and "less successful" groups (Appendix IX)
FIGURE 1 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Controls (Students)</th>
<th>Experimental (Clients)</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Quarter, 1960</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last week of regular classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday of last week, after all counseling</td>
<td>Ratings of &quot;Successfulness&quot; of counseling (Appendix IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend intervenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam day</td>
<td>Post-test (Appendix II)</td>
<td>Post-test (Appendix III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check-list (Appendix VI)
Rating of "successfulness" (Appendix VII)
"Want-Got" test (Appendix VIII)

Another 11 client-counselor teams, who have been listened to for four weeks, divided into "more successful" and "less successful" groups (Appendix IX).
The 11 counselors divided by "effectiveness"
At the beginning of the quarter all students in the "how-to-study" course received the pre-test (Appendix I). Non-counseled students were considered the control group and given the same test at the end of the quarter (Appendix II).

It is recognized that this arrangement did not result in a valid control group. Factors that seem comparable for the two groups include the passage of the same amount of time between pre- and post-want tests, random changes in scores, and the effects of the how-to-study course itself. But the decision of whether to be counseled was left with students, rather than being determined by the experimenter on the basis of random selection or the matching of subjects. Thus, important motivational and other factors were doubtless different for the two groups.

The only hypotheses in which controls were involved had to do with whether client preferences changed significantly during the period of counseling. It might be argued, of course, that changes in client preferences, if found, would result from motivational and other factors present before counseling. With controls and clients selected as described above, we could not refute this argument empirically, although it was assumed that initial client-control differences would not bias the results.
Pre-want measures were obtained from both clients and controls at the beginning of the quarter, several days before the possibility of seeing counselors had been presented to students. Clients were given the forms on which they judged the success of counseling after all counseling was completed. This took place on the last regular day of class, a Friday. Clients and controls received their post-want tests, and clients their post-got tests, on the day of the final examination, so that clients took this measure at least one week-end after making their judgments of "success." All 11 counselors completed their forms between the conclusion of their final interview and the end of the examination week.

Seven clients did not complete their post-tests, or did not include their birthdays. These included two who had dropped from school. Letters (Appendix XI) were sent explaining the situation and enclosing instruments and stamped envelopes with the return address. Four students replied and thus completed their forms at home after the end of the quarter.

Clients, counselors, and the supervisor-teacher were assured concerning every instrument completed that what they said would not be known to anyone except the one research worker. Also, clients did not put their names on any forms and were identified only by birthdays.
This was true of instruments solicited by mail, as well as of those completed in class sessions.

**Subjects**

The setting of the study has been described earlier. All students who saw counselors in the introductory practicum and who remained in school during the entire quarter were defined as potential "clients" for the purposes of this study. A few students who saw other counselors were not included at all. The remainder of the students who stayed in school during the entire quarter were considered as potential "control subjects." All counselors in the introductory practicum were defined as potential "counselors" for the purposes of this study. The number of potential subjects in each category and the proportion of these who actually completed the instruments are listed in Table 2.

**Hypotheses and Statistical Tests**

**The Central Hypothesis, H₁**

Smaller D-scores (representing greater degrees of adherence by counselors to client preferences for counselor behavior) will be associated with judgments of greater "success."

This is in reality 18 separate sub-hypotheses, represented by the 18 cells generated in Table 1, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of potential subjects</th>
<th>Number of subjects who participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients with completed ratings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients with completed post-test pairs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients with completed pre-post test pairs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls with completed pre-post test pairs</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed client-counselor post-test pairs</td>
<td>31\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Counselors were asked to complete their instruments with reference to three clients each, so that in a sense there were 33 potential client-counselor post-test pairs. However, by definition we had excluded anyone who dropped out of school. Two clients of the 33 dropped out; follow-up letters were unsuccessful. These two are not included in the group of potential clients.
tested by the statistical techniques listed in connection with the five measures of "success" and the measure of "effectiveness." Let us review briefly how these 18 cells were obtained. We shall then state the specific sub-hypotheses and the statistical procedures used to test H 1.

Across the top of Table 1 are plotted three "D-scores." Early in this chapter we presented the method of arriving at these "D-scores," which measure the degree of counselor adherence to client preferences. Three types of D-scores were computed. One D-score of each type was computed for each counseling series. In testing the central hypothesis, comparisons were made only between D-scores of any one type. For example, the client/post/want--client/post/got D-scores for all client-counselor teams were compared for size, but such D-scores were not compared with D-scores of the other two types in testing Hypothesis 1.

Our prediction was that, within any given type of D-scores, smaller D-scores (representing greater degrees of counselor adherence to client preferences) would be associated with greater judged "success."

We had six judgments of success, plotted down the left of Table 1. As in the case of the three D-scores, comparisons were made only within judgments of a given type. Thus, each cell in Table 1 represents a
separate statistical test, where one type of D-score (a measure of the degree of counselor adherence to client preferences) was compared with one judgment.

We might list 18 specific sub-hypotheses below, and 18 statistical tests. This would be redundant, since with any given "success" measure we used the same statistical procedure with each of the three D-scores, and made the same prediction about each D-score. Therefore below we spell out six predictions, for the six "success" measures. But it should be understood that each stated prediction really represents 3 predictions, one for each type of D-score. Similarly, each statistical test listed was used three times, once with each type of D-score.

**Measure 1.** D-scores associated with the highest client rating (1) were tabulated. Then D-scores associated with the next highest client rating (2) were tabulated, and so on for each of the seven ratings. The prediction was that smaller D-scores would be associated with the higher client ratings. This was tested by means of a one-way analysis of variance.

**Measure 2.** The same procedure as that described above was carried out for counselor ratings, which were made on the same seven-fold scale. The statistical test chosen was, again, the one-way analysis of variance.
Measure 3. Each counselor had been asked to choose three clients according to certain rules. He was then to indicate the name of the client with whom counseling had been the most "successful," the name of the client with whom counseling had been second most "successful," and the name of the client with whom counseling had been third most "successful." Our prediction was that, on the whole, clients ranked second would have larger D-scores than those ranked first, and that clients ranked third would have larger D-scores than those ranked second.

The statistical measure originally chosen was the Mann Trend Test (Siegel, 1956) which would have thrown differences between ranks 1 and 2, and between ranks 2 and 3, into the same hopper. After the study was completed (if we may anticipate the results here), it seemed that there might be no significant difference between D-scores associated with ranks 1 and 2, but that there might be a significant difference between D-scores associated with ranks 2 and 3. Therefore the Mann Trend Test was replaced by the Binomial Test.

We illustrate how the Binomial Test was carried out by discussing the procedures used to test differences in size of D-scores between ranks 1 and 2. We tallied every case where the D-score associated with rank 1 was larger than the D-score associated with rank 2. Then we tallied every case where the D-score associated with
rank 2 was larger than the D-score associated with rank 1. Our prediction was that there would be significantly more cases of the second type than cases of the first type. If there were indeed more cases of the second type than cases of the first type, a table (Siegel, 1956, Table D) was consulted to see whether the larger number was significantly greater than the smaller number.

The same procedure was used in comparing D-scores associated with ranks 2 and 3. It was also decided, after the gathering of data, to compare by the same procedure D-scores associated with ranks 1 and 3.

Measure 4. The teacher-supervisor of the practicum had divided 11 client-counselor teams into the "more successful" and the 5 "less successful." Mean D-scores for the more successful and the less successful groups were compared by means of the t-test. The prediction was that the mean of the "less successful" group's D-scores would be significantly larger.

Measure 5. The teacher-supervisor of the practicum had divided a different set of client-counselor teams into the 5 "more successful" and the 5 "less successful." Mean D-scores for the more successful and the less successful groups were compared by means of the t-test. The prediction was that the mean of the "less successful" group's D-scores would be significantly larger.
Measure 6. The teacher-supervisor of the practicum had selected the 5 "more effective" and the 5 "less effective" counselors. The D-scores of all clients who had seen the "more effective" five counselors were averaged and the mean compared with the mean of the D-scores of all clients who had seen the "less effective" five counselors. The statistic used was the t-test. The prediction was that the mean of the D-scores of clients who had seen the "less effective" counselors would be significantly larger.

The Other Major Hypotheses

H 2. There will be significant item differences between client post-counseling "want" and "got" statements, consistent in these directions:

Items 2, 4, 7, 11, 14, 16, 27, and 29--clients will "want" the behavior less often than they "got" it;

Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17-26, 28, and 30--clients will "want" the behavior more often than they "got" it.

The Binomial Test was used to test this hypothesis. Item 1 may be taken to illustrate the application of this statistical test. We tallied every client whose ratings expressed a preference for the behavior described in item 1 to occur more often than it did. (In other words, we tallied every client whose post/want rating
was for more often than his post/got rating.) The number of clients in this category was totalled.

Also, we tallied every client whose ratings expressed a preference for the behavior described in item 1 to occur less often than it did. (In other words, we tallied every client whose post/want rating was for less often than his post/got rating.) The number of clients in this category was totalled.

For item 1, the prediction was that the group of clients would "want" the behavior more often than they "got" it. In other words, the prediction was that the number of clients in the first category above (who wanted the behavior more often than they got it) would be significantly larger than the number of clients in the second category above (who wanted the behavior less often than they got it). If more clients were actually found to fall into the first category, a "Table of probabilities associated with values as small as observed values...in the Binomial Test" (Siegel, 1956, Table D) was consulted for significance levels, using one-tailed values. In this statistical test, a subject whose "want" and "got" ratings were identical for item 1 was not counted.

H.3. Client/pre/want--client/post/want D-scores will be significantly larger than control/pre/want--control/post/want D-scores. This is saying in effect
that over-all change in client preferences will be significantly greater than the over-all change in control preferences during the period when counseling occurred. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to check this hypothesis.

