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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The counseling relationship has been viewed, particularly in recent years, as a social influence process. By social influence process it is meant that specific behaviors and attitudes of the counselor may effect a change in the behavior of the client (cf. Strong, 1964; Frank, 1961). As early as 1956 Parloff stressed the need for research in this area in a review of research literature on psychotherapy:

"The interpersonal relationship between the therapist and the patient is widely accepted as basic to psychotherapy. It is assumed that the 'better' the relationship, the greater the possibility that the patient will benefit from treatment. Despite this, little attention has been devoted to the problem of matching therapist and patient in order to enhance the quality of the relationship (p. 34)." There has not been much that has been added to the literature to refute Parloff's statement.

More recent statements by other researchers also emphasize the social influence aspects of counseling, but again do not
attend to the problems of matching counselor and client (Goldstein, Heller, and Sechrest, 1966; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). Citing several studies related to the client-counselor relationship aspects of counseling, Goldstein et al. (1966), assert that there is a positive influence of the therapy relationship upon treatment outcome. Following this assertion the authors demonstrate the ambiguity in the term relationship and how this term is almost never clearly defined in research. Viewing the psychotherapeutic relationship in terms of interpersonal attraction Goldstein et al. (1966), propose that by "heightening the favorableness of patient attraction toward his therapist, to that degree does the patient become more receptive to therapist influence." Several ways to manipulate the client's attraction to the therapist are suggested. However, there is little mention of matching the interpersonal styles of the two individuals.

Truax and Carkhuff (1967) also discuss the possible effects of the interaction of patient and therapist in producing the most effective counseling. They posit that different kinds of interaction between therapist and patient would affect the levels of empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness offered by the therapist. They also state that the interrelationship of affective states in therapist-patient would impinge on the behavior of both the therapist and the patient. Several studies are cited by them indicating that personal prejudices of individual therapists affect
the outcome of counseling. Their viewpoint stresses that when the therapist is his most 'ideal self' the therapist can overcome his own prejudices, and can offer high levels of therapeutic conditions to everyone. Rather than concluding the above, why not view personal prejudices as part of a personal style that might be matched with the personal styles and behaviors of the patient to enhance the therapeutic outcome?

The present investigation is designed to test predictions about interpersonal influence and matching of client and counselor, with respect to their cognitive and behavioral characteristics. This is done within an experimental analogue of a counseling treatment situation. One way of looking at this problem is to study whether clients who differ on dimensions assumed to be important to counseling exhibit different reactions to counselors whose verbal styles differ. Verbal styles refer to sets of behavior engaged in by the counselor during a counseling interview. In this study the two discrete sets of behavioral characteristics identify the counselor as either directive with a major focus on client verbal content or non-directive with a major focus on client feelings. The client dimension that is studied is 'cognitive style' which relates to the way an individual perceives and conceptualizes events (Witkin, Dyk, Faterson, Goodenough, and Karp, 1962). The results of a number of investigations by Witkin and his colleagues (1962) suggest that individuals perceive and
organize perceptual events in distinctive ways. These differences in perceptual organization have important implications for other behaviors including counseling.

The basic questions raised by this study are whether persons who perceive and conceptualize events differently from one another, react differently to different counselor verbal styles; and, how these cognitive and verbal styles can be matched to effect the counseling relationship. More specifically, do persons with different cognitive styles express preferences for either a directive content-oriented counselor, or for a non-directive affect-oriented counselor upon viewing these counselors in a videotaped counseling interview? Specific predictions relating to this question are presented at the conclusion of Chapter III.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The focus of this investigation is on the interaction between the cognitive style of potential clients and the verbal styles of counselors. The first section of this chapter will cover the past research on the interaction of client and counselor variables. The second section will discuss "cognitive styles" and their correlates. An explanation and rationale for categorizing "counselor verbal style" will form the third section of this chapter.

