INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
MERLUZZI, Bernadette Hartley, 1945-
THE EFFECTS OF CLIENT RACE ON COUNSELORS'
JUDGMENTS OF CASE MATERIALS.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1976
Psychology, clinical

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
THE EFFECTS OF CLIENT RACE ON COUNSELORS'
JUDGMENTS OF CASE MATERIALS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Bernadette Hartley Merluzzi, B.A., M.A.

****
The Ohio State University

1976

Reading Committee:
Richard C. Kelsey
Joseph J. Quaranta
Donald J. Tosi

Approved By

Joseph J. Jerry
Adviser
Faculty of Special Services
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the faculty of the Counseling and Guidance Department. Also, I would like to thank my husband, Tom, who gave me much advice on this project and my daughter, Msichana, who helped me keep in touch with other things of importance.
VITA

November 10, 1945 ............................................. Born - Birmingham, Alabama

1965 .............................................................. A.A., Trenton Junior College
                             Trenton, New Jersey

1968 .............................................................. B.A., Central Conn. State
                             College, New Britain, Conn.

1972 .............................................................. University Fellowship, The
                             Ohio State University

1972-1973 ..................................................... Coordinator, Freshman Early
                             Experiencing Program, The
                             Ohio State University

1973 .............................................................. M.A., The Ohio State
                             University

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Counseling and Guidance; Advisers, Richard C. Kelsey
                        and Joseph J. Quaranta

Minor Field: Developmental Psychology
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. RESULTS</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DISCUSSION</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

1. Summary Table: Multiple Regression with Total Scale Score as the Dependent Variable ........................................... 35

2. Analysis of Variance on the Final Regression Equation .......... 37
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United States of America has a population comprised of many cultural and racial groups. For many reasons, political, historical and economical, all groups of people in the U.S.A. are not accorded the same rights and dignities. The American society is a racist society and all who live in it are affected by it. As a result of that condition, most of the institutions in this country uphold and practice racist beliefs. Therefore, anyone reared in its institutions might hold prejudicial attitudes. That condition is evident by the numerous laws which have been passed in an attempt to correct the effects of racism.

Since most psychology students trained in this country were, in all probability, reared in this country, it is highly likely that they have prejudicial attitudes. Thus, training programs in psychology must begin to address themselves to the values and beliefs which the entering student brings with him as a result of being reared in this society. Counselor training programs should assist the student with examining the trainee's biases if he is later to assist all persons with equal respect.

A study by Yamasoto, James, Bloombaum and Hattem (1967) illustrates the need for confronting the issues raised above. The authors found that
clients who were most popular and given the most attention were:
Caucasian women, Caucasian men, Mexican-American women, Negro women,
Mexican-American men and Negro men, in that order. The study also
demonstrated that therapists who indicated the greatest social distance
(measured by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale) from Negroes and other
minorities also saw their Negro clients the least number of times. In
a follow-up those same clients reported racial prejudice from the therapi-
pists with the most social distance from minorities.

As a result of prejudice and neglect certain groups of people are
attributed qualities and characteristics by which the dominant society
can describe and explain the behavior of the whole group, collectively.
That process is referred to as labeling. There are many deleterious
effects of labeling which can inhibit the development of the labeled
person. One negative effect was reported by Jones (1972). He studied
counselors' expectations of a "culturally deprived" child's attitudes
toward school. The counselors in the study had completed a year of
study in an institution devoted to preparing counselors of "culturally
deprived" youth. They completed the School Morale Inventory (Wrightsman,
1968) with the instructions to respond as a 12 year old "culturally
deprived" youth might respond. The control group had the same informa-
tion and the same instructions except the label "culturally deprived"
was absent.

Counselors' responses with labeling were more negative than coun-
selors responding without the culturally deprived label. The study
demonstrated that counselors have more negative expectations of
"culturally deprived" children which in many cases refers to minority
children. The labeling process may establish expectations and performance levels of children which in no way reflect their individual abilities.

In another study Smith (1974) had counselors predict the success of high school students in certain colleges on the basis of several test scores. Half of the cases were labeled with Spanish surnamed students and the other half with names that supposedly did not denote an ethnic group. The findings indicated that students with Spanish surnames had the same expected success rating as an identical case without a Spanish surname.

There were several problems with Smith's (Smith, 1974) study which were not adequately controlled nor explained. Specifically, the study did not report whether the author checked to determine if the Ss did attend to the name on the case or whether the counselor knew how to interpret test scores. Also, the author assumed that if the case did not have a Spanish surname the counselor would automatically assume that the student was not of a minority group (i.e., not all Spanish people have Spanish surnames). In addition, by including a surname which is supposed to denote certain characteristics does not guarantee that the name is encoded in that fashion for all counselors.

The present study incorporated aspects of Yamamoto et al (1967), Jones (1970) and Smith (1974) and also extended beyond the scope of those studies. The study reported here included the presentation of intake case summaries to counselors who rated each case on a scale which included items concerning client personality characteristics, counseling readiness, environmental effects on the client and the predicted outcome.
As in Jones (1970) and Smith (1974) labels were attached to case materials, however, instead of "culturally deprived" or Spanish surnames, racial labels (Black, White and no label) were included. The counselors were also assessed as to their counseling experience, their personal contact with minorities and their physical social distance to minorities to determine if those variables in addition to race labels affects counselors' assessment of clients.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine if counselors were biased in their evaluation of clients of different races. Since the counseling process requires the counselor to establish a close trusting relationship with the client, it becomes imperative that the counselor be aware of any bias he has that might inhibit that trusting relationship. This research attempted to assess whether racial labels contribute to counselors' assessment of clients. Also, in order to account for other variables which might influence counselors' assessments, their level of counseling experience, the extent of their contact with minorities and their social distance were included in the investigation.

Research Question

For the purpose of research the following question was raised:

To what extent are ratings of client case materials a function of the racial labels attached to written cases, the experience of the counselor, the contact the counselor has had with minorities and the
physical social distance with respect to minorities a counselor is willing to permit for himself.

**Definitions of Terms Used**

**Client** - a hypothetical intake case summary. Eight such summaries were created for this study.

**Counselor bias** - Operationally defined as attitudes which result in differential ratings of cases as a function of race of the client.

**Counselor experience** - Counselors enrolled in graduate training programs who were in their third year or beyond having had 3 or more practica or in their second year who had 4 or more supervised practica were considered experienced counselors. Low experienced counselors were in their first or second year and had 2 supervised practica or less.

**Minority Contact** - a S' personal contact with Blacks or in black settings. High minority contact indicated that the S has more experience with Blacks than a S who was low with respect to minority contact.

**Minority or ethnic group** - racial groups of non-European extraction and groups of Spanish extraction in America.

**Race labels** - the designation of the racial group to which the "client" belongs, i.e., Black, White or No Race Label.

**Rating scale score** - sum of the items on the Rating Scale (Appendix A) for each S on the four test cases. Higher
scores represent a more positive overall judgment for the disposition of the case.

**Social Distance** - represents the degree of physical social distance that the S was willing to permit with respect to minority groups as indicated by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (BSDS). A low social distance score showed a willingness to enter into a closer relationship with minority groups, whereas a high score showed a desire to remain distant from minority groups.

**Social Distance I (SD I)** - Scale scores on the BSDS were divided into high and low at the median scale score.

**Social Distance II (SD II)** - The low social distance category included all Ss willing to "marry into" five critical minority groups (Mexican-American, Negro, American-Indian, Spanish-American and Chinese-American). High SD II Ss did not indicate that they would "marry into" the five groups listed above.

**Social Distance III (SD III)** - Ss who indicated they would "marry into" the Negro minority group were categorized as low in SD III and those unwilling to marry Negroes were high in SD III.

The limitations of this research, as with most research of this type, is the ability to measure attitudes both with the self-report method and instruments. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale may not measure racial prejudice but it can imply negative racial attitudes by the S' willingness or unwillingness to associate with members of
other ethnic groups. It also may not predict actual behaviors since it is a self-report attitude measure.