This hypothesis and the next one predict changes in client preferences during counseling. It will be recalled that one of the three D-scores (used to measure the degree of counselor adherence to client preferences) involved clients' post-counseling statements of their preferences. Such post-counseling preferences (if H3 and H4 are supported) will be different from pre-counseling preferences. This does not mean that client post-counseling preferences are contaminated for use in a measure of counselor adherence to client preferences. One D-score purports to measure the degree of counselor adherence to client pre-counseling preferences; another, to client post-counseling preferences. If preferences change during counseling, naturally pre-counseling and post-counseling preferences are different. But each may be of interest in its own right.

It was felt that significant gross changes (as predicted in H3) might occur, even though there were no consistent directional shifts in preferences on particular items. The reverse might also be true.
Another hypothesis dealt with such directional shifts of items:

H_4. There will be significant item differences between client/pre/want and client/post/want statements. This is saying in effect that there will be group trends in preference changes about specific items over the period of counseling.

This was tested by the Binomial Test, and the procedures were quite parallel to those employed in testing out H_2. The reader who recalls these procedures may wish to proceed to the next hypothesis. It should first be noted, however, that in the present case no prediction was made of the direction of item differences between the two ratings. Hence, when the Binomial Test was applied, two-tailed values were used.

Item 1 may be taken to illustrate the application of the Binomial Test in testing H_4. We tallied every client whose post/want rating indicated a preference for the behavior described in item 1 to occur more often than his pre/want rating indicated. The number of clients in this category was totalled. Also, we tallied every client whose post/want rating indicated a preference for the behavior to occur less often than did his pre/want rating. The number of clients in this category was totalled.

In order for a significant group shift to have
occurred during counseling in client preferences about item 1, one of the above two totals must be significantly larger than the other. Whether or not this was the case was determined by consulting a "Table of probabilities associated with values as small as observed values...in the Binomial Test" (Siegel, 1956, Table D). In this statistical test, a subject whose "want" and "got" ratings were identical for item 1 was not counted.

\[ H_5 \] Client/pre/want--client/post/got D-scores will be larger than client/post/want--client/post/got D-scores. This is saying in effect that, after counseling, clients will state preferences which are closer to reported counselor behaviors than were the preferences stated before counseling. The statistic used to test this hypothesis was the Mann-Whitney U Test.

**Peripheral Hypotheses**

The instruments and administrative procedures described above are designed to check on the major hypotheses, represented by \( H_1 \) through \( H_5 \). The data could, with little additional effort, be used to test certain other hypotheses. Most of the peripheral hypotheses stated below can be seen as having at least some relationship to the central hypothesis. Hypotheses 6 through 10 involve a comparison of various client and counselor perceptions.
H_6. Client/post/want--client/post/got D-scores will be significantly larger than Co/post/want--Co/post/got D-scores. This is saying in effect that clients will feel a bigger disparity than counselors realize they do between what happens in counseling and what they would like to have happened. The Mann-Whitney U Test was the statistic used.

H_7. Client/post/want--Co/post/want D-scores will be significantly larger than client/post/got--Co/post/got D-scores. This is saying in effect that it will be easier for clients and counselors to agree about what happened than for counselors to estimate what clients would have liked in counseling. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used.

H_8. There will be a significant positive relationship between clients' and counselors' ratings of the successfullness of the interviews. To test this hypothesis, the upper and lower halves of the ratings of each group were compared in a two-by-two Chi-squared test to see whether the property of being in the upper half in one rating was associated with the property of being in the upper half of the other rating. The factor analyses of Gibson, Snyder, and Ray (1955), and of Cartwright and Roth (1957), both indicated differences between clients and counselors in their estimates of change. Despite these differences, it seemed reasonable that there would be some commonality among the ratings.
H 9. Clients will rate the success of the counseling experience as having been significantly higher than will the counselors involved in rating the same interviews. This hypothesis was also tested by means of a Chi-squared test. The categories of the test, going in one direction, were clients and counselors. In the other direction the categories were ratings 1 and 2; ratings 3, 4 and 5; and ratings 6 and 7.

This prediction was based upon the writer's own impression that counselors in supervised practica often become overwhelmed with their inadequacies and view pessimistically the outcomes of counseling. Also, clients might tend to overestimate the outcomes of counseling because of "flight into health" or a favorable "good-bye" attitude (Hathaway, 1948).

H 10. Client/post/want—client/post/got D-scores for women will be significantly larger than the corresponding scores for men. This is saying in effect that women will express greater dissatisfaction with what their counselors did. The Mann-Whitney U Test was the statistic chosen. This prediction is based on somewhat similar findings in an earlier study of client preferences (Pohlman and Robinson, 1960) and on two studies discussed there (Cason, 1930; Conrad and Jones, 1942).

After the study was completed we decided to break the group down into those counseled by men and those
counseled by women. This hypothesis was therefore tested, not only for the group of clients as a whole, but for the above two sub-groups. The same statistical procedure was used.

**H11.** Smaller Co/post/want—client/post/want D-scores (indicating greater agreement between client and counselor about what the client would like the counselor to have done) will be associated with greater judged "success" and "effectiveness." This hypothesis is in reality six separate sub-hypotheses, tested against the very same criteria of success used in testing H 1, and which are listed down the left of Table 1. The same statistical techniques were used in each case. While the same criteria and same statistical techniques were employed in H 1 and H 11, the hypotheses were quite different. Both hypotheses involved D-scores, but these D-scores had different things. In H 1, D-scores were designed to measure the degree of counselor adherence to client preference. In H 11, the Co/want—client/want D-scores were an attempt to get at the degree of agreement between client and counselor on the question of what the client would like the counselor to have done.
Summary of Chapter II

The present study was conducted at The Ohio State University and involved counselors from an introductory counseling practicum and clients from the "how-to-study" course.

Our central prediction was that the extent of counselor adherence to client preferences for counselor behavior is positively related to judgments of the "success" of counseling. To test this hypothesis, we needed two kinds of measures: (1) measures of the degree of counselor adherence to client preference for counselor behavior and (2) measures of the "success" of counseling. Measures of these two types have been described in this chapter.

Hypothesis 2 predicted significant item differences between client post-counseling statements of what counselors actually did and of what clients would like them to have done, consistent in directions predicted for each item.

Hypothesis 3 predicted, in effect, a significant over-all change in client preferences as stated before and after the period of counseling. Hypothesis 4 became more specific and predicted, in effect, significant group trends in client preference changes about specific items over the period of counseling. Hypothesis 5 pre-
dicted, in effect, that after counseling clients would state preferences that were closer to reported counselor behaviors than were the preferences stated before counseling.

A number of peripheral hypotheses were also stated at the end of the chapter.
Results Pertaining to the Central Hypothesis

H 1 stated that smaller D-scores (representing greater degrees of counselor adherence to client preference for counselor behavior) would be associated with judgments of greater "success." This was tested by 18 specific tests, which are summarized in Table 1 and again in Table 7. Down the left side of these tables are listed the six criterion measures used; each of these measures was used in a test with each of the three types of D-scores.

There was virtually no support for H 1. Results involving Measure #1, client ratings, are presented in Table 3; those involving Measure #2, counselor ratings, in Table 4. Results pertaining to counselor rankings, Measure #3, are presented in Table 5. All the various procedures involving supervisor judgments (Measures #4-6) are included in Table 6. Finally, the results concerning H 1 are summarized for quick reference in Table 7.
TABLE 3

One Way Analysis of Variance to Compare Client Ratings of Success with Measures of Counselor Adherence to Client Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean D-score</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean D-score</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean D-score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate of sigma</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The test was carried out only in the two cases where there seemed to be a trend in the predicted direction. In neither case did the size of F approach significance.

<sup>b</sup>No rating larger than 5 was made.
### TABLE 4

One Way Analysis of Variance to Compare Counselor Ratings of Success with Measures of Counselor Adherence to Client Preferences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating 1</td>
<td>N = 1, Mean D-score = 11.0</td>
<td>N = 1, Mean D-score = 33.0</td>
<td>N = 1, Mean D-score = 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 2</td>
<td>N = 8, Mean D-score = 20.7</td>
<td>N = 7, Mean D-score = 37.4</td>
<td>N = 8, Mean D-score = 20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 3</td>
<td>N = 8, Mean D-score = 19.2</td>
<td>N = 8, Mean D-score = 32.2</td>
<td>N = 10, Mean D-score = 19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 4</td>
<td>N = 10, Mean D-score = 20.2</td>
<td>N = 8, Mean D-score = 29.5</td>
<td>N = 10, Mean D-score = 26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating 5*</td>
<td>N = 3, Mean D-score = 15.7</td>
<td>N = 2, Mean D-score = 30.0</td>
<td>N = 4, Mean D-score = 25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimate of sigma**

| F                      | 0.94 |

---

*The test was carried out only in the one case where there seemed to be a trend in the predicted direction. In this case, the size of F did not approach significance.

*No rating higher than 5 was used.*
TABLE 5
The Binomial Test for the Significance of the Differences Between Size of Measures of Counselor Adherence to Client Preferences Associated with Various Counselor Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in D-scores from ranks 1 to 2</th>
<th>Client/post/want--</th>
<th>Client/pre/want--</th>
<th>Co/post/want--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/post/got</td>
<td>Client/post/got</td>
<td>Co/post/got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of increases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of decreases</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number no change (not counted)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of significance (if in predicted direction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in D-scores from ranks 2 to 3

|                                      | Client/post/want-- | Client/pre/want-- | Co/post/want-- |
|                                      |                    |                   |                |
| Number of increases                  | 5                   | 2                 | 8              |
| Number of decreases                  | 3                   | 3                 | 1              |
| Number no change (not counted)       | 1                   | 1                 |                |
| Level of significance (if in predicted direction) |        |                   | .02            |

The Mann trend test was originally planned for this data; for reasons discussed in the text the binomial test seemed to give greater precision.
TABLE 6

*t Test for the Differences Between Means of D-scores of the Upper and Lower Halves of Rankings Made by the Supervisor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Client/post/want—</th>
<th>Client/pre/want—</th>
<th>Co/post/want—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/post/got</td>
<td>Client/post/got</td>
<td>Co/post/got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean D-score</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean D-score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t^a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 &quot;More successful&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. &quot;less successful&quot;</td>
<td>1.10^b</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interview series—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first half of quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 &quot;More successful&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. &quot;less successful&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interview series—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last half of quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 &quot;More effective&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. &quot;less effective&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counselors' clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a The prediction in each case was that the upper of the pair of D-scores would be significantly smaller. The t-test was carried out only in those cases where the difference was as predicted and of noticeable size.