Interaction of Counselor-Client

Sex. Such variables as counselor-client sex pairings, counselor-client personality similarity, counselor-client interest similarity, and counselor-client value similarity have been explored within the context of counseling process research. It is unfortunate that many of these variables are treated as incidental issues to other research questions. This is particularly true with regard to sex variables.
A major study on client-counselor personality similarity (Mendelsohn and Geller, 1963) examined counselor-client combination of sexes in relation to length of counseling. Based on a total of 41 female and 31 male clients seen by six female and four male counselors, it was concluded that sex matching had little or no effect on counseling outcome. This result was duplicated by Mendelsohn (1966) with a total of 201 subjects seen by six female and five male psychologists.

Several studies which specifically dealt with the issue of sex matching indicate little or no reason to believe that sex pairing has an effect on counseling. Sex of therapist was one of several variables related to premature termination of therapy by McNair, Lorr, and Callahan (1963). No relation of sex to duration of treatment was found among predicted terminators and remainders. A study by Hiler (1958) attempted to determine if different kinds of therapists lose or hold different kinds of patients. The variables under examination were sex of therapist interacting with the productivity (as measured by number of Rorschach responses) of the patient, as they relate to terminating therapy. The results were inconclusive because of some methodological flaws. Termination was treated as an independent variable and productivity prior to treatment as the dependent variable. It is not logical to consider that Rorschach response prior to therapy is dependent on whether the patient subsequently terminates.
In the most complete and methodologically sound study on sex preferences, Fuller (1964) surveyed client preferences regarding counselor sex and studied the interaction of the sex of the client and counselor verbalization of feeling. Scores for the amount of feeling expressed were obtained from a revised Kelly and Fishk Relationship Index. The pre-counseling preference regarding counselor sex of 588 non-clients of a University counseling service was secured, as well as pre- and post-counseling preferences of 40 of the clients. These 40 clients, however, included only individuals presenting educational or vocational problems, not personal problems. The results indicate that male non-clients preferred male counselors more frequently and female counselors less frequently than did females. Female clients preferred male counselors more frequently than female non-clients. Clients who preferred female counselors before counseling changed preferences more readily following counseling than clients who preferred male counselors. However, this study did not attempt to study the relationship between preferences and any counseling variable. It was also acknowledged that the lack of clients who prefer female counselors limited generalizations based on this study.

In summation, the few studies that have been done on sex matching in counseling show no sex differences with regard to patient-improvement or duration of treatment. At present, there is no basis for preferential assignment of a client of either sex to a
counselor of either sex. A finding of particular sex combinations that would be reliably more effective with a particular client sex could be of substantial value in improving chances of counseling success. This possibility will probably continue to be explored.

Therapist Variables. Several studies conducted during the last 15 years attempt to study the relationship between vocational interests of the therapist and the outcome of therapy with two different types of patients. The patients have been classified either as schizophrenic or neurotic. Whitehorn and Betz in their initial study (1954) selected two groups of seven therapists each from a pool of 35, and classified these groups as 'high success' and 'low success' groups with schizophrenic patients. Upon administering the SVIB it was empirically determined that four vocational interest scales differentiated between high and low success groups. They have been able to reproduce these results several times but with much overlap of patients and therapists and a shifting of predictive measures. A study not done by Whitehorn and Betz but dealing with virtually the same variables and some of the same subjects did not reveal any significant relationship between Type A and Type B therapists and different patient types (Stephens and Astrup, 1965). This failure to replicate earlier findings is puzzling, particularly because it was done in the same place with overlap of the patient and therapist samples.

McNair, Lorr, and Callahan (1962) studied the comparative
success rate of Type A and Type B therapists with a nonschizophrenic sample. The patients (N=40) and therapists (N=40) were drawn from seven VA out-patient clinics. The findings suggest that Type B therapists were more successful with these patients than were Type A therapists, which was the opposite of Whitehorn and Betz's findings. In another study (McNair, Lorr, and Callahan, 1963), however, no relation at all was found between therapist A-B type and duration of stay in therapy.