Although hypothetical case summaries allow for greater control over the design, it cannot completely create the physical presence of a real client. A client's gestures, appearance, language and skin color might also influence a counselor's evaluation process. Therefore, case summaries cannot predict actual behavior but merely imply it since a counselor's behavior might differ in an actual setting.

Finally, it can be stated that all Ss were in reputable counseling programs (5 out of 6 were APA approved) but it cannot be said that all will become skilled counselors. Therefore, these results can only be implied for the large population of counselors. Although there were only six institutions used in this research, which is a small number compared to the total number of counseling programs, they were dispersed across the country and all of the programs recruit students from all parts of the United States.

This chapter presented the problem of bias in society as well as in the counseling process. The basic research question was posed and relevant definitions presented. The next chapter will review literature concerning the effects of race in the helping services.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of the psychological and educational literature yielded three areas of research in which race was a critical variable: Effects of Counselor Attitudes and Behavior, Labeling, and Effects on Client. The review of literature to follow concentrated in those three areas.

Research has shown that the client's race can and does affect the counselor's response to the client both in terms of the process and outcome of counseling. Much of the research, in fact, shows negative effects of counselors' responses to clients of minority groups. Banks (1972a), Yamamoto et al (1967) and Rosenthal and Frank (1958) feel that white counselors' racial attitudes are no different than the population at large in the American society. Therefore, the prospective counselor brings to counseling training programs the same cultural conditioning and racial prejudices which he shares with the larger society. Banks (1972a) has stated that "Being white or black in America virtually assures the individual a set of perceptions relating to his own and the opposite racial group (p. 205)."

Effects of Counselor Attitudes and Behavior

There have been several studies performed at outpatient clinics which show that therapists prefer to accept and treat those clients most
like themselves racially and socioeconomically. In a study by Bloombaum, Yamamoto and James (1967), psychotherapists were interviewed to determine their attitudes towards Mexican-Americans, African-Americans, Japanese-Americans, Chinese-Americans and Jews. Of all the responses 22.6 per cent were culturally stereotypic in terms of imputations of superstitiousness, changeability, impulsivity, grasp of abstract ideas and distinction between illusion and facts.

The therapists were also given the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The results indicated that African-Americans were the group they would least marry into, Chinese-Americans and Mexican-Americans followed. Jews were the group they would marry into most. These results suggest that psychotherapists may reflect the general culture of which they are a part and, therefore, cannot be considered immune to cultural conditioning.

Yamamoto, James, Bloombaum and Hattem (1967) surveyed the treatment course of 594 consecutive new admissions to an outpatient clinic. All of the therapists who saw these clients were given the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The therapists most socially distant from five minority groups (African-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Chinese-Americans) saw their black clients for six or fewer visits. Those therapists who were less socially distant from those minorities saw their black clients six or more times and roughly the same number of times they saw their white clients. Regardless of social distance the duration of treatment varied as a function of race and sex as follows: Caucasian women were seen for the longest time, followed by Caucasian men, Mexican-American women, African-American women, Mexican-American men and,
finally, African-American men.

Therapists who endorsed that they would "marry into" those minority groups tended to see proportionally more black clients and tended to see those clients for more sessions than therapists who did not endorse that they would "marry into" the five minority groups listed above.

Yamamoto et al (1967) feel that the question concerning marriage may be a minimal cue to stronger feelings toward minority groups and that therapists may be much more prejudiced than they admit.

Rosenthal and Frank (1958) also found that black clients and lower socioeconomic groups were less likely to be accepted for therapy and when accepted usually received less therapy than non-minority clients of higher socioeconomic status. The authors suggested that psychiatrists tend to refer persons for psychotherapy who are most like themselves. Brill and Starrow (1960) found the same results even when ability to pay for services was eliminated. These findings are also corroborated by Hollingshead and Redlich (1958).

In a similar study to those cited above Albronda, Dean and Starkweather (1964) focused on the expectations and benefits of therapy and number of times lower class clients were seen in therapy. They found that lower class clients expected shorter treatment than middle class clients. Also, lower class clients tended to terminate their treatment close to their expectations for the length of treatment (10 visits).

The authors also found that prior to the 21st interview upper class patients were more likely to remain in therapy to a greater extent than lower class clients. The study also indicated that both lower and upper class clients stood an increasingly better chance of being considered as
having improved if they remained in treatment past 21 interviews. Unlike Hunt (1960) and Lief and Lief (1961) who suggest that psychotherapy is a middle class form of treatment, Albronda, Dean and Starkweather (1964) conclude that lower class patients may need more encouragement and help in remaining in psychotherapy than upper class patients. They suggest that the therapist try to change the expectations of lower class clients in order to reduce the number who terminate prior to 21 sessions.

Although Albronda, Dean and Starkweather (1964) reported encouraging results with respect to the numbers of lower class patients seen in therapy, they did not conclusively demonstrate that clients' expectations concerning treatment time was the only reason for early treatment termination by lower class patients. Race and/or social class differences between client and therapist may have accounted for the early termination.

Gross, Herbert, Khottered and Donner (1969) studied disposition and diagnosis as a function of the race and sex of patients admitted to a daytime psychiatric emergency clinic. There was a total of 2,279 Ss, 1,286 females and 993 males, in the sample who entered the clinic between the years of July 1964 and June 1966. The sample included 796 white females, 490 non-white females, 598 white males and 395 non-white males. The Ss, when admitted to the clinic, were diagnosed as Schizophrenic, Psychoneurotic, Sociopathic or Other. The disposition of the cases was Inpatient, Outpatient or Other.

The authors found that white females were more likely than non-white females to be diagnosed neurotic and referred to an outpatient department. Non-white females are more likely to be treated in the emergency room proper and not referred out but hospitalized. Also,
non-white females are 1.5 times more likely to be diagnosed schizophrenic than white females and are just as likely (1.5) to be hospitalized with a diagnosis of schizophrenia. Thus, behavior that requires hospitalization is more often perceived as neurotic when a female patient is white and as schizophrenic when non-white. Discharge time for non-white females from the state hospital is earlier than for other groups, which might support a suspicion that the diagnostic response to aberrant behavior in the non-white female may be exaggerated. Finally, while males in general were more likely to be diagnosed sociopathic, non-white males are likely to be hospitalized and least likely to be diagnosed neurotic.

Gross et al state:

The response set of the ... clinician is thought of in part as a predisposition to make decisions based on his experiences. As the sociocultural distance between clinician and his patient increases, diagnosis becomes less accurate and disposition more nonspecific. ... The resident does not find aid and comfort in modern clinical psychiatric knowledge, for the psychiatric primers assume that clinical listening is anchored in a common patient-therapist culture (p. 638).

The different diagnostic labeling by race was again found by Lane (1968). The Symptom Check List was given to therapists to guide their division of 200 schizophrenics into the categories of either "process" (behavior considered withdrawn or aggressive toward others) or "reactive" (behavior considered aggressive toward one's self). Within the 200 Ss, there were 50 white males and 50 black males. The black males were more often rated "process" and white males more often rated "reactive." Lane hypothesized that therapist bias is a significant source of influence in the clinical classification process.
The effect of different treatment outcomes as a function of client race and socioeconomic status was demonstrated by Charkhuff and Pierce (1967). In a mental hospital with schizophrenics they found that therapists' race and social class differences had a retarding effect on the clients' progress in therapy.

In the studies reported above three major areas of therapist bias were demonstrated. First, therapists prefer clients who are similar to them both in race and socioeconomic status; second, diagnostic labeling of blacks is usually more severe than whites and third, black clients usually receive less time in therapy and progress through the therapy process is retarded.

The above studies also give support to the premise that the race of a client as a variable affects the counselor's attitude and behavior toward the client. Such data demonstrates the need for counselor training programs to direct themselves to the trainee's attitudes on race which he brings to the program.