^b Falls just short of the amount needed for the .05 level with 6 degrees of freedom.

^c Falls short of the amount needed for the .10 level with 6 degrees of freedom.

^d Falls just short of the amount needed for the .10 level with 28 degrees of freedom.
TABLE 7
Summary of Results Pertaining to the Central Hypothesis, H 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of &quot;Success&quot; and &quot;Effectiveness&quot;</th>
<th>Measures of Counselor Adherence to Client Preferences for Counselor Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/post/want--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/post/got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Client ratings (One-way analysis of variance)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Counselor ratings (One-way analysis of variance)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Counselor rankings—Ranks 1 to 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor rankings—Ranks 2 to 3 (Binomial Test)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Supervisor division into &quot;more&quot; and &quot;less successful&quot;—first half**</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Supervisor division into &quot;more&quot; and &quot;less successful&quot;—second half**</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Supervisor division into &quot;more&quot; and &quot;less effective&quot; counselors**</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Trend in predicted direction. Y Trend in direction opposite to that predicted. ? No discernable trend.

*Significant at .02 level. No other results significant at .05 level. **t test.
A number of the statistical tests showed non-significant trends in the predicted direction, and about as many showed trends in the direction opposite to that predicted. Significance was achieved only in the case of one portion of one of the 18 sub-hypotheses. This involved a relationship between counselor rankings (Measure #3) and Co/post/want--Co/post/got D-scores, and is presented in Table 5. The Mann Trend Test was the statistic originally planned to test measure #3. This would have tested all together the changes in D-scores from ranks 1 to 2 and from ranks 2 to 3. An inspection of the data suggested that there might be a significant trend in the predicted direction from ranks 2 to 3 but not from ranks 1 to 2. Use of the Binomial Test revealed this to be the case. Such a fine distinction would have been blurred by the Mann Trend Test, which was therefore replaced by the Binomial Test in all sub-hypotheses involving Measure #3. An additional tally with the Co/post/want--Co/post/got D-scores showed a trend in the predicted direction when rank 1 was compared with rank 3, significant at the .01 level. The Binomial Test applied to the other two sub-hypotheses involving D-scores in combination with Measure #3 showed no such significant trends.

Thus of the 18 sub-hypotheses summarized in Table 7, it might be said that only one-half of one was supported
at the .05 level in the predicted direction. Out of 18 tests, we might expect approximately one to be significant at the .05 level by chance alone. Even in this case it was necessary to replace the statistical test originally chosen with another, selected post hoc, to tease out a relationship which was lurking in only one-half of the sub-test.

Thus there is clear evidence for rejection of H 1 and support for the null hypothesis.

Results Pertaining to Hypothesis 2

H 2 stated: There will be significant item differences between client post-counseling "want" and "got" statements, consistent in these directions: Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17-26, 28, 30, clients will "want" the behavior more often than they "got" it; Items 2, 4, 7, 11, 14, 16, 27, and 29, clients will "want" the behavior less often than they "got" it.

Of the 30 items, 22 showed differences in the predicted direction, significant at the .05 level or below. All but two of these were also significant at the .01 level. Thus hypothesis 2 is supported. There were significant item differences between client post-counseling "want" and "got" statements, consistent in predicted directions.

Table 8 deals with H 2, presenting the wording
**TABLE 8**

Binomial Test for Consistencies in the Direction of Item Differences Between Counselor Behavior and Client Preferences for Counselor Behavior, As Reported by Clients after Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wording of Item</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>( \frac{x}{y} )</th>
<th>Absolute Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas 1 and 2 &quot;More Directive&quot; and &quot;More Leading Techniques&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me what he thinks I should do</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat what I have just said, in the same or other words</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me make the decisions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me information</td>
<td>6**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me do the talking</td>
<td>7**</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give an opinion of his own, different from one I expressed</td>
<td>9**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me introduce new topics for discussion, instead of introducing them himself</td>
<td>14**</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer questions by asking other questions of me, such as &quot;What do you think?&quot;</td>
<td>16**</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let me know what he thinks is morally right or wrong for me to do</td>
<td>17**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wording of Item</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Results $\frac{x}{y}$</th>
<th>Absolute Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 3 &quot;Friendly Equal&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand what I am saying</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and like me to the same extent no matter what I tell him</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>5 3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be friendly and kind</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a personal interest in my problems</td>
<td>10**</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>15 4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be strictly business-like; counseling me is just a job</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express approval when I have done well$^a$</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>10 3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to his own experience, life, problems</td>
<td>13**</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>26 4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express confidence in me</td>
<td>15**</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>17 2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act like just another human being, instead of an &quot;expert&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let me know what we are trying to do</td>
<td>19**</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel free to express any idea or discuss any topic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording of Item</td>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Results x</td>
<td>Results y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area 3, Contd.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand my true feeling</td>
<td>21**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seem sure of himself</td>
<td>22**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area 4 &quot;Discussion Topics&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss better study habits for me</td>
<td>23**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss effective use of my time</td>
<td>24**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss what type of job would be best</td>
<td>25**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss religious or moral questions</td>
<td>26**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss relations with my family or friends</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss information on different jobs</td>
<td>28**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording of Item</td>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Absolute Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss my personality and personal problems</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the purposes and goals of living</td>
<td>30**</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level in the predicted direction.

x Clients say they want it more often than counselors did it.

y Clients say they want it less often. 

aThis item was also part of Area 2.
of each item and the results pertaining to it. In the column marked "Prediction," x indicates that clients were predicted to want the action more often than counselors did it; y indicates the reverse. The "Results" column indicates the number of clients, for each item, whose want-got differences were in the x and y categories. When the number in one category exceeded that in the other in the predicted direction, asterisks following the item number indicate this.

As much as possible, Table 8 breaks items into the four areas of predicted client preference (p. 7). Some items, however, were thought of as having "loadings" on more than one arm-chair factor. The four areas of predicted preference were (1) for counselors to do more decision-making and advice-giving, (2) for counselors to use techniques involving more "lead," (3) for more of a "friendly equal" than an "efficient superior" counselor role, and (4) for less concern with "mental hygiene" problems and more concern with vocational matters and "college routine." For identification in Table 8, we shall label these areas: (1) "More directive," (2) "More leading techniques," (3) "Friendly equal," and (4) "Discussion topics."

Area 1 (Items 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 14, 17) showed results in predicted directions for all items except 4. Area 2 (Items 2, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16) showed results in pre-
dicted directions for all items. Area 3 (Items 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21) showed results in predicted directions for six of the eleven items (3, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 21). Area 4 (Items 23 through 30) showed results in predicted directions for all items except 27 and 29.

Pohlman and Robinson (1960) weighted client ratings and averaged all weights on a given item, to get a composite picture of how much subjects would like or dislike each of 92 possible events in counseling. After collecting data in this study, we decided to follow a similar procedure to secure a composite picture of client preference on each item. Each post-counseling item rating was given an arbitrary weight from 0 for "almost never" to 4 for "almost always." Weights for all client ratings on a given item were then averaged; the mean for each item is given under the heading "Absolute Means" in Table 8.

The difference between these means and other material in Table 8 may be clarified by looking at two items, 3 and 26. For both, there was a tendency as predicted, significant at the .01 level, for clients to want the behavior to occur more often than it did. But did clients want these actions to occur frequently or rarely? The absolute mean of 3.9 for item 3 indicates that clients wanted this to happen often; the absolute mean of 0.9 for item 26 indicates that clients wanted
this to happen comparatively rarely. Some of the conclusions to be drawn from these absolute means will be presented in the discussion section.

**Results Pertaining to H 3**

H 3 stated: Client/pre/want—client/post/want D-scores will be significantly larger than control/pre/want—control/post/want D-scores. This was saying in effect that the over-all change in client preferences would be significantly greater than the over-all change in control preferences during the period when counseling occurred.

Table 9 presents the results pertaining to this hypothesis. The Mann-Whitney U Test indicated a difference in the predicted direction, significant at the .001 level. Thus H 3 is supported. In every case where the U Test was used, as a guide to the reader, we have presented means of scores in the tables involved, even though the mean was not crucial to the execution of the statistical test.

Over-all changes in client preferences, the subject of H 3, might have been attained with clients changing their preferences in consistent ways for given items, or with some client preferences shifting in one way on a given item and some shifting in exactly the opposite
### TABLE 9

U-Test for the Significance of the Difference in Changes of Clients' and Controls' Expressed Preferences During the Period of Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total of pre/want--post/want D-scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean of pre/want--post/want D-scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of U 1771.5*

*Significant at the .001 level.
direction. The next hypothesis predicted the former of these two possibilities.

Results Pertaining to H 4

H 4 stated: There will be significant item differences between client/pre/want and client/post/want statements, in consistent directions for particular items. This is saying in effect that there would be group trends in preference changes about specific items over the period of counseling. On 9 items, clients showed consistent changes significant at the .05 level or less, 6 of these also being significant at the .01 level. Thus the hypothesis was supported in part. There were significant item differences between client/pre/want and client/post/want statements, in consistent directions for particular items.

Table 10 presents the results pertaining to H 4. The hypothesis was not stated in terms of a comparison between client and control changes on given items. It was decided after the collection of the data, however, that it would be useful to know whether controls also showed consistencies in changes in preferences about particular items. This material is therefore included in Table 10.