Similarity. Based on observation of the contradictory and unclear findings the hypothesized relationship of therapist interest patterns to patient types remains hypothetical. It might prove more effective to more directly compare therapist and patient interests in successful and unsuccessful cases. Most researchers who have studied therapist-patient personality similarity have used global criterion measures, as reflected in a pattern of personality test performances or broad personality types. The assumptions about the importance of patient-therapist similarity are based on the observations that something in the dyadic relationship is key to that which is therapeutic, this is in some ways directly related to the personalities of the two participants. The potential importance of similarity or dissimilarity to the success rate, and the idea that by some systematic matching of personalities the success rate will increase has generated a number of research designs.
One of the earliest studies in this area investigated the relation between client-counselor personality similarity and therapeutic improvement in 57 college students with emotional problems at the University of Illinois Counseling Center (Gerber, 1958). Personality similarity was assessed for both counselor and client by the Ewing Personal Rating Form. Gerber's hypothesis that a medium amount of similarity would lead to the most favorable outcome received partial confirmation. Although there was a significant difference between the medium and high similarity group, in favor of the medium similarity group, no difference was found between the medium and low similarity group. The results of this study are limited since only five therapists were observed and the spread of potential personality differences was thus limited.

In a more extended series of studies begun in 1963, Kendelschn and his colleagues explored the effects of client-counselor similarity in cognitive and perceptual style on length of stay in counseling, failure to keep appointments, and client attitudes toward the counseling experience. Client-counselor similarity was assessed by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) which had been administered to all students at the time of college admission, and to the counselors after treatment had terminated. The MBTI looks at four personality dimensions based on Jungian theory, which are (1) judgement-perception, (2) thinking-feeling, (3) sensation-
intuition, and (4) extroversion-introversion. Length of stay in counseling was used as the dependent variable, considering it to be a limited indicator of success by revealing the willingness of the client to permit himself to become involved in counseling. For male clients as the total difference scores increased, the mean number of sessions decreased. For each of the individual scales, the greater the client-counselor dissimilarity scores the shorter the duration of stay, although the only correlation that reached significance for the group as a whole is on the judgement-perception dimension. Several limitations exist in this study. First, the correlations that are significant are of a low order. Second, length of stay, without a determination of reason for termination, is a dubious success criteria. Also, the generality of this study is limited to those aspects of similarity tapped by the MBTI, a paper and pencil personality test.

A follow-up study conducted in 1965 by Mendelsohn and Geller corrected some of the flaws in the original study. Subjects divided into high, medium, and low similarity groups completed a rating scale of attitudes toward the counseling process and outcome some 3 to 12 months after completion of the interviews. The results indicate a significant curvilinear relation showing a positive evaluation of counseling to personality similarity in the nonfreshman group only. There was a curvilinear relation in the freshman group, too, but it did not reach significance. Mendelsohn and Geller
report a third study which was an attempt to replicate and extend their 1963 report of a positive linear relation between counselor-client personality similarity and duration of counseling. The subjects were 111 male and 90 female students counseled by six male and five female psychologists. A significant effect due to counselor-client similarity between high and low similarity groups was found. The relation was slightly curvilinear but not U-shaped. This well-designed study was consistent with previous findings, for while there may be differences among them in terms of linearity or curvilinearity, all showed dissimilarity related to unfavorable outcome.

In a subsequent study (Mendelsohn and Geller, 1967) the data re-analyzed and what appeared to be contradictory results were obtained. A chi-square analysis contrasting those who missed appointments and those who never missed an appointment revealed that frequency of missed appointments was greatest in the high similarity group. The less similar the counselor to his client, the lower the proportion of his cases that miss appointments. Neither individual counselor scores or individual client scores on individual scales were found to be associated with failure. The results are interpreted to mean that although similarity may facilitate communication it may also lead to early exploration of personal and conflictive material. Counseling therefore becomes both attractive and anxiety-provoking, generating ambivalence on
the part of the client. Missed sessions may reflect this ambivalence.