Labeling

There have been studies which have demonstrated that labeling can produce lower expectation levels for labeled groups. The labeling (i.e., using cultural stereotypes or labels such as culturally deprived) of blacks or minorities seems to carry over into the therapy process.

In a pioneer study Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) showed how teacher expectations could affect student performance. The term "Rosenthal Effect" now refers to the relationship between expectation levels of teachers (therapists) and the subsequent performance of the student
(client). Although the study has been faulted on methodological grounds there have been later studies to support their findings (Herriott and St. John, 1966; Jones, 1972; Beez, 1968).

Jones (1972) showed that counselors hold clear negative stereotypes about characteristics and attitudes of children labeled "culturally deprived." The counselors were asked to respond to questions on the School Morale Inventory as a 12 year old culturally deprived boy in the sixth grade in an inner city school would respond. A control group was given the same materials but the boy was not labeled culturally deprived. The counselors predicted lower morale on all subscales on the inventory for the case labeled "culturally deprived" than those for the case not labeled "culturally deprived." The subscales of the inventory included (a) morale about the school plant, (b) morale about instructions and instructional materials, (c) morale about administration, regulations and staff, (d) morale about teacher-student relationships, etc. If these results are extrapolated to a natural setting the potential for the Rosenthal Effect seems evident.

Bloombaum, Yamamoto and James (1967) reported negative stereotyping by 16 practicing psychotherapists who were interviewed to obtain their attitudes toward Mexican-Americans, Blacks, Japanese-Americans, Chinese-Americans and Jews. Of all the responses 22.6 per cent were culturally stereotypic in terms of imputations of superstitiousness, changeability, impulsivity, grasp of abstract ideas and distinction between illusion and facts. Mexican-Americans were the most frequently stereotyped, with Blacks, Jews, Chinese-Americans and Japanese-Americans following, in that order. Of all the responses 79.2 per cent indicated the presence of more
subtle stereotypic attributes.

Some studies, however, have produced different results with respect to expectation levels and labeling (Deitz and Purkey, 1969 and Smith, 1974). Deitz and Purkey (1969) assessed teachers' expectations of future performance of Black and White students and found no significant difference between the groups. The Ss were 14 graduate students who had been employed as classroom teachers. They were given a case study of a student. Half of the Ss had the label "Negro boy" on the case while the other half had no such label. Other than the label the case materials for all Ss were identical. The authors found no significant differences between Ss' expectations for the case labeled "Negro boy" and the case with no such label. However, the study did not report whether the Ss had attended to the "Negro" label. If the Ss had not attended to the label the results would not be testing the effects of labeling.

Smith (1974) studied the effects of student ethnic group and sex on counselors' prediction of achievement level of the student. Four hypothetical cases of high school students were developed. Each case included profiles of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Kuder Preference Record, the Edwards Personal Preference Record, the Differential Aptitude Test, School and College Ability Test with percentiles from the appropriate norms and the person's percentile rank in his or her high school class. The sex and ethnic group designations were manipulated by varying the name of the person placed at the top of the case. One group of counselors, for example, saw Case A as "Steve Miller" while another saw the same case but with the name "Linda Garcia."
A third group saw the case with a male first name and a Spanish-American surname and a fourth group saw the case with a female first name and a non-Spanish surname.

The counselors were asked to give their predictions of the clients' chances of making average grades and graduating from each of three educational institutions with which the counselors would be familiar. Smith found no significant differences as a function of the sex or ethnic group of the student. Also, the sex of the counselor was not a significant factor.

There were several factors which were not controlled in the Smith study which could greatly affect the interpretation of the study. First, Smith did not report whether Ss actually attended to the name at the top of the case. Since the first name gave the sex and the surname the ethnic group, it would have to be attended to by the counselor in order to interpret the study. Second, it may be important to know whether the Ss saw the surname as one belonging to an ethnic group or if the counselor saw that person as a member of a minority group. In other words, did the surname "Garcia," for example, carry the cultural effects of a group or would labeling the case "Chicano" have been more effective in terms of assuring that the case was seen as belonging to an ethnic group. Finally, it is not reported if all the Ss knew how to interpret all of the test data given in the cases presented to them.

Effects on Clients

Although the present study focuses on the therapists' bias in counseling as it relates to the race of the client, it is important to
briefly report on some data which focuses on the effects of counselor race on clients. The importance of this data lends support to previous studies and suggests that there needs to be direct efforts on the part of counseling programs to deal with racial interference in the counseling process. The studies do not directly show that the white therapist's approach is faulty because he is prejudiced, but they do imply that race is a factor that affects counseling.

Banks (1972b) found that black and white high school students reported a greater degree of rapport when counseled by racially similar persons. In addition to the self-report of the clients, trainee raters rated client self-exploration significantly greater when the client and counselor belonged to the same racial group.

Banks, Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) found that inexperienced black and white counselors were rated by black clients as functioning higher on the facilitative conditions than a more experienced white counselor. Also, all of the clients indicated they would return to the black counselors while only one said he would return to a white counselor.

Eiben (1970) found that when race relations was to be the area covered in counseling both black and white students preferred a black counselor. However, both black and white students preferred a white counselor for all other topics presented to them by the experimenter.

In a study of black youth who were enrolled in a job training project Gurin (1968) found counselor race made a critical difference in trainees' success but race made no significant difference in other than the counselors' role. When compared to the white male counselors, the black male counselor was much more attractive to the trainees and
they perceived him as having more knowledge and influence. The differences were large and significant. In contrast, when black and white education and workshop teachers were compared, the differences were not as large nor significant. The study suggests that race was a factor in a role that required a relationship of trust. Tucker (1969) and Taylor (1970) have reported similar results.

Grantham (1973) demonstrated that in spite of black clients' greater satisfaction with black counselors they exhibited greater depth of self-exploration with female counselors (regardless of race) and white counselors (when counselor's level of facilitative conditions was "equalized" in an analysis of covariance). Grantham suggested that the core conditions may operate differentially across race with respect to depth of self-exploration. Carkhuff and Banks (1970) similarly have shown that regardless of race the counselor who showed greatest empathy produced greater results with a black client.

Perhaps a factor that needs to be examined is how well one can display core conditions to a black client if his racial prejudices interfere.

**Implications for the Present Study**

The literature reviewed provided a rationale for the present study. The labeling process seems to have an effect upon the counselor's perceptions and judgments of the black client. Also, counselor characteristics such as ethnocentricity and social distance might affect the counselor's attitudes towards the client.
In the present study intake case summaries which were labeled White, Black or had no label were rated by counseling graduate students. The counselors were assessed on social distance as well as their level of experience and their personal contact with minorities.

This chapter has reviewed the literature on race and counseling. The next chapter presents the methodology used to conduct this study.
CHAPTER III

METODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the design and the procedures used in determining the ability of the independent variables Race Labels, Counselor's Experience, Counselor's Social Distance and Counselor's Contact with Minorities to predict the dependent variable, ratings of case materials. The first section deals with the research setting and the selection of the sample. The second section discusses the instruments used to collect the data for the study. The questions raised by the study are presented with a discussion of the methods used to test these questions.

Research Setting

Counseling programs at six universities were used for the collection of data during the period between April of 1975 and September of 1975. The six programs were Colorado State University, Indiana University, Iowa State University, Ohio State University, University of Maryland and University of Notre Dame. Five out of the six counseling programs were A.P.A. approved, therefore, meet similar requirements as professional training centers. The only exceptions were Indiana University and Ohio State University. Some Ss from Ohio State University and all Ss from Indiana University were enrolled in the Counseling and
Guidance program, the remainder of Ohio State's Ss were in an A.P.A. approved counseling program.

All six counseling programs recruit students from all over the United States, which allowed for testing a good cross section of attitudes throughout the country.

Examiners were all known to the experimenter and were asked by letter and telephone conversations to administer the data. The directors of each program were written letters requesting the use of Ss and explaining the purpose of the study. The examiners received approval from the directors to collect the data. Examiners were asked to contact the experimenter by telephone if any problems or questions arose concerning the collection of the data.