Controls showed 3 consistent changes significant at the .05 level or lower, one of which was also signifi-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wording of Item</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me what he thinks I should do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat what I have just said, in the same or other words</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand what I am saying</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me make the decisions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and like me to the same extent no matter what I tell him</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.012**</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.012**</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me do the talking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.008**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be friendly and kind</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give an opinion of his own, different from one I expressed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.022*</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a personal interest in my problems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording of Item</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be strictly business-like; counseling me is just a job</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express approval when I have done well</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to his own experiences, life, problems</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me introduce new topics for discussion, instead of introducing them himself</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express confidence in me</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer questions by asking other questions of me, such as &quot;What do you think?&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let me know what he thinks is morally right or wrong for me to do</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.004**</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act like just another human being, instead of an &quot;expert&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let me know what we are trying to do</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording of Item</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More^a Less^b Level</td>
<td>More^a Less^b Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel free to express any idea or discuss any topic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>12 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand my true feeling</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8 4</td>
<td>7 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seem sure of himself</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>7 17 .064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss better study habits for me</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17 7</td>
<td>.064 20 10 .098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss effective use of my time</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16 9</td>
<td>25 11 .02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss what type of job would be best for me</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13 8</td>
<td>19 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss religious or moral questions</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17 5</td>
<td>.016* 20 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss relations with my family or friends</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5 14</td>
<td>.064 21 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss information on different jobs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15 5</td>
<td>.042* 11 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording of Item</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More^a</td>
<td>Less^b Level</td>
<td>More^a</td>
<td>Less^b Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss my personality and personal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the purposes and goals of living</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25 .072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aSignificant at the .05 level.  **^bSignificant at the .01 level.

^aNumber of ratings which changed during the period of counseling towards wanting the counselor behavior in question to occur more frequently.

^bNumber of ratings which changed in the opposite direction.
cant at the .01 level. Thus we have clients making shifts significant at the .05 level on 9 items, and controls doing so on 3. H 4 is supported in part.

Results Pertaining to H 5

H 5 stated: Client/pre/want--client/post/got D-scores will be significantly larger than client/post/want--client/post/got D-scores. This said in effect that, after counseling, clients would state preferences which were closer to reported counselor behaviors than were the preferences stated before counseling. Results pertaining to this hypothesis are tabulated in the first row of Table 11. The prediction was supported at the .001 level of probability.

Results Pertaining to H 6

H 6 stated that client/post/want--client/post/got D-scores would be significantly larger than Co/post/want--Co/post/got D-scores. This said in effect that clients would feel a bigger disparity than counselors would realize between what happens in counseling and what clients would like to have happened. The size of the D-scores for these two groups is presented in the second row of Table 11. Differences were in the reverse of the predicted direction. Thus the hypothesis is rejected.
### TABLE 11

Mann-Whitney U Test for the Significance of Group Differences Between Members of Three Pairs of D-scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis No.</th>
<th>Measures being compared</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total of D-scores</th>
<th>Mean of D-scores</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Client/post/want—Client/post/got</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/pre/want—Client/post/got</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>1054*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Co/post/want—Co/post/got</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/post/want—Client/post/got</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Client/post/got—Co/post/got</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>27.87</td>
<td>511b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client/post/want—Co/post/want</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>29.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* In each case the prediction was that the upper of the two means would be smaller. Only in the two cases where this was true were the statistical tests carried out.

*Significant at the .001 level. *b*Not significant at the .10 level.
Results Pertaining to H 7

H 7 stated: Client/post/want--Co/post/want D-scores will be significantly larger than client/post/got--Co/post/got D-scores. This said in effect that it would be easier for clients and counselors to agree about what happened than for counselors to estimate what clients would have liked in counseling. Results pertaining to this hypothesis are tabulated in the third row of Table 11. The trend of results was in the predicted direction, but the difference was not significant at even the .10 level. Thus H 7 is not supported.

Results Pertaining to H 8

H 8 stated that there would be significant positive relationships between clients' and counselors' ratings of the successfulness of the interviews. Table 12 presents the data pertaining to this hypothesis, as prepared for the Chi-squared test. The statistical test itself was unnecessary because the observed frequency in each of the cells was almost exactly that which would have been the expected frequency by chance. Thus H 8 is rejected. There was virtually no relationship between clients' and counselors' ratings of the successfulness of the interviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Ratings</th>
<th>Upper &quot;half&quot; (Ratings 1, 2 &amp; 3)</th>
<th>Lower &quot;half&quot; (Ratings 3 on)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 9</td>
<td>o 8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e 9</td>
<td>e 8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.0 \] Not significant
Results Pertaining to H 9

H 9 stated that clients would rate the success of the counseling experience significantly higher than would counselors involved in rating the same interviews. Virtually no raters used ratings 6 or 7, so that the 2 x 3 Chi-squared originally planned was shortened to a 2 x 2 Chi-squared. This is presented as Table 13. The statistic compared the total number of 1 and 2 ratings given by counselors with the total number given by clients; and the total number of all other ratings given by counselors with those given by clients. The results were in the predicted direction, and the Chi-squared value was significant at the .05 level. Thus H 9 is supported. Clients did rate the success of the counseling experience significantly higher than did the counselors who rated the same interviews.

Results Pertaining to H 10

H 10 stated that client/post/want—client/post/got D-scores for all women would be significantly larger than those for all men. This said in effect that women would express greater dissatisfaction with what their counselors did. The results pertaining to this hypothesis are tabulated in Table 14. The Mann-Whitney U Test was not made since the results were in the reverse of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings 1 and 2</th>
<th>Counselor Ratings</th>
<th>Client Ratings</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 9</td>
<td>o 16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e 12.5</td>
<td>e 12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings 3 and on</td>
<td>o 21</td>
<td>o 14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e 17.5</td>
<td>e 17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 3.4$ Significant at .01 level, using one-tailed test
### TABLE 14

U-Test for the Significance of the Differences Between D-scores of Sex Groups in Reports of Counselor Adherence to Client Preference for Counselor Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total of Client/post/want-- Client/post/got D-scores</th>
<th>Mean of Client/post/want-- Client/post/got D-scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>343</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The prediction was that the upper of the two means would be smaller. Since this was obviously not the finding, the U-test was never carried out.*
predicted direction. Thus H 10 is not supported, and the null hypothesis is retained.

After the completion of the study, it occurred to us that perhaps H 10 would have been tested better if sex of counselor were held constant. Therefore clients were broken down into two groups: those counseled by men and those counseled by women. For each group, the procedure used to test H 10 was repeated. In other words, in each group, the client/post/want—client/post/got D-scores for men clients were compared with the scores for women clients. The results of this comparison are presented in Table 15. It was felt that differences in means were in each case so slight that they were certainly non-significant with the small numbers involved. No statistical test was carried out, and it was concluded that there is no evidence for greater annoyability of either client sex group.

Results Pertaining to Hypothesis 11

H 11 stated: Smaller Co/post/want--client/post/want D-scores will be associated with greater judged "success." This said in effect that counselor ability to judge what clients want in counseling is associated with such greater judged "success." This hypothesis is in reality six sub-hypotheses, tested out against the very same criteria used in testing H 1. Again the pre-
TABLE 15

Differences Between Client/post/want—client/post/got
D-scores of Client Sex Groups, Broken Down by Sex of Counselor

| Sex of Counselor | Male Clients | | Female Clients | |
|------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|
|                  | Total D-scores | N | Mean | Total D-scores | N | Mean |
| Male             | 250 | 15 | 16.66 | 149 | 9 | 16.5 |
| Female           | 119 | 6 | 19.8 | 150 | 7 | 21.4 |
diction was that smaller D-scores—this time representing closer agreement between client and counselor on what the client would have liked—would be associated with greater "success." H 11 received partial, although not complete, support. Measures 1, 2, and 3 showed non-significant trends in the predicted direction; measures 4, 5, and 6 showed trends in the predicted direction, significant at the .05 level or lower.

The results pertaining to this hypothesis are presented in Tables 16 through 18. Table 16 presents the data involving counselor and client ratings of "success." In neither case did the size of F approach significance. Table 17 gives the data involving counselor rankings of "success." Neither the change from ranks 1 to 2 nor the change from ranks 2 to 3 was significant.

Table 18 presents the data involving a comparison of D-scores with the three sets of criteria based on judgment by the supervisor. All three of these measures showed differences in the predicted direction, significant at the .05 level or less. In the last two measures, differences were also significant at the .01 level.

Two additional questions arose after the gathering of the data. One was about the extent of agreement between clients and counselors in their judgments of how nearly counselors were meeting client preferences. Item post/want—post/got ratings of 15 client instruments
### TABLE 16

One Way Analysis of Variance to Compare Clients' and Counselors' Ratings of "Success" with Measures of Counselor Perception of Client Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co/post/want--</th>
<th>Co/post/want--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client/post/want</td>
<td>Client/post/want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-scores associated with Client Ratings (Measure #1)</td>
<td>D-scores associated with Counselor Ratings (Measure #2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| "1" Rating<sup>a</sup> | 6 | 31.7 | 1 | 24.0 |
| "2" Rating | 10 | 29.0 | 8 | 28.6 |
| "3" Rating | 10 | 30.9 | 8 | 27.5 |
| "4" Rating | 2 | 23.5 | 10 | 32.0 |
| "5" Rating<sup>b</sup> | 2 | 31.0 | 3 | 35.0 |

Estimate of sigma 8.15

F 0.68<sup>c</sup>

*The test was not carried out in the case where there appeared to be little observed difference between the means.

<sup>a</sup> A "1" Rating is the highest of the seven possible ratings of "success" (see Appendix II).

<sup>b</sup> No rating larger than 5 was made.