A frequently cited early study providing positive evidence of the similarity hypothesis was done by Tuma and Gustad (1957). They proposed that there would be a relation between client-counselor similarity and the amount of learning that takes place about the self. The Dressel-Matteson Self Knowledge Inventory as well as aptitude tests were the dependent variables. Correlations were computed between similarity indices of each of ten personality areas and criterion measures for academic ability, reading comprehension, vocational interests. Even though one of thirty correlation coefficients was significant, less than might have been expected by chance, they did not reject their hypothesis. They state in their conclusions that client-counselor personality similarity is associated with successful outcome.

A study by Cook (1966) deals with counselor-client similarity in values rather than personality. Ninety students engaged in short-term counseling and their counselors completed the Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey Study of Values. The difference scores were correlated with pre-post counseling difference scores on four different semantic differential scales involving own-self, ideal, education, and future occupation. Medium similarity was associated with more positive changes than either high or low similarity. The author himself acknowledges the many limitations of this
finding including the fact that the criterion measures are much too global, especially for brief counseling. Also, he tells us that the semantic differential may be contaminated by a social desirability factor. He also mentions that the range of client values was too narrow in itself and too similar to graduate and student counselor values.

In summary, not a single study was found which did not have some major flaws. None of these studies designated specific areas of similarity either predicted on some theoretical grounds or derived from empirical studies. It also seems the criteria were often too global and not related to the problem type of clients as the type of counseling. It is of interest to note that none of these studies explored the hypothesis within a framework of intensive, individual psychotherapy or the context of behavior modification done with experienced therapists. The only trend that does appear in the aforementioned studies suggests that curvilinear relationship on selected but too global personality variables is related to somewhat better results.

Other studies have been done which demonstrate that dissimilarity is connected with more favorable outcomes. These include studies by Lesser (1961), Snyder (1961), and a series of studies by Carson and his colleagues (1962, 1966), and Bare (1967). Lesser (1961) investigated the effect of client-counselor similarity of self-concept on counseling progress. The Butler-Haigh Q sort
was filled out by the counselor and by the client after the first and last hours of therapy. The greater the counselor-client dissimilarity on self-concept, the greater the improvement as measured by self-ideal discrepancy. A suggested negative relationship between perceived counseling success and similarity of Edwards Personality Preference Scores (EPPS) is reported by Snyder (1961).

Carson and Heine (1962) measuring personality similarity of patient-therapist pairs on the MMPI related this to criterion outcomes based on ratings of supervisory psychiatrists, clients judgment of outcome. The results showed a curvilinear relation of dissimilarity and success. Up to the point of marked dissimilarity, successful outcomes increase. This study was followed up by Lichtenstein (1966) who could not reproduce these results, and found no relationship between degree of dissimilarity and success. Carson himself then tried to replicate his original findings using subjects and setting that were highly comparable to his original study (Carson and Llweyllyn, 1966). The authors had to conclude that the original curvilinear relationship could not be duplicated by them and may have been a relationship produced by chance. Furthermore, they stated that at this stage of experimental development, global personality similarity does not appear to be a very fruitful or workable concept. They suggest more precise, analytical procedures be used to evaluate personality similarity of
patient and therapist.

Bare (1967), using the Gordon Personal Profile, Gordon Personal Inventory, and the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule with 208 clients, tested the hypothesis of a relationship between similarity and counselors' general effectiveness, empathy and facilitation of a close relationship as rated by clients. Generally, dissimilarity rather than similarity of counselor-client personality was more frequently associated with high ratings of counselor success.

This mass of conflicting data provides no clear-cut evidence that similarity or dissimilarity aids or hinders counseling success. It also seems evident that better designed studies, with better and more specific criterion measures, are necessary to test the null hypothesis that matching of counselor and client on the basis of personality has no measurable effect on counseling success or process.

Cognitive Styles.