Examiners at each institution were all white, six males and one female. All examiners were either faculty or staff in the program or fourth year graduate students. The examiners were given the following instructions for administration of materials: Please solicit both advanced and beginning students. Hold group testing sessions and ask that the Ss not discuss any of the testing until all testing sessions were ended.

Since the materials were randomly ordered examiners were also asked not to change the order of the materials when they received them and to pass them out in that order. Examiners were either given instructions in person or over the phone as well as in writing. Finally, examiners were told the general purpose of the study.

Each S received a test packet which included eight case studies, a rating scale for each case, a Bogardus Social Distance Scale and a
Personal Data Sheet. When testing sessions were held more than once at a given institution, Ss were asked not to discuss the testing with any other student within the program.

Population

The 86 Ss in this study were white graduate students enrolled in counseling programs at the six universities (Colorado State University, Indiana University, Iowa State University, Ohio State University, University of Maryland and University of Notre Dame). Ss volunteered to engage in the research and signed a consent form. The consent form indicated that the research project involved their rating intake materials as well as filling out one check list and a personal data sheet. If the S consented to participate they signed the form. Ss were also told they could withdraw from the project at any time.

When case materials were returned ninety-nine had been collected. Thirteen cases were disqualified for the following reasons: incomplete information, Ss who would not marry into any groups on the Bogardus SDS and those with rating scale scores which showed a lack of face validity as evidenced by uniformly extreme scores for all scales on all cases. Also, as a result of receiving only two black Ss their tests were not used.

Some Ss at Colorado State University began to suspect the researcher's purpose when they arrived at the final question on the study. They began to question the examiner at that point and refused to hand in test materials when he refused to tell them the purpose of the study. The examiner reported that Ss' complaints were very defensive in nature and
upon further questioning they said they did not want some of their atti-
tudes known through these measures.

Instruments

There were four instruments in all: (1) the case summaries, (2) Rating Scales for each case, (3) personal data sheet and (4) the Bogardus Social Distance Scale.

Case Summaries. Case summaries were eight hypothetical clients for which intake information was developed. The cases were four males and four females of varying socioeconomic groups. Only four of these cases were used in the analysis of this research. Eight cases were given to disguise the purpose of the study. The cases included a brief description of the home environment, sex of the client, socioeconomic class, age, and a problem the client was experiencing.

Each test packet which contained all instruments was assigned a random number and ordered accordingly. Examiners were instructed not to disturb the order in which materials were received and to hand them out in that order.

The case materials were randomly assigned to distribute Ss into three groups; (1) no race labels on the eight summaries, (2) four white and four black labeled cases and (3) the same four cases labeled white in Group 2 were labeled black in this group and the same four black cases in Group 2 were labeled white in this group. The No Label group was to act as the control group. The position of the case within the test packet was randomly determined.

The instructions for completing the test packet were as follows:
In this packet of materials you will find eight intake summaries which give general descriptions of people who could be clients in a psychological services center. Please read each summary carefully. After each summary you will find a Rating Scale sheet with eleven (11) items containing a seven point scale. Rate each client on all eleven dimensions to the best of your ability. Please answer all items for all clients. After the intake summaries you will find additional materials to complete. The directions for those materials are included at the beginning of each or are self-explanatory. Please do not look ahead as you complete materials and once you have completed something please do not look back or make any corrections or changes. Thank you for your participation. The case summaries appear in Appendix B.

Rating Scale. The Rating Scale included 11 items which ranged from 1 to 7 representing a positive to negative rating. The same 11 items were asked for all eight case summaries.

Items 1, 6 and 10 were concerned with the S' estimate of personal characteristics of the client. Items 3, 4, 5 and 8 assessed the client's orientation toward counseling and his counseling readiness; 2 and 7 dealt with the effects of the environment and 9 and 11 dealt with predicted outcome. For scoring, a scale score of "1" was assigned to the negative end of the scale and a "7" to the positive end.

The instructions for the scale were as follows:

Please rate the client you have just reviewed on the scales below. Based on the case materials indicate the point on each scale which best represents, in your judgment, that client. On scales where you are uncertain or feel that you do not have sufficient data to make a judgment, make the best possible choice—please do not leave any scale blank; answer all eleven (11) items.

Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale (BSDS) was designed to assess attitudes toward various nationalities and ethnic groups. The items on the scale represent the degree of physical
social distance or the degree of acceptance one maintains for any nationality or ethnic group. For any group or nationality the seven classifications which constitute the scale are:

1. Marry into the group
2. Would have as a close friend
3. Would have as next door neighbor
4. Would work in same office
5. Would have as a speaking acquaintance
6. Would have as visitor to my country
7. Would have as members of another nation

The items range from endorsing a willingness to enter a close relationship with a member of an ethnic group to endorsing a rather distant relationship. The highest degree of intimacy endorsed is considered the scale score for a particular group. Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962) indicated that relatively few reversals occur on the scale. That is, when one endorses "marry into the group" with almost no exceptions that person would also endorse all items preceding that item.

Reliability. The BSDS seems to be a reliable measure with split-half reliabilities of .94 and .95 in two independent tests of reliability with student populations (Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb, 1964). Sherif and Sherif (1956) indicated that there was stability in the rankings of nationalities based on the BSDS scores over a period of 20 years from 1926 to 1946. Although Karlins, Coffman and Walters (1969) have shown changes in students toward becoming less prejudiced over the last 45 years, the slowness of the change seems to indicate the stability of
the instrument over a short term period.

Validity. Sherif and Sherif (1956) indicated that there is a close relationship between social distance and stereotypes concerning the nature of groups of people such that stereotypes can be considered an index of social distance. For example, English, who are ranked high on the BDS were attributed values acceptable to American values. However, Negroes and Japanese and others who were ranked low were characterized in terms alien to American values. In general, Sherif and Sherif (1956) reported that unfavorable stereotypes of groups usually vary as a function of their rank on the social distance scale.

Hartley (1946) reported that the acceptance of a social distance scale with one's own group on top leads to generalization of negative ratings to fictional groups. However, less prejudiced people tended to include the fictional groups in greater categories of intimacy, thus, there seems to be a correlation between prejudice and social distance.

In a study which was reported in Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb (1964) a Thurstone paired comparison scale was used to assess attitudes of student groups toward several nationality and racial groups. The result was that students' preference for the various groups was very similar to those obtained by using the Bogardus Social Distance Scale.

More recent studies have indicated that although social distance has decreased (Karlin, Coffman and Walters, 1969) there are correlates of social distance in studies concerning the delivery of mental health services to black clients. Yamamoto et al (1967) have reported that the item "would marry into the group" represents a minimal cue to greater attitudes of racial bias. The authors found that therapists who
indicated they would "marry into" five minority groups, found in America, tended to see more black clients for more sessions than therapists who would not marry into the "minority groups."

Thus, although social distance may have decreased in recent years, the item concerning intermarriage may represent the direction for further validity research. In some original writings Bogardus (1925) on the scale reported that marriage may be the best single indicator of any prejudice.

Instructions for taking the Bogardus SDS were as follows:

On the left of the chart below you will find the names of various groups of people. Across the top of the chart are a list of statements. For each group put a check (√) by the statement(s) which appropriately describe your relationship to that group at this point in time. Check as many statements for each group as you feel are needed.

**Personal Data Sheet.** The personal data sheet was given to obtain the variables for counselors' experience and experience base as well as other information such as age, sex, race, socioeconomic level, etc. The data sheet also asked two other important items whether Ss felt their programs prepared them to counsel minorities and a check to see if racial labels were attended to and if they were attended to properly.

The following instructions were given for filling out the data sheet:

Please answer the following questions. Most of the questions involve choosing an option or short answer, however, if you feel that additional information would clarify your answer to a question please use the back side of this form and indicate which question was elaborated upon.
As a result of questioning about 25 per cent of the Ss following testing, it was found that they did not know what the purpose of the study was while filling out the test materials.