<sup>c</sup> This amount does not approach significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Changes in D-scores from ranks 1 to 2</th>
<th>Changes in D-scores from ranks 2 to 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of increases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of decreases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number no change</td>
<td>(Not counted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of significance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if trend was noticeably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the predicted direction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Mann trend test was originally planned for this data; for reasons discussed in the text the binomial test seemed to give greater precision.*
### TABLE 1g

**t Test for the Differences Between Means of Client/post/want—Co/post/want D-scores of the Upper and Lower Halves of Supervisor Rankings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Measure Number</th>
<th>Type of Measure</th>
<th>Mean D-score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;More successful&quot;* vs. &quot;less successful&quot; interview series—first half of quarter</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;More successful&quot; vs. &quot;less successful&quot; interview series—last half of quarter</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;More effective&quot; vs. &quot;less effective&quot; counselors' clients</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The prediction in each case is that the upper of the two means will be significantly smaller.

**Significant at the .05 level.  ***Significant at the .01 level.
were correlated with corresponding item ratings from instruments of these clients' counselors. The Pearsonian correlation coefficient was .09. This is just at the .05 level of probability with the N of 450 pairs of item ratings.

A second question was whether greater movement of a client's preference toward his counselor's actions was associated with greater judged success. Client/post/want—client/post/got D-scores were subtracted from client/pre/want—client/post/got D-scores for each client, with larger remainders taken to represent greater movement toward perceived counselor actions. These scores were then compared against the same six criteria used to test H 1 and H 11. None of the statistical tests computed yielded significant results. The comparison involving Measure #3, counselor rankings, was tested by the Binomial test. The other five comparisons were tested by the Chi-squared test. In each of these five cases scores were ranked and an attempt was made to see whether there was an association between higher scores (indicating greater movement of client preference toward perceived counselor actions) and higher "success" judgments. One of the six criteria, client ratings, showed a significant trend in the predicted direction. This material is presented in Table 19. Thus preferences of clients who rated their interview series as having been more "successful" tended
TABLE 19

Chi-squared Test for the Relationship of Client Preference Movement Toward Counselor Practice and Client "Success" Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ratings 1 and 2</th>
<th>Ratings 3 and on</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper half of Scores</td>
<td>0 13</td>
<td>o 4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicating Preference Movement</td>
<td>e 9.5</td>
<td>e 7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower half of Scores</td>
<td>0 6</td>
<td>o 11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicating Preference Movement</td>
<td>e 9.5</td>
<td>e 7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.84 \] Significant at .05 level, using two-tailed test
to show greater movement toward perceived counselor actions.

Discussion

Differing Viewpoints of Clients, Counselors, and Observers

One theme that pervades many of the findings is the disparity between client and counselor viewpoints. Clients and counselors did not agree at all on whether a counselor was doing a particular action as often, more often, or less often than the client wanted. This is shown by the near-zero correlation of counselor and client item want-got scores, reported above.

Clients and counselors did not agree at all on the "success" of interviews (H 8). H 8 was not tested by computing a correlation or other measure that would have required agreement on the finer shades of judgment. The Chi-squared test involved only a division into the upper and lower halves of ratings made by each group.

We view these two findings as examples of a pervasive difference between client and counselor views. But when one client and one counselor rated the same situation, there is no proof that a disparity between their ratings was due to differences between clients as clients and counselors as counselors. The disparity might have been due instead to inter-rater unreliability,
which would have been equally noticeable between different clients, or between different counselors.

This difficulty is not found in interpreting the results pertaining to $H_2$ or $H_9$. As predicted, the group of clients tended to rate the "success" of counseling significantly higher than did the group of counselors ($H_9$). A contrast between client and counselor thinking is implied. Results pertaining to $H_2$ also indicated group differences between clients and counselors. The testing of the prediction for each item depended upon the agreement between various clients about whether their counselors had done the item more often (or less often) than clients wanted. Clients agreed significantly on 24 of the 30 items, although on two of these the trend was in the direction opposite to that predicted. Again, a contrast between client and counselor thinking is implied.

Differences between client, counselor, and supervisor viewpoints are listed below as one of the possible reasons for the failure to get significant results for $H_1$. If this interpretation is correct, then the results for $H_1$ can be cited as one more illustration of differences in viewpoints.

Others have found evidence of differences between the vantage points of various observers of counseling. (1) Poole (1957) found counselors and non-participating judges had different judgments of what happened in
sessions with clients. (2) Other studies have found differences between counselors and clients in their judgments of success and in various measures of change (Cartwright and Roth, 1957; Gibson, Snyder, and Ray, 1955; Nichols and Beck, 1960; Richardson, 1954). Cartwright (1957b) and his colleagues were sufficiently concerned over these and other difficulties in securing measures of change that they decided to postpone certain other studies. Instead, Cartwright announced, they would try to identify certain "substantive change factors"—measures of change in counseling that were not limited to a particular class of observers or instruments.

(3) Differences between clients and counselors in their preferences and expectancies have been substantiated by many studies, which were in part reviewed in Chapter I.

Client-counselor differences have been widely encountered. How are they to be understood? Patterson (1958) has attempted to sketch some cultural factors that may be responsible for at least some of the client-counselor differences. Since supervisors are also counselors by training and profession, supervisors and counselors might be expected to have similar views. Yet the contrast between the role of teacher and student, and between participating in counseling and observing it, might generate definite differences in views.

Pepinsky and Pepinsky (1960) and Pepinsky, Pepinsky,
and Pavlik (1958) have thought in terms of a "task" set out for an "actor" by a "task setter," who eventually evaluates the actor's performance. These publications discuss three views of the task, those of (a) the actor to whom it is assigned, (b) the task setter who assigns it, and (c) an observer. Presumably when these views of the task are markedly different, judgments of the degree of success with which the task has been carried out will also be different.

In our study, the supervisor may be thought of as the task setter, with conceptions of the task that are different from those of the counselor or actor. Varying conceptions of the task would lead to varying criteria for evaluation, and to varying estimates of "success."

Trends in Differences between Client and Counselor Views

What are some of the patterns in the differing views of clients and counselors?

Higher client "success" judgments. One finding, noted above, is that clients rated the "success" of the counseling experience significantly higher than did their counselors (H 9). This may have been because counselors tended to rate somewhat low, because clients tended to rate somewhat high, or both.

If counselors tended to rate low, perhaps we are seeing here an indication of the feelings of inadequacy
as counselors that frequently plague those in training for this activity. It may be that when counselors are in practica, under careful supervision, the tendency to such feelings is particularly strong. The results pertaining to another hypothesis, H6, suggest that clients were not more critical of counselors than were counselors of themselves.

Clients may have had an exaggerated idea of the success of the counseling experience. Their ratings may reflect a feeling that, after spending a good bit of time in interviews, something surely must have happened. Their ratings might be seen as a manifestation of what has been called a "flight into health" following counseling.

**Client-counselor differences on H2.** Some other patterns in the differences between client and counselor views showed up in the results of H2.

1) Clients did want a more directive, advice-giving, guiding counselor than they got; and they wanted more use of counselor techniques which involved greater counselor leading. These conclusions are supported by all but one of the items involved; they are in keeping with findings reviewed in Chapter I.

2) There was some evidence that clients wanted more of a friendly, warm fellow-human for a counselor. This predicted pattern was supported on 6 of the 11 items involved. Most clients showed little difference between
"want" and "got" ratings on the remaining 5 items. On these last items, did clients want a "warm-friendly-human" counselor, and find one? Or did clients find counselors to be impersonal and expert, but prefer this? The "absolute means" of clients' post-counseling "want" ratings are presented in Table 8. An examination of the absolute means of the items in question suggests that clients do want a "warm-human-friendly" counselor.

3) H 2 also predicted that clients would want to discuss "college routine" and vocational planning problems more often than counselors did, but that they would want to spend less time discussing adjustment or mental hygiene type matters. Instead, clients indicated they wanted to talk about everything—including these more personal issues—more often than they had been able to. Thus we are robbed of the distinctive contrast in the prediction that clients would want to discuss certain things more and others less.

Perhaps the beginning counselors spent too much time in making light conversation or were unable to focus on problems as effectively as they might, and hence covered less material than they should. Yet in general it would seem that counselors could spend more time discussing certain of these areas only if they spent less time in discussing others. A survey of the results concerning these eight items shows that almost no students
wanted any area to be discussed less often. It would almost seem that a sort of general set affected the answers to these eight questions. Perhaps clients, with the feeling that counselors somehow should have "done more" for them, were simply saying that the counselor should have spent more time discussing every area.

It is clear that the trends in answering items 27 and 29 were not random occurrences. (1) There was a low probability associated with the statistical tests in each case, although in the table we have not starred these two items because the difference was in the direction opposite to that predicted. (2) In the pilot study, these two items elicited exactly the same reaction as they did in the final study.

We find some difficulty in harmonizing these findings with those of Bordin (1955) and Warman (1958) summarized earlier. Possible explanations include (1) the general set mentioned above and (2) a possible failure of our items 27 and 29 to convey adequately the "mental hygiene" approach with which counselors often handle such areas. In the comparison of the present study with Warman's study, additional possible explanations include (1) differences in the wording and context of the items used; (2) the fact that his were experienced, and ours beginning, counselors; and (3) the fact that some of Warman's results were based on client opinions
as expressed before counseling, while our H 2 was based on post-counseling ratings.

Differences despite preference change. Consistent differences in the preferences of clients, as contrasted with the actions of counselors, remained at the end of counseling. As predicted, there were significant changes in client preferences during counseling (H 3, H 4, and H 5). But when all this changing had taken place, client-counselor differences remained. Two other aspects of the change in preference are noteworthy: (1) the consistencies in the group in the directions of change and (2) the question of whether change was toward counselor action or away from it.

This last-mentioned question prompted H 5, which predicted a client preference change toward counselor action. The hypothesis was supported; but it dealt only with the total change on all items combined. Another approach to this question involves the nine items on which there were significant group shifts during counseling (H 4). One can compare the direction of these shifts with the direction of post-counseling "want-got" differences under H 2. This comparison suggests that most of the shifts in client preference on these items were away from counselor action. Where an item was "wanted" more often than it was "got," under H 2, the shift tended to be toward wanting the item more often--
suggesting that post-counseling want-got differences were even larger than pre/want-post/got differences on these nine items.