Procedures

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the data. The purpose of multiple regression is to produce an equation which is a combination of independent variables that correlate highly with the dependent variable. In stepwise multiple regression independent variables are chosen such that the prediction of the dependent variable is accomplished with the fewest number of independent variables. The independent variable which is the best predictor is taken first. Then, the second independent variable is selected which provides the best prediction in conjunction with the first. Thus, the variable that explains the greatest amount of variance unexplained by variables in the equation enters at each step. That process continues until no other variables make a significant contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable.

Since Race Labels (i.e., Black, White and No Label) in this study are categories and constitute a nominal scale, the numbers assigned to them cannot be assumed to have an order. Thus, they must be changed for inclusion in the regression analysis. A set of "dummy variables" was created by treating each category as a separate variable. As a result, Black, White and No Label can be conceived as three separate variables. However, in order for proper computation to be performed, it is necessary to use one variable as a reference category. That variable becomes a
sort of relative reference point by which the other variables are judged and interpreted. For that category the No-Label condition was chosen.

The F ratio for all the variables included in the regression equation was used to determine the significance of the regression. Variables which do not exceed the criterion for inclusion are eliminated from the regression.

The independent variables and dependent variable are described in the following section.

Independent Variables

The independent variables which were studied included Racial Labels (Black, White and No Label) on case materials, Experience of the Counselors, Social Distance (Social Distance I, II and III) and Minority Contact.

Racial Labels. The Ss were given case materials which were described as "intake case summaries of potential clients in a psychological services center." The cases were actually fictional summaries which were constructed by the experimenter for the study. The cases represented a variety of problems and included information that could not be identified with any particular racial group.

The Ss were asked to read each summary and then rate the "client" on eleven dimensions. The rating scale included items which assessed the Ss' judgments concerning the client's personal characteristics, counseling readiness, effects of the environment on the client and the predicted outcome for the case. The Rating Scale is included in Appendix A.
All Ss reviewed and rated eight case summaries. Four of the eight cases were critical test cases and four were filler or non-test cases. The four critical test cases were identical for all Ss except for the racial label attached to the case description. For one group, the four critical test cases were labeled "White." For a second group, the same test cases were labeled "Black" and, finally, for a third group, no racial label was included in the description.

For the Ss whose test cases were labeled "White" the filler items were labeled "Black." Ss the group who saw "Black" labeled test cases had "White" labeled filler cases and those Ss who had no labels attached to test cases also had no labels on filler cases.

Thus, Racial Labels on case summaries provided three discrete labels, White, Black and No Label. At the end of the experiment Ss were asked to indicate the racial labels used on case materials. The case summaries are included in Appendix B.

**Experience of Counselor.** The counselors (Ss) were enrolled in counseling programs and varied in their degree of counseling experience. In order to determine their level of experience they were asked to indicate their year in graduate school, the number and extent of practica experiences, training experiences, internships and other counseling related activities. The Personal Data Sheet was used to assess experience on the criteria listed above. The Personal Data Sheet is found in Appendix C.

Inexperienced counselors were defined as those who were in their first or second year of graduate school and who had limited experience (two supervised practica or less) in counseling. Experienced counselors
were those who were in their third year of graduate school or beyond and who had more extensive experience (three supervised practica or more). The only exceptions to the decision rules stated above were for Ss who, in their program, had four supervised practica by their second year. Those Ss were included in the "Experienced" group.

Social Distance. The BSDS was scored by assigning a score of "1" if the S chose "marry into the group," a score of "2" if "would have as close friend" was chosen, etc. Thus, low social distance was indicated by a low scale score and high social distance was indicated by a high scale score.

Three methods were used to divide Ss into High and Low categories on social distance. The first method (Social Distance I) was to determine a median scale score for critical minority groups which are found in the United States. Those groups include Mexican-Americans, Negroes, American-Indians, Spanish-Americans, and Chinese-Americans. The scale scores were summed across those groups for each S, then divided at the median to form groups which were high and low with respect to social distance to minority groups in the U.S.A.

The second method (Social Distance II) of determining two levels of social distance was suggested by Yamamoto et al (1967). Yamamoto et al found that differences between therapists' proportion of minority versus caucasian clients and mean number of sessions therapists saw Black clients was based on their endorsing "marry into the group" for the five critical minority groups listed above. Thus, that one item scored for five minority groups was able to predict the number of minority clients a therapist saw and the number of sessions he had with those
clients.

Their study suggested the second method used to distinguish high and low social distance scores on the BSDS. One group (low social distance II) included those Ss who endorsed "marry into the group" for all five minority groups. The other group (high social distance II) included Ss who endorsed a variety of levels but did not have "marry into the group" as a response for all five minority groups.

The third method (Social Distance III) of determining categories of social distance was to place those Ss who endorsed would "marry into" the Negro minority group in a low Social Distance III category. Ss in the high Social Distance III category were those who indicated that they would not "marry into" the Negro minority group. This division is an extension of Yamamoto et al. (1967) since their data suggests that with Black clients one scale item may determine the counselor's behavior and attitudes with that group.

All methods of determining high and low groups on social distance were used in the present study in order to assess the effects of those methods on the dependent measure. The BSDS is included in Appendix D.

Minority Contact. Ss were assessed as to their personal contact with minorities and with Blacks in particular. The Personal Data Sheet (Appendix C) contained questions concerning the Ss' contact with minorities both in personal and work settings. Three judges took the information from the Personal Data Sheet and categorized the Ss as either high or low with respect to their personal contact with minorities. In the case of discrepant judgments, the judges discussed the case until a consensus
of judgments was reached.

**Dependent Variable**

The Ss were asked to rate the cases on a series of items on a seven point scale (Appendix A). The scores assessed several areas of concern in the counseling process. Items 1, 6, and 10 were concerned with the S's estimate of the personal characteristics of the client. Items 3, 4, 5, and 8 concern the client's orientation toward counseling and his counseling readiness. Items 2 and 7 assess the effects of the environment and outcome was assessed by items 9 and 11. The scale represents a positive to negative rating with the order and direction of the items randomly determined. For scoring, a scale score of "1" was assigned to the negative end of the scale and a "7" to the positive end. Thus, a higher score represents a more positive rating on the scale.

Total scale scores for the cases were summed across Ss and used in the statistical analysis of results.
Chapter IV will present the results of the analysis performed on the data collected.

The research objective was to determine the extent to which racial labels, counseling experience, contact with minorities and social distance contribute to the ratings of written client case materials. In order to test the research question a stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed with the Ss' ratings of case materials summed across all cases on the dependent variable and Counselor Experience, Minority Contact, Social Distance I, Social Distance II, Social Distance III, Black (labeled cases) and White (labeled cases) as the independent variables. Recall that the No Label condition was used as a relative reference category against which the other variables are judged and interpreted.

The results are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 presents the statistics obtained with all the variables which were included in the regression equation. One variable, Counselor Experience, was not entered due to the default option of the program used to calculate the regression. Excluded variables either have an F below .01 or Tolerance below .001.
Table 1

Summary Table:
Multiple Regression with Total Scale Scores as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Simple R</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>F=t²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.75**</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Contact</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.82*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance I</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance II</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance III</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable not in the equation:  Experience

** = .01  * = .05
Of the variables included in the equation two significant predictors were obtained, Black and Minority Contact. Black obtained an $R^2$ of .12 which indicates that 12 per cent of the variance of the total rating scale score can be accounted for if the case is labeled "Black." Minority Contact, the other significant predictor, obtained an $R^2$ of .03. Thus, although Minority Contact was a significant predictor, it accounted for only three per cent of the variance in the total rating scale scores.

The remaining variables, although exceeding the criterion for inclusion in the regression equation, were not significant predictors. An inspection of the $R^2$ change column illustrates that the remaining variables account for very little of the variance in the dependent variable.

Beta weights also appear in Table 1. Beta weights indicate how important a variable is in predicting the dependent variable. Some of the beta weights are negative, which indicates that those variables may act as negative predictors. The only significant variable which also has a negative beta weight is Minority Contact. The negative beta for Minority Contact represents negative prediction relative to the reference point which in this equation is the No Label condition. The negative beta means that once the variable is entered into the equation it decreases the total scale score. The positive beta for Black indicates that relative to the No Label condition the total scale score increases when the Black variable is included in the equation.

The Multiple $R$ is also presented in Table 1. The Multiple $R$ represents the predictive efficiency of the independent variables. An inspection of the Multiple $R$ column in Table 1 indicates that the predictive
efficiency of the independent variables does not increase substantially after the first variable. That fact was similarly illustrated by the negligible increase in $R^2$ which is the per cent of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variables. Therefore, the increase in the Multiple R and $R^2$ which amounted to .02 and .01, respectively, after the second variable demonstrates the relatively insignificant contribution of the remaining variables to the prediction of the dependent variable, total scale score. Further, the second variable only adds .04 to the Multiple R and three per cent change in $R^2$. These results reinforce the significance of the Black variable in determining rating scale scores.

Table 2 presents the analysis of variable on the final regression equation. The analysis represents the overall goodness of fit of the

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4959.15</td>
<td>826.52</td>
<td>2.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26566.17</td>
<td>336.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05

regression equation. That is, if the F is significant the variation in the dependent variable (total scale score) is explained by the combination of the independent variables as opposed to error. The F was computed at the step at which the last variable entered the equation.
The F obtained for the equation was 2.46 ($F=2.46, df=6.79, p=.05$) which was significant. Thus, the variation in the total scale score predicted by the independent variables was greater than chance and not a function of error.

In answer to the research question it is apparent from the information presented in Table 1 that cases labeled Black account for the greatest amount of variance in the total rating scale score when compared with other variables in the equation. Twelve per cent of the variance in the total scale score is a function of having the label "Black" on case materials.

Since the beta for Black is positive, it appears that Black labeled cases are rated higher than No Label, which was used as the reference category. In addition, since the "White" variable has a small negative beta weight and accounts for only .2 per cent of the variance, cases labeled "White" are likely not to be different from No Label cases with respect to the total scale score.

The remaining variables like the White variable add little to the prediction of the total scale score. Although the regression was significant (Table 2), it appears that the variables included here do not contribute greatly to the ability to determine the overall rating. However, one variable, Black, stands out over the others in terms of the per cent of variance it accounts for, the significance of its contribution and the beta weight. It can be stated that that variable alone may account for changes in the dependent variable relative to the No Label condition. The analysis suggests that ratings of Black labeled cases are higher and, therefore, more positive.
Additional Findings

Subjects' Attention to Labels. After rating case materials and filling out all questionnaires, Ss were asked to indicate whether any of the case materials were labeled by race. If the Ss answered "yes" they were asked to indicate what race labels were used. Four Ss incorrectly reported the types of labels on cases. One S in the No Label condition indicated he saw racial labels and three Ss who were in the groups which were labeled reported seeing no labels. Thus, in general, the labeling by race was effective in assuring that the S attended to the label.

Minority Training. Ss were asked if they felt that their program equipped them to counsel minorities. Sixty-three (73.3%) Ss indicated that their program did not equip them to counsel minorities, 20 Ss (24.1%) indicated that their program did equip them to counsel minorities, and 3 Ss (3.5%) did not respond to that question. The question referred to here is question 13 on the Personal Data Sheet (Appendix C).

Social Distance III. Of the 86 white Ss in the study 57 (66.2%) indicated that they would not marry Blacks (on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale) and were, therefore, categorized as high with respect to SD III. Twenty-nine (33.8%) of the Ss indicated that they would marry Blacks.

Chapter IV presented the results of the statistical analysis as well as some additional findings. The implication of the results and findings is presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In general, the results demonstrated that with the No Label condition as a reference there was a significantly higher contribution of Black (labeled cases) to the total rating scale score when compared with cases labeled White. In addition, with the exception of Minority Contact, none of the other variables significantly affected the total scale score. The results disconfirm the absence of the effect of labeling reported by Smith (1974) and confirm the effects reported by Jones (1972). However, in Jones (1972) the label "culturally deprived" resulted in more negative ratings by Ss, whereas, in the present study, counselors tended to rate Black labeled cases more positively than White and No Label.

In view of the many published articles concerning the negative effects of counselor bias and the focus on neglected clients, counselors may have overcompensated. In an attempt to appear to have less professional bias they may have, in fact, revealed a bias in the opposite direction. The counselor's assessments of the Black "clients" in this study may have been overinflated as a function of that reverse bias.

The more significant contribution and, thus, the more positive rating of Black labeled cases may have implications for the counseling
process. Counselors may be overreacting to the label without a firm grasp of what is needed to really help the client. In an attempt to overcome professional bias the counselor may be underestimating the needs and expectations of the client. The tendency to see the Black client as more positive may result in neglecting the individual needs of the client. Thus, labeling may affect treatment of minority clients in a biased and systematic fashion.

When confronted with a Black client or Black case materials, white counselors may perhaps, because of a feeling of not wanting to contribute to the neglect or lack understanding of Black clients, overreact to compensate for their own feelings. In the counseling setting that same process may hinder the effective treatment of minority clients.

The literature reviewed earlier (Bloombaum and Yamamoto, 1968 and Yamamoto et al, 1967) indicated that counselor attitudes towards minorities did affect the counseling of minority clients. Because of the white counselor's attitudes and the bias that results, there may be impediments to the counseling process with minorities that does not exist with white clients.

The higher contribution of Black labeled cases over White may have implications for the counseling minorities. Race does seem to interfere with the counselor's views of the client. Thus, it may indicate a systematic professional bias which may affect the delivery of mental health services to minorities.

Minority Contact did have a significant contribution to the prediction of the rating scale score. Although accounting for only three percent of the variance in the dependent variable, Minority Contact may be
acting as a negative predictor or a suppressor which would attenuate the effect of the Black variable. It appears that the higher the value of Minority Contact (i.e., more minority contact) the more it would reduce the total scale score. Therefore, a person who was higher in Minority Contact would not rate the Black case as high as someone who was low in Minority Contact (i.e., someone with minimal contact with minorities).

The findings reported at the end of Chapter IV indicated that 73.3 per cent of the Ss felt that their programs did not train them to counsel minorities. In addition, 66.2 per cent of the Ss did not endorse "marry into the group" for the Negro category on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. These findings, combined with the more positively inflated ratings of Black cases and the contribution of Minority Contact, may indicate a need for counselor training programs to attend to racial attitudes and the counseling of minorities in their programs.

Social distance as measured by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale seemed to have no influence in determining the rating scale score. Although the three methods of determining Social Distance ranked second, fourth and fifth for Social Distance I, II and III, respectively, their contribution was virtually insignificant. That would indicate that the greater contribution of Black Labeled cases relative to the No Label condition occurs regardless of the counselor's level of Social Distance.

The reader will recall that Yamamoto et al (1967) found differential treatment of Black clients by counselors who did not endorse "would marry into the group" for five minority groups in America. The present study implies that differential assessment of the client as a function of race
occurs independent of Social Distance. Therefore, counselors at all levels of social distance displayed the same bias. However, in this study the bias was in the opposite direction. The implications of the reverse bias needs to be explored in a more systematic fashion to determine the actual effects of that bias on Black clients.

In summary, the results suggest that cases labeled Black will be rated higher and, thus, be seen as more positive than those with no label. Also, cases labeled White will not differ greatly from those with no label. Minority Contact seems to affect counselors' assessments of cases such that those with greater contact with minorities will tend to rate Black cases less high than those with minimal Minority Contact. Finally, Social Distance does not contribute significantly to changes in the ratings of cases.

Implications for Future Research

Future research might focus on the effects of the reverse bias in the counseling process. If, as this study suggests, there is a bias in the assessment of clients labeled Black, then the carryover into the actual counseling setting needs to be investigated. If the bias does affect counseling, then the manner in which the bias is displayed and its effect on both the process and outcome of counseling should be determined.