Thus the present study does not indicate clearly whether client preferences change toward being more like counselor preferences during counseling. There is extensive evidence of client-counselor difference in viewpoints.

Discussion of H 1

Have the negative results of H 1 given any evidence that counselor adherence to client preference is not related to the judged "success" of counseling? The failure to reject the null hypothesis does not constitute proof of it. Among possible reasons why H 1 might not have been supported, even though correct, are the following: (1) pervasive differences in the viewpoints of clients, counselors, and the supervisor-teacher; (2) the presence of other independent variables; (3) insensitivity of the instruments used.

Evidence that various participants in counseling had differing viewpoints has been presented in the preceding sections. In 14 of the 18 sub-tests of H 1, difference scores supplied by one type of raters were compared with "success" judgments provided by another type of raters (Table 7). An example would be client/
pre/want--client/post/want D-scores compared with counselor or supervisor "success" judgments. A relationship of the predicted type might have been obscured by widely differing vantage points of clients, counselors, and the teacher-supervisor. This explanation would not account for negative results on the other four sub-tests, where D-scores and "success" judgments were supplied by the same person. But (1) the one statistical test which showed the results predicted was in this group of four sub-tests, and (2) some non-significant trends in the predicted direction were also found in this group.

Another possible explanation for the H 1 results is the presence of other powerful independent variables. Certainly many factors other than counselor adherence to client preference would determine the "success" of counseling and thereby affect judgments of "success." It was assumed that these would operate randomly; yet we have no evidence that this was so. If they did not, this could have obscured a relationship of the type that H 1 predicted.

One or both of the major types of instruments used in the present study may not have been sufficiently sensitive. Some reliability has been demonstrated. But it is still possible, for example, that the instruments had somewhat idiosyncratic meanings for each individual.

There is some evidence that the instruments used
were not interpreted in a completely idiosyncratic fashion by different raters. In H11, exactly the same criteria were used as in H1. These criteria were matched against D-scores. The D-scores for H11 were different in meaning from those in H1, and had the additional complication being based upon ratings by different individuals—the client and counselor. If these measures were sensitive enough to pick up a predicted relationship in H11, it would seem that the measure of H1 should have been sensitive enough to do so. In the case of H11, three of the six measures showed statistically significant differences, and the other three showed non-significant trends in the predicted direction. In the light of this comparison, it seems hard to attribute the results surrounding H1 solely to an insensitivity of the instruments employed. There is also some suggestion in the results pertaining to H11 that differences in vantage points of clients and counselors may not have been completely responsible for the negative results found in H1.

A further argument in support of the instruments used may be made by a comparison with the results of H2. The direction of differences between client preferences and counselor actions was successfully predicted for 22 of the 30 items. This would suggest that the instrument upon which D-scores were based was
measuring something other than the vagaries of chance or client whims of the moment.

Three factors have been suggested which might have led to negative results for H₁ even though a relationship of the predicted type "really" existed. Also, (1) perhaps this relationship did not exist in our setting, but might still exist elsewhere, possibly when experienced counselors were involved. And (2) it is possible that no relationship exists between counselor adherence to client preference and the immediate criteria we used (judgments of "success"), but that one might be shown when long-range criteria were employed. In view of these possibilities, it seems unwarranted to conclude from the H₁ results that counselor adherence to client preference is not related to judgments of "success," or (more broadly) to counseling outcome. Further research is needed.

Further Studies

Findings pertaining to H₁ might be made the basis for a hypothesis that counselor adherence to client preference is not related to counseling outcome. This would agree with results of Danskin (1955), which were also labelled as primarily suggestive of a hypothesis for further testing. Another approach would be to maintain, in keeping with findings of Biddle (1958), that
there is a relationship of the type predicted in H 1, and to keep looking for it with different measures and settings. Before undertaking such studies, consideration should be given to the possibility, discussed above, that powerful independent variables not carefully matched or randomized might affect outcome measures in a way to obscure any existing relationship.

Other measures of outcome, possibly delayed for some time after counseling, might be used. Other measures of the degree of counselor adherence to client preference might prove valuable. These might involve less of a variety of client preferences than did the present study, where preferences about discussion areas, specific techniques, and general counselor roles were all lumped together and weighted equally. Trained raters might also rate the degree of counselor adherence to client preference, while observing interviews, listening to tapes, or reading typecripts (Danskin, 1955). The danger here is that observers or readers might have trouble knowing what the client would prefer, and whether the client felt the counselor was meeting his preference on any given point. Another interesting question is whether the shift in client preference, which seems to occur during counseling (H 3 and H 4), was towards or away from counselor preference.
Discussion of Results Pertaining to the Peripheral Hypotheses

H_6. There was no support for the prediction that clients would feel a bigger disparity than counselors would realize between counselor action and client preference. Other results (H 2) suggest that clients were not bashful about saying when counselors did not adhere to their preferences. Results of H 6 indicate that counselors were critically aware of disparities between what they were doing and what clients wanted. This may fit with findings for H 9, where clients rated the "success" of counseling significantly higher than counselors. Seemingly, clients are not more critical of counselors than are counselors of themselves.

H_7. There was no support for the prediction that it would be easier for clients and counselors to agree about what happened than for counselors to estimate what clients would have liked in counseling. The N of 60 was sufficiently large that we cannot blame lack of significant results primarily on small numbers. The instrument on which the calculations were based was originally designed to measure differences between two ratings by the same rater; the present hypothesis involves differences between ratings by two different raters, the client and the counselor. Yet this same difficulty was present in the
methodology of H 11, the results of which were in the predicted direction.

H 8 and H 9. Earlier in the chapter there was a discussion of results pertaining to H 8 (p. 101) and H 9 (pp. 102, 104, 105).

H 10. Pohlman and Robinson (1960), reviewing their own study and the studies of Cason (1930) and Conrad and Jones (1942), began to entertain the possibility of a rather widespread factor of greater female annoyability or irritability. The present hypothesis was a check on this idea, in a situation where subjects had actually been counseled before expressing their opinions. The results pertaining to H 10 do not indicate greater feminine annoyability when counseling has occurred. When the comparison was refined by considering clients who had seen male and female counselors as separate groups, there was still no indication that either client sex group was more annoyable.

H 11. There is some evidence from the results pertaining to H 11 that some sort of counselor skill manifested in filling in our instruments is associated with greater success as judged by the supervisor. This counselor skill might be called empathic ability or described as an adeptness in perceiving the emotions of others. In keeping with the discussion of Cronbach (1955), however, it is possible to interpret in other
ways the counselor skill which \textit{H} required. These interpretations are much more closely linked to methods of filling in instruments. Recently, Cronbach (1958) has questioned the whole procedure of using difference scores to measure adeptness in perceiving others.

\textbf{Summary of Chapter III}

Results of the present study were given in the first half of this chapter; they will be summarized in Chapter IV. It was felt that there were indications of pervasive differences between the viewpoints of clients, counselors, and non-participating observers. Ways of interpreting various findings, particularly those for the central hypothesis, were discussed; there was also a discussion of some possible areas for future research.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

(1) Is there a significant positive relationship between (a) counselor adherence to client preference for counselor actions and (b) the judged "success" of counseling? (2) What changes in client preference occur during the period of counseling? (3) After counseling, are counselor actions seen by clients as having deviated from their preferences?

Answers to these major questions were sought in a study involving 38 clients from a "how-to-study" course and 11 counselors from an introductory practicum in counseling. After counseling, clients and counselors indicated how often clients would like counselors to do 30 things, and how often counselors had done them. Clients had also answered the first question before counseling.

From these ratings, three estimates of the difference between what a client wanted the counselor to do, and what he did, were made for each interview series: post-counseling estimates by (1) the client and (2) the counselor, and (3) an estimate based on client pre-counseling preferences and post-counseling statements of preferences.
what counselors did. Within any given type of difference score, the prediction was that smaller scores (representing greater adherence to client preference) would be associated with greater judged "success." Judgments of "success" were secured from clients, counselors, and the teacher-supervisor of the practicum.

Summary of Findings

Major Hypotheses

H 1 is not supported. The extent of counselor adherence to client preference for counselor behavior was not positively related to judgments of the "success" of counseling.

H 2 is accepted. There were significant item differences between client post-counseling statements of what they would like counselors to do, and of what their counselors did, consistent in predicted directions. Differences significant at the .05 level or lower were found on 22 of the 30 items.

H 3 is accepted. The over-all change in client preferences was significantly greater than the over-all change in control preferences during the period when counseling occurred.

H 4 is accepted in part. There were nine significant group trends in client preference changes about
specific items during counseling. Controls showed only three such changes.

H 5 is accepted. Results may be interpreted to mean that, after the period of counseling, clients stated preferences which were closer to reported counselor behaviors than were the preferences stated before counseling. Some misgivings about the interpretation of the material in this way were expressed.

Peripheral Hypotheses

H 6 is rejected. There was no evidence that clients expressed a bigger disparity than counselors realized between what happened in counseling and what they would like to have had happen.

H 7 is rejected. There was no evidence that it was easier for clients and counselors to agree about what happened than it was for counselors to estimate what clients would have liked in counseling.

H 8 is rejected. There was no evidence that the property of being rated in the upper half of client "success" ratings was related to the property of being rated in the upper half of counselor ratings.

H 9 is accepted. Clients rated the success of the counseling experience significantly higher than did counselors involved in rating the same interviews.

H 10 is rejected. Women did not express greater
dissatisfaction than men with what their counselors did.

H11 is accepted in part. Difference scores indicating greater agreement between client and counselor about what the client would like the counselor to have done were associated with greater judged "success" on three of the six criterion measures used.

Conclusions

The present study yielded no evidence of a relationship between (1) the degree of counselor adherence to client preference for counselor actions and (2) the judged "success" of counseling, although the hypothesis may not have been adequately tested. Further studies involving other measures of outcome and of counselor adherence to client preference might prove valuable.