Areas of research might include the difference between counselors' initial assessment of Black cases (prior to actual contact) and subsequent assessments after the counselor has seen the client. Another area of research might focus on determining if social distance affects actual
client contact. In this study social distance was not a significant factor. Yet, Yamamoto et al. (1967) suggest that it is an important factor in the counseling of minority clients. Perhaps there are changes in the counselor's social distance after a certain amount of counseling with minorities. In Yamamoto et al. (1967) the counselors were more experienced than the counselors included here. A fruitful area of research might include using counselors from a wider range of counseling experience and from a wider range of experience in counseling minorities.

Finally, assessing Black clients' judgments of counselors might help illuminate how clients view counselors of high and low social distance or high and low in minority contact. That research effort could help to determine if there are any perceivable differences in the manner of relating on the part of the counselor. If those differences occur, research could also find out what areas of counseling those differences affect.

Summary

This study was undertaken to determine if counselors would evaluate Black labeled clients in hypothetical case summaries any differently than White clients or cases with no reference to a race for the client. Eight hypothetical cases were developed and were all exactly the same except for race labels (Black, White or no race label) which were varied systematically. Thus, three test groups were formed. Group 1 had no race label on the cases; Group 2 had four white cases and four black cases in random order, and Group 3 had the same cases as Groups 1 and 2 except the race labels were reversed. That is, a case in Group 2 that was labeled "Black" was labeled "White" in Group 3 and vice versa.
Eight cases were developed to disguise the purpose of the study and only four of the cases were actually analyzed. All Ss were given all eight case summaries which had four male and four female cases in addition to their age, sex, socioeconomic class, home environment and a problem they were experiencing. Race was given only in the two groups mentioned above. The No Label group was used as a reference group. Except for race label the four test cases were identical for all groups and only those cases were used in the analysis of results.

S's social distance, as measured by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, counselors' experience level as counselors and counselors' contact with minorities were also examined as independent variables. The BSDS was used to determine if counselors who desired more socially distant relationships with five ethnic groups (Mexican-American, Negroes, American-Indian, Spanish-American and Chinese-American) would evaluate Black cases differently than S's who desired less social distance from those groups.

Cases were rated on 11 seven point scales which represented positive to negative dimensions on a variety of questions concerning the client and predicted outcome. The scores for all scales were summed across all cases for each S. That summed score was the total scale score. A higher scale score indicates a more positive rating.

A stepwise multiple regression was used with Black, White, Counselor Experience, Social Distance I, Social Distance II, Social Distance III, and Minority Contact as the independent variables and the Total Rating Scale Score as the dependent variable. The No Label condition was used as a reference category such that the other independent variables were
judged and interpreted relative to that condition.

The results of the study showed that Black (labeled cases) contributed more to the prediction of the Total Scale Score than any of the other independent variables. The only other significant predictor was Minority Contact which had a much smaller contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable than Black. White (labeled cases) was not a significant predictor and contributed little to the prediction of the dependent variable. White labeled cases were seen as not different than the No Label condition. The remaining variables were also not significant predictors and, therefore, contributed very little to the prediction of the dependent variable.

With four exceptions all Ss correctly reported the type of race labels included on their case materials. Thus, Ss did attend to the race labels.

The more positive ratings for Black cases may be viewed as an overreaction to a fear of negative bias on the part of the counselors. Since 63 (73.3%) Ss indicated that they felt their programs did not equip them to counsel minorities, their fear of bias may have been coupled with a feeling of lack of training and knowledge. Race does seem to interfere with the counselor's view of the client.
Please rate the client you have just reviewed on the scales below. Based on the case materials indicate the point on each scale which best represents, in your judgment, that client. On scales where you are uncertain or feel that you do not have sufficient data to make a judgment, make the best possible choice—please do not leave any scale blank; answer all eleven (11) items.

1. With respect to self-awareness this person is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>high in self-awareness</th>
<th>low in self-awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. This person's behavior is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>controlled very much by her/his environment</th>
<th>controlled very little by her/his environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. This person's behavior is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very open to change</th>
<th>very closed to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. This person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>will not be able to conceptualize her/his problems well</th>
<th>will be able to conceptualize her/his problems well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. This type of person will usually be:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{self-referred} & \text{referred by others} \\
\text{to counseling} & \text{to counseling}
\end{array}\]

6. With respect to self-esteem this person is:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{low in} & \text{high in} \\
\text{self-esteem} & \text{self-esteem}
\end{array}\]

7. This person would:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{benefit from} & \text{not benefit from} \\
\text{removal from her/} & \text{removal from her/} \\
\text{his environment} & \text{his environment}
\end{array}\]

8. This person would likely:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{take advantage} & \text{not take advantage} \\
\text{of counseling} & \text{of counseling}
\end{array}\]

9. This person would be a:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{short term client} & \text{long term client}
\end{array}\]

10. This person will be:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{highly self-disclosing} & \text{not self-disclosing} \\
& \text{at all}
\end{array}\]

11. Counseling with this client would result in a:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{negative outcome} & \text{positive outcome}
\end{array}\]
APPENDIX B

CASE SUMMARIES
James B.

James is a 5 year old boy, he lives with his mother, three sisters and one brother. James is the second child.

He has been enrolled in a Head Start program for five months and his teacher reports no appreciable gains since he first entered the classroom. He constantly causes disruptions and never attends to her or classroom work. When sent to the school counselor he cursed her and told her "if she messed with him his mother would come and beat her up."

James also has trouble with the people in his neighborhood. He is always beating up on other children, breaking windows and stealing whatever he gets his hands on. One mother in the next apartment building complained that he tried to sexually assault her six year old daughter. She confronted James' mother but got no satisfaction and has threatened to call the police.
Louise is a 35 year old female widow and the mother of seven (2 boys and 5 girls). Her oldest daughter was born before Louise married so she was raised by her grandparents and lives in another state.

The next two daughters live at home and both have a child. One is married but her husband is in jail and the other daughter has returned to high school.

The family's income is a combination of social security and welfare. Louise receives social security for five of the children as a result of her husband's death four years ago.

Louise is a well dressed woman and looks younger than her age. She enjoys going out and has a male friend eight years younger than herself. He has been living with the family off and on for three years. He moves out whenever he and Louise argue, which is usually about other women.

Louise is having a great deal of trouble concerning the boys (ages 10 and 12) who are constantly in trouble at school. But her most immediate problem is with her youngest daughter. She has been placed on drugs for hypertension. Louise feels the teacher simply doesn't like her daughter and referred her to the school nurse because she cannot control her in the classroom.

The child was placed on medication by a doctor at the children's hospital as a result of one fifteen minute visit. Louise doesn't feel the medication was given on the basis of examination but on the strong recommendation of the social worker who is in close contact with the school nurse. Some other friends of Louise have also had the same problem.

The school has informed Louise that if the child doesn't take the medication she will not be allowed in the classroom. The child tends to sleep more than normal and seems very lethargic most of the time. Louise hates to see her child like this and sometimes refuses to give her the medication. She really feels the school is persecuting this child because of the problems they had with her older children.
Carol B.

Carol is a 29 year old housewife. She lives with her husband and four children. The oldest daughter is by her husband's former marriage. Basically, the family is stable financially although they have seen some very hard times. Carol's husband, Bill, has a good job and they live in a middle income neighborhood.

Carol feels they could be in a more secure situation if Bill would spend their money more practically. Bill doesn't allow Carol to make any decisions about spending money because he feels she is not capable. He sees her role as caring for the children and the house.

Bill spends time with the two boys but he has very little time for the girls. Generally he is affectionate with all the children and Carol but when he doesn't like something they all know it. The oldest boy and girl seem to fear him at times.

Bill spends a great deal of time away from home and Carol is certain much of it is spent with other women. She can't prove it and is not sure what she could do about it if she could prove it.

The family lives far from Carol's family and former friends. Carol feels she has no one to turn to with her problems so she usually puts up with a lot that angers her. On one occasion she left home alone and stayed in a motel for four days. Things got better when she returned but that was short lived.