There is some support for several conclusions:
(1) During counseling, there are significant changes in client preferences, including some consistent group changes on particular issues. (2) After counseling, there are still definite differences between client reports of their preferences and of what counselors did. Group consistencies in these "want-got" differences are present on specific questions, in patterns which seem predictable. (3) Clients want counselors to be more advice-giving and directive, and to use techniques in keeping with this general approach. (4) Clients want
less of an efficient, impersonal "expert" than a friendly fellow-human with a personal interest in them. (5) Clients and counselors see things from different vantage points. No agreement was found on ratings of "success," nor on ratings of whether a counselor did a given thing more often, less often, or as often as the client wanted it done.

A somewhat over-simplified summing up might be that clients did not like many of the things counselors did, despite some changes in their preferences during counseling; but that there was no evidence that client preferences make any difference in counseling outcome anyway.
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX I

Pre-counseling "Want" Measure, given to Clients and Control Students

STUDENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

One of the features of Psychology 411 is that some students can arrange a series of appointments with counselors during the quarter. Whether you are or are not planning to see a counselor this quarter, you can be of definite help to us in some research we are doing. We are interested in students' feelings about some things that counselors sometimes do in counseling, and would like to know how you feel.

What you say here will never be revealed to your counselor (if you see one this quarter) or to your teacher. This will not influence your grade. It is not a test of intelligence or personality. This is simply some research to see how people feel about the things mentioned below.

Listed below you will find a number of things which counselors sometimes do. For each one, please tell how often you would like a counselor to do the thing mentioned. For example, look at this sample item:

Call me by my first name

How often would you like a counselor to do this? You may mark your answer in one of the five boxes given.

If you would like him to do it almost always, mark the box under those words—

If you would like him to do it frequently, mark that box—

If you would like him to do it sometimes, mark that box—

If you would like him to do it seldom, mark that box—

If you would like him to do it almost never, mark that box—

You may have some difficulty in deciding how to answer an item, perhaps because you have never seen a counselor. But we are interested only in how you feel, so simply answer every item with your best judgement. Please do not leave any item blank but answer every item to the best of your ability. Thank you; you may go on to the next page.
APPENDIX I (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me what he thinks I should do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat what I have just said, in the same or other words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand what I am saying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me make the decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and like me to the same extent no matter what I tell him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me do the talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be friendly and kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give an opinion of his own, different from one I expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a personal interest in my problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be strictly business-like; counseling me is just a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express approval when I have done well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to his own experiences, life, problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me introduce new topics for discussion, instead of introducing him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express confidence in me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answer questions by asking other questions of me, such as

- "What do you think?"
- Let me know what he thinks is morally right or wrong for me to do.
- Act like just another human being, instead of an "expert."
- Let me know what we are trying to do.
- Make me feel free to express any idea or discuss any topic.
- Understand my true feeling.
- Seem sure of himself.

Discuss better study habits for me.
Discuss effective use of my time.
Discuss what type of job would be best for me.
Discuss religious or moral questions.
Discuss relations with my family or friends.
Discuss information on different jobs.
Discuss my personality and personal problems.
Discuss the purposes and goals of living.

Aside from the counselor in your college office, have you ever seen a counselor since you began college? Yes  No
Your class meets
Date of your birth
Month  Day  Year

Thank you for helping us. You should have 30 boxes checked and answered three questions above, including date of your birth—NOT today's date. We will be asking for your help again later on in the quarter. Thank you!
APPENDIX II

Instruction sheet for Post-counseling "Want" Measure, given to Control Students*

STUDENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

ONLY FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE NOT SEEN A COUNSELOR DURING THE QUARTER

At the beginning of the quarter you helped us by giving your reactions to some things that counselors sometimes do in counseling. We appreciated that help and want to thank you for it. We told you then that you could help us again at the end of the quarter. That time has come.

In the material below you may recognize some of the same questions you answered at the beginning of the quarter. Please answer them again. This may seem silly; we assure you it will be of definite help in the research being done.

What you say here will be known only to the one person doing this research; your teacher will never see your answers and of course they will not affect your grade. This is not a test of intelligence or personality. It is simply some research to see how people feel about the things mentioned below.

Listed below you will find a number of things which counselors sometimes do. For each one, please tell how often you would like a counselor to do the thing mentioned. For example, look at this sample item:

Call me by my first name

How often would you like a counselor to do this? You may mark your answer in one of the five boxes given.

If you would like him to do it almost always, mark the box under those words—
If you would like him to do it frequently, mark that box—
If you would like him to do it sometimes, mark that box—
If you would like him to do it seldom, mark that box—
If you would like him to do it almost never, mark that box—

You may have some difficulty in deciding how to answer an item, perhaps because you have never seen a counselor. But we are interested only in how you feel, so simply answer every item with your best judgement. Please do not leave any item blank but answer every item to the best of your ability.

Thank you; you may go on to the next page.
APPENDIX III
Post-counseling "Want" and "Got" Measure, given to Clients

REACTIONS TO COUNSELING

You have been seeing a counselor during the quarter. This makes you particularly valuable for the research we are doing. At the beginning of the quarter you gave your reactions to some things counselors sometimes do in counseling. Now that you have been seeing a counselor, we would appreciate your help again.

What you say here will not be given to your counselor, or to his or her supervisor (if any); it will not be known by or affect your counselor in any way. It will not be given to your teacher either, or affect your grade. This is not a test of intelligence or personality. It is simply some research to see how people feel about the things mentioned.

Listed below you will find a number of things which counselors sometimes do. This time, please indicate two things for each one: 1) Tell how often your counselor actually did the thing mentioned, and 2) Tell how often you would like a counselor (any counselor), ideally, to do the thing mentioned. Take this sample item:

Call me by my first name

You are to mark in one of the first five boxes on the right how often he (or she, whichever it was) actually did call you by your first name:

- If he did it almost always, mark the box in the first five which bears those words, like this-
- If he did it frequently, mark that box-
- If he did it sometimes, mark that box-
- If he did it seldom, mark that box-
- If he did it almost never, mark that box-

So the boxes in the left column are for how often your counselor actually did the thing mentioned; you are also to mark, in the boxes of the right hand column, how often you would like a counselor (any counselor) to do the thing:

- If you would like him to do it almost always, mark-
- If you would like him to do it frequently, mark-
- If you would like him to do it sometimes, mark-
- If you would like him to do it seldom, mark-
- If you would like him to do it almost never, mark-

For every item you should have two, and only two, marks: One for how often your counselor actually did the thing, and one for how often you would like a counselor to do it.

For any item, your two marks in the two columns might be under the same words, of course; or they might be in different places. Remember that "he" means "he or she".

You may have some difficulty in deciding how to answer an item. But we are interested only in how you feel, so simply answer every item with your best judgment. Please do not leave any item blank but answer every item to the best of your ability.

Thank you; you may go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often would you LIKE a counselor to do this?</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
<th>SOME TIMES</th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me what he thinks I should do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat what I have just said, in the same or other words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand what I am saying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me make the decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and like me to the same extent no matter what I tell him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me do the talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be friendly and kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give an opinion of his own, different from one I expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a personal interest in my problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be strictly business-like; counseling me is just a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express approval when I have done well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to his own experiences, life, problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have me introduce new topics for discussion, instead of introducing them himself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express confidence in me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III (Contd.)

Answer questions by asking other questions of me, such as "What do you think?"

Let me know what he thinks is morally right or wrong for me to do.

Act like just another human being, instead of an "expert".

Let me know what we are trying to do.

Make me feel free to express any idea or discuss any topic.

Understand my true feelings.

Seem sure of himself.

Discuss better study habits for me.

Discuss effective use of my time.

Discuss what type of job would be best for me.

Discuss religious or moral questions.

Discuss relations with my family or friends.

Discuss information on different jobs.

Discuss my personality and personal problems.

Discuss the purposes and ends of living.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actually</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
<th>OCCASIONALLY</th>
<th>ALMOST ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>OCCasionally</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
<th>ALMOST ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>OCCasionally</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How many counseling interviews did you have? One ☐ Two ☐ Three ☐

Thank you for helping us. You should have checked 30 boxes and answered the questions above. Please do NOT give today's date but your birth date. This is very important because we want to be able to match your answers now with the ones you gave at the beginning of the quarter. If you are a twin, please give first name.

Please turn to the next page...
APPENDIX IV

Client "Success" Rating Form

RESEARCH RATING FORM

Research is constantly being done to develop better ways of counseling. We are doing research of this type, and we need your help.

You have been seeing a counselor during this quarter in connection with Psychology 411. As a result you have an opinion which is very important in this research—an opinion as to the successfulness of your counseling experience. We would like you to express that opinion by making the rating requested on the next page.

Your rating will be of great help, and it will be kept completely confidential. I give you my word that I will never tell your counselor or teacher or anyone else what you put on this form. No one else will look at it. It will not be used in grading you; it will not be used in grading your counselor; it will not do you or your counselor any good or harm. We simply want your honest opinion and will use it only in research.

Please put the name of your counselor and the date of your birth on this first page. Then make your rating on the next page, and hand this in with the first page on top. No one will look at your rating and it will be handed to me.

Thank you for your help!

Hour your class meets ____ (signed) Edward Pohlman

Date of your birth _______ 19
Month Day Year

Your counselor's name ____________
Please rate the degree of successfulness of the counseling experience on the form below.

This is not to be a rating of how skillfully the counselor used various techniques or how well he conducted the interviews, although these may be part of the picture. We are not interested in a rating of how "good" the counselor was, for the success of the counseling experience involves many other factors as well. This is a rating, then, of the successfulness of the counseling experience as a whole.

Please use your own definition of "successful" in terms of whatever you feel success in counseling to be. This is to be your rating as you see it; it is not to be in terms of how your counselor or teacher or anyone else might see it.

Please express your rating by choosing the phrase in the list below which most nearly describes your feeling, and placing beside that phrase a check mark in the appropriate box. Please make one and only one mark.

IN THE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS SPENT TOGETHER, THIS COUNSELING EXPERIENCE WAS, I FEEL:

Extremely successful; it would be hard to imagine how it could have been any more successful

Highly successful, although there might have been a few ways in which it could have been slightly more successful

Definitely successful, even though in several ways it could have been more successful

Somewhat successful but in many ways it could have been more successful

Not too successful, but it was successful enough so that it was better than if no counseling had taken place

Unsuccessful; but it probably didn't do any more harm than it did good

So unsuccessful that it was worse than if no counseling had taken place
APPENDIX V

General Instructions to Counselors

PLEASE DO NOT EXAMINE THIS MATERIAL UNTIL AFTER YOUR LAST COUNSELING INTERVIEW

Dear 828A Counselor:

We are doing some research this quarter which has involved giving questionnaires to students, including your clients. Now that your actual counseling sessions are over, we would like your help in completing a vital part of the research.

This pack of material should take 30 to 40 minutes to complete. We don't think anyone will take over an hour, but if you should, record your excess time here _______ when you've finished, and we'll pay you extra. Our pay scale is low, however, and we ask for your help on other bases than big financial rewards.

We believe that answering these questions will be a truly constructive experience in your growth as a counselor; it is certainly essential for this piece of research. There are only 11 of you counselors and we need every one of you to help us. Many of you this quarter and other quarters have asked what 411 students want and expect from counseling, how they feel about it, etc.; results of this quarter's study will be made available as a whole (with no names involved) and should be of help to future 828A counselors as well as others.

We tried to avoid telling you much about this little study until now, simply because we did not want knowledge of it to affect your counseling in any way. We have assured your clients that their answers would not be given to their teachers, to you, or your supervisors. We give you a similar promise that your answers will be kept in complete confidence. The identity of any participant will be known only to one researcher who probably knows almost no one involved anyway.
You begin this game by selecting 3 clients, as follows: 2 of them should be the 2 to whom Dr. Smith listened for the largest number of interviews (presumably one during the 1st four weeks and one during the last four weeks of the quarter.) Of your remaining clients, take the one whom you have seen for the largest number of interviews as the third. In case of ties, take the client whose last name comes first in the alphabet. The next page will tell you what to do with these 3 names.

(Just for purity in research, please don't discuss your answers with anyone, and please complete each page before going on to the next one.) Have coffee and doughnuts on us.*

*A total of one dollar in coin was affixed to counselors' instruments.
APPENDIX VI

Counselor Checklist of Areas of Possible Client Movement

In what ways did these 3 clients change as a result of counseling? (This does not include changes resulting from class alone.) Down the left-hand side of this form, a number of areas of possible change are listed. Across the top of it, please write in the names of these 3 clients.

Now, each little box represents an area of possible change for a given client. If the first name you write in is "Mary Jones," then the top left-hand box (with the *) represents the possible change of Mary Jones in the area of study habits.

For each box we want your impression of the change which took place toward what you consider to be the optimal (ideal) level for this client in this area. We will call such change "improvement." Indicate your impression as follows:

- No noticeable improvement—leave box blank
- Noticeable, definite improvement—
  one check mark
- Great improvement, an unusual amount—
  two check marks

Please base this impression on the evidence you have from the interviews. Such evidence may lead you to think that improvement has occurred, when in reality none has; or improvement may have occurred of which you have no knowledge from the interviews. Don't worry about these possibilities; give your best impression on the basis of what was said and done in the interviews, and don't spend too much time or anxiety on this.
APPENDIX VI (Contd.)

Please write in names of your 3 clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>first names</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study habits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of time, or time scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of positive and negative statements about self (self-confidence expressed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight into own or others behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations to parents and authority figures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations to peers or friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational or curricular planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety or tension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality integration or functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII

Counselor "Success" Rating and Ranking Form

Please rate the degree of successfulness of the counseling experience for each of these three clients on the form below.

This is not to be a rating of how skillfully the counselor used various techniques or how well he conducted the interviews, although these may be part of the picture. We are not interested in a rating of how "good" the counselor was, for the success of the counseling experience involves many other factors as well. This is a rating, then, of the successfulness of the counseling experience as a whole.

Please use your own definition of "successful" in terms of whatever you feel success in counseling to be. This is to be your rating as you see it; it is not to be in terms of how your supervisor or the client in question might see it.

Please express your ratings by choosing for each client the phrase in the list below which most nearly describes your feeling, and placing beside that phrase one check mark under each client's name. Please make only one mark for each.
IN THE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS SPENT (Please write in the names of your 3 clients)

TOGETHER, THIS COUNSELING EXPERIENCE WAS, I FEEL:

1. 2. 3.

Extremely successful; it would be hard to imagine how it could have been any more successful

Highly successful, although there might have been a few ways in which it could have been slightly more successful

Definitely successful, even though in several ways it could have been more successful

Somewhat successful but in many ways it could have been more successful

Not too successful, but it was successful enough so that it was better than if no counseling had taken place

Unsuccessful; but it probably didn't do any more harm than it did good

So unsuccessful that it was worse than if no counseling had taken place

Please rank these three clients according to degree of successfullness (The purpose of this is to force you to break any ties in the above ratings)

Name of client whose counseling experience was most successful

Name of client whose counseling experience was 2nd most successful

Name of client whose counseling experience was 3rd most successful

THANK YOU!
APPENDIX VIII

Instructions for Counselors' "Want" and "Got" Measure*

Three copies of a questionnaire are attached. Write the names of your three clients on these, one name on top of each questionnaire.

Now, take the first copy—suppose it has the name of "Mary Jones" on it. This questionnaire contains 30 statements of things you might have done in counseling with Mary. Beside each item, you are to make two ratings: a) One for how often you feel you actually DID the thing in question in working with Mary (not just in your counseling in general), and b) one for how often you think Mary would LIKE a counselor (any counselor) to do this thing. Take this sample item:

Call ce by his first name

(He means his or her) You are to mark in one of the first five boxes on the right how often you actually DID call ce by her first name:

If you did it almost always, mark the box in the first five which bears those words, like this-
If you did it frequently, mark
If you did it sometimes, mark
If you did it seldom, mark
If you did it almost never, mark

So the boxes in the left column are for how often you actually DID the thing mentioned; you are also to mark, in the boxes of the right hand column, how often this ce would LIKE a counselor (any counselor) to do the thing. You indicate your ideas in exactly the same way as in the example above, but use the right hand column.

For every item you should have two, and only two, marks: One for how often you actually DID the thing in working with this client, and one for how often this ce would LIKE a counselor to do it.

*This was followed by two sheets, like the last two pages of Appendix III, for each of three clients.
You may have some difficulty in deciding how to answer an item. But we are interested only in your best judgment. Please do not leave any item blank but answer every item to the best of your ability. Buy yourself some coffee and doughnuts or a milkshake whenever you want to. Thank you and go on to the next page.
APPENDIX IX

Instructions for Supervisor "Success" Rankings*

You are asked to rank the counseling experience of eleven clients, for whom you heard approximately four interviews each. This is not a ranking according to how "good" or "skillful" the counselor was, as such, although this may be a related factor. Instead, you are asked to rank how "successful" you felt the counseling experience was for each client during the period you heard his interviews.

You are to use your own definition of "successful," and your own criteria in terms of those goals which you felt were appropriate in a given case.

This is not a question of the client's or the counselor's perception of success, but of your own as a supervisor.

To summarize: Rank these eleven client names according to how successful you felt the counseling experience was for them during the period you heard their interviews.

*After the supervisor had ranked these names, she was asked to cut the distribution approximately in half, making a "more successful" and "less successful" group.
Letter to Clients in Reliability Study

121 N. Waggoner Road
Blacklick, Ohio
June 21, 1960

Dear (Student's name),

You are one of several persons whose help we need very much. Last quarter you took Psychology 411 and saw a counselor several times. We wanted your ideas on several questions—how successful you thought counseling was; how often your counselor did certain things, and how often you would like your counselor to have done those things.

In order to get your ideas, we passed out questionnaires in class. However, somehow we missed your replies. This may be for any one of the following reasons:

1) Some of you dropped school in the middle of the quarter. (We still want your ideas.)
2) Some of you filled in only the first page and didn't realize there was any more to fill in.
3) We lost some questionnaires.

We are sorry to bother you again, particularly if this is our fault. However, we are eager to get the ideas of 100% of the students who saw counselors, and we do want to know your feelings. Would you be willing to help us by answering the enclosed sheets? Before you put them in the self-addressed envelope to mail back to us, would you check to see that you haven't overlooked any page or any item? Thank you for your kindness; we believe the ten minutes you take will be a help to new counselors and thus to future students.

Yours,

(signed)
Edward Pohlman
Letter to Clients for whom Material was Missing

121 N. Waggoner Road
Blacklick, Ohio
June 21, 1960

Dear (Student's name)

You are one of six people whose help we need very much. Last quarter you took Psychology 411 and saw a counselor several times. We wanted your ideas on several questions—how successful you thought counseling was; how often your counselor did certain things, and how often you would like your counselor to have done those things.

In order to get your ideas we passed out questionnaires in class. However, for some reason we missed YOU and 5 other students. This may be for any one of the following reasons:

1) Two of you dropped school in the middle of the quarter. (We still want your ideas.)

2) One of you filled in only the first page and didn't realize there was anything more to fill in.

3) Several of you forgot to give us your birthday or the time your class met. That way we couldn't match your questionnaire with the one you filled in at the start of the quarter.

We really need your help as we want the ideas of 100% of the students who saw counselors. Won't you please help us by filling in the enclosed questionnaire and then mailing it to us in the enclosed self-addressed envelope? Before mailing it in, please see that you have not overlooked any page, and that you have answered all the questions on each page.

Thank you very much!

(signed)
Edward Pohlman
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