Carol feels helpless because she has no skills with which to get a job and is afraid of the thought of making it on her own with the children. Carol also loves Bill and isn't sure she wants to leave him.
Paul G.

Paul is a 16 year old youth, living with his mother and younger brother who is five. In the past three years he has been an increasing problem for his mother. He has been arrested several times for car theft and placed on probation. His next arrest will likely place him in jail.

Until three years ago he was doing well in school. His mother exerted a great deal of pressure on him to get good grades. She also determined who his friends would be and delivered harsh punishment whenever he disobeyed.

They are a welfare family and his mother is enrolled in a six month training program in hopes of getting a job. Having been a former alcoholic his mother wants very much for her children to succeed and not repeat her mistakes.

Paul began to rebel and since three years ago he has been in constant trouble. He had been arrested for stealing cars twice and is always being expelled from school. Each time his mother has managed to get him out of trouble. Now she is worried because he is 16, has dropped out of school and is not working. He is dating a 25 year old woman who has four children and will have a baby in three months that she says is Paul's.
Judy P.

Judy is a 20 year old female who came from a middle class home. Her family consists of herself, one brother, her mother and stepfather. Judy's younger brother is her half brother, the child of her mother and stepfather. She has never had a good relationship with her stepfather but has had a very supportive and protective mother.

Judy graduated from high school with good grades and is now attending a large university. After one year of college she moved out of the dorm to live with her boyfriend Greg. Greg is not in college and changes jobs frequently. When he is not working (which is most of the time) they live on Judy's salary from a part-time job and the money her mother gives her.

Judy and Greg's relationship has been very trouble-ridden. Greg dominates Judy and threatens her life whenever he gets angry with her. For example, on one occasion he actually threatened her with a gun. Recently, he was arrested on a drug charge and is now on probation.

After Greg was arrested Judy returned home for a while but Greg persuaded her to return. He usually appeals to her sympathy by telling her he really can't live without her and that he needs someone like her to love him.

Judy's grades at school have really dropped and she is falling behind her class. Her mother has tried on every occasion to help her daughter but has very little influence over changing her.

Two weeks ago both Judy and Greg were arrested for forgery of checks, after which she asked to come home to live. Her stepfather has refused to let her live in his house. He feels this is just another temporary separation and as soon as she gets out of trouble she will return to Greg.
Michael T.

Michael is a 17 year old male and a senior in high school. He lives at home with his parents, there is an older brother in college. His parents manage and operate a small bar and restaurant.

Michael being the youngest has always felt he lives in his brother's shadow, especially since his parents constantly compare him to his brother. Whenever Michael gets into any trouble at school they remind him that they never had any problem with his brother.

In an attempt to establish his own identity he has joined a protest group at school. He also has been going around with an older group of young men he met at his parents' bar. He is attracted to this group because he feels big when he is with them and they also supply him with all the marijuana he can smoke. In fact, sometimes the group will spend the entire weekend smoking without interruption.

Michael has been smoking every day for a year and has not been off long enough to be straight for more than a couple of hours. He smokes because he finds he can talk to people easily when he is high and is doing his own thing.

So far Michael's grades have not suffered greatly and his home situation isn't too bad. Once in a while Michael thinks about not smoking because he feels he sometimes loses control over his behavior and becomes very suspicious of people. On one occasion while driving he felt his arms were independent of his body and he thinks he ran a couple of red lights. The loss of control over his behavior bothers him a little but so far he has not stopped smoking. If he gives up the smoking he will also have to give up his only friends.
Helen is a 60 year old widow who lives alone in a typical brick row house in a large urban city. She has one child (daughter), two grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

Helen works as a mail clerk for a large business. Her salary and a pension she receives from her husband's death makes her income quite adequate. She uses most of her extra money to help the grandchildren. The grandson is in college and the granddaughter has two children and is separated from her husband.

Helen's daughter tried living with her when she left her husband but they couldn't get along so she moved out. Helen also tried taking in boarders but that was also unsuccessful.

Aside from loneliness Helen's biggest problem is her drinking. She has been an alcoholic for twenty years. When her husband was alive she was able to control it better but lately she has been on drinking sprees for three and four weeks several times a year. She has been warned by her boss that she will lose her job if her absenteeism doesn't improve. Helen finds she really has very little ambition to get up each day. She doesn't look forward to anything in the future and her family provides very little support. They seem to be too involved with their own problems.
George A.

George is a 30 year old male, divorced and has a B.S. in marketing which he received from Temple University in 1968. George's father is one of eleven vice-presidents of an international corporation and makes a substantial salary. George's mother does not work.

While George was in the seventh grade (age 12) his father was transferred to England to become coordinator of European operations. George returned to the USA when he was 19 to attend Temple. After graduating from college he married a wealthy young woman but they divorced a year later. After the divorce George moved back with his parents.

Three years ago his parents moved back to the USA and he came with them. George has really not worked at very many jobs nor has he held one for any length of time. His parents support him most of the time.

He spent the last year reading in his room for the most part. His reading was mostly in philosophy and his activity has been an "examination of his existence." He considers himself a philosopher of sorts. He constantly worries about the problems of mankind and literally feels he must personally share the guilt of mankind. He has rediscovered Catholicism and has actively thought about entering a contemplative order of monks. He has no social life other than family gatherings.

His parents and friends worry about him as he has not worked at any substantial job since leaving college.

His parents also worry about his mental well being and as a result they make no demands upon him.

George feels that he is on a long journey that will ultimately result in the resolution of his soul. He has accepted the journey as one that must be painful and often wishes he were not so endowed with this special knowledge.
APPENDIX C

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Please answer the following questions. Most of the questions involve choosing an option or short answer, however, if you feel that additional information would clarify your answer to a question, please use the back side of this form and indicate which question was elaborated upon.

1. What year are you in graduate school?
   a. first
   b. second
   c. third
   d. fourth
   e. fifth
   f. other (specify)

2. Indicate the number of supervised practica you have had.

3. Indicate your previous counseling experience prior to graduate school.

4. Indicate any traineeships, internships or other training experiences you have had.

5. Sex: Male ____ Female ____

6. Race: Black ____ White ____ Mexican-Amer. ____ Oriental ____
   Spanish-Amer. ____ Other ________________________________.
7. Was your pre-college educational setting:
   a. Predominately Black _____
   b. Predominately White _____
   c. Half Black, half White _____

8. The work settings in which you have worked have been:
   a. Predominately Black _____ amount of time __________.
   b. Predominately White _____ amount of time __________.
   c. Half Black, half White _____ amount of time __________.

9. Have you ever lived in a predominately Black neighborhood?
   Yes _____, amount of time __________, no ____.

10. Do you have a close friend that is other than your own race?
    Yes _____  No _____

11. Do you have a person in your home of another race?
    Yes _____  No _____

12. Have you taken any minority courses or course training?
    Yes ____  How many __________  No ____

13. Do you feel your college program equips you to counsel minorities?
    Yes ____  No ____

14. In what socioeconomic group would you say you were reared?
    lower-lower _____  lower-middle _____  lower-upper _____
    lower _____  middle _____  upper _____
    upper-lower _____  upper-middle _____  upper-upper _____

15. Without looking back at the case material, were any cases labeled by race?
    Yes ____  No ____

16. If yes, were any:
    a. Black _____
    b. Mexican Amer. _____
    c. Caucasian _____
    d. Oriental _____
APPENDIX D
RATING SCALE II

On the left of the chart below you will find the names of various groups of people. Across the chart are a list of statements. For each group put a check ( ) by the statement(s) which appropriately describe your relationship to that group at this point in time. Check as many statements for each group as you feel are needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marry into the group</th>
<th>Would have as a close friend</th>
<th>Would have as next door neighbor</th>
<th>Would work in same office</th>
<th>Would have as speaking acquaintance</th>
<th>Would have as visitors to my country</th>
<th>Would have as members of another nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Amer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian (Amer.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Amer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Amer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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