Three of the major research groups involved with theoretical and applied studies on cognitive styles are Witkin and his associates, Klein and Gardner, and Bieri. Witkin (1965, p. 317) defines "cognitive style" as a "self consistent way of functioning in perceptual and intellectual activities." The terms cognitive controls (Gardner, Holzman, Klein, Linton, and Spence, 1959) and cognitive structures (Bieri, Atkins, Leaman, Briar, Miller, and
Tripodi, 1966; Schroder, Driver, and Strenfere, 1967) are employed as well as cognitive style to describe behaviors related to mediating cognitive processes. All three groups agree that knowledge of the organization of cognitive processes should lead to predictions concerning the way in which the person copes with his environment. A primary concern of the research on "cognitive styles" has been with the adaptive function of an individual's style. Many of the studies attempt to find the empirical correlates of individuals' perceptual styles, which includes body concept, defense mechanisms, and sense of identity. Since the rationale and measurements used in this study are primarily based on the work of Witkin and his colleagues, the term "cognitive style" will be employed throughout this paper.

The research program of Witkin and his colleagues (Witkin, 1965; Witkin et al., 1954) grew out of investigations attempting to identify contrasting modes of orientation for individuals when completing space orientation tests. In test situations, known as the Tilting-Room-Tilting-Chair test, and the Rod and Frame Test, some subjects relied on postural experiences and others primarily on the surrounding visual field as the standard of reference in making perceptual judgments. Subjects with contrasting modes of orientation on these tests were found to differ significantly on other perceptual tests, unrelated to body orientation. For instance, persons who, on the body orientation tests, used their bodies as
standard references in perceptual judgments, were also more adept at finding a simple geometric figure within a more complex geometric form on the Embedded-Figures Test (EFT). All these tests involve the necessity to keep an item separate from an embedding context, ignoring those aspects which are irrelevant to the specific task. Individual consistency in functioning on perceptual tests was also related to conventional intelligence tests, which require an analytic approach, to problem-solving situations which require re-structuring, and to unstructured situations such as the Rorschach and interview experiences, the Thematic Apperception Test and the Draw-A-Person test. On the basis of correlations obtained between the scores on both perceptual and intellectual tests and perceptual and personality tests a more general dimension of personal functioning that underlies these varieties of relationships was identified. This cognitive style was labeled "field dependence-independence" (Witkin et al., 1954).

A field dependent person is one who consistently experiences his environment in a global and diffuse manner. In studying more general behavior correlates, Witkin and his associates (1954) describe the field dependent person as one who tends to exhibit passive dependence on, and an absence of initiative in relation to, his environment. A field independent person consistently experiences his environment as structured, perceiving discrete parts which fit into an organized whole. Field independent persons tend toward
an active, initiating and organizing role in relation to their environment. When relating field dependence-independence to a more general area of personal functioning than just perceptual, the terms analytic and global cognitive functioning are used by Witkin; these terms contrasting the extent to which the individual is able to articulate and define his experiences with the tendency to leave it diffused, and ill-defined.

Different cognitive styles have been related to forms of pathology (Witkin, 1965). Using the Draw-A-Person (DAP) test, significant correlations were found between body perceptions based on the DAP and other strictly perceptual tasks. People who exhibit an analytic cognitive style on perceptual tasks also have a sense of their own discrete body parts and their interrelatedness. In a summary of his and others' research, Witkin concluded that articulated persons have more awareness of their own needs, feelings, and attributes which they recognize as their own. Those individuals who were classified as global with respect to their perceptual styles also relied more on external sources for a definition of their attitudes, judgments, sentiments, and views of themselves. Three sources of evidence are cited from sleep-dream experiments, incidental learning experiments, and experiments on children's test taking behavior.

Particularly interesting is that specific psychological defenses have been related to cognitive styles and degree of
perceptual differentiation (Witkin, 1965). It was hypothesized that repression and primitive denial are less specific ways of functioning than isolation and intellectualization. When feelings are not kept discrete from thoughts and precepts a more global style is being used. An empirical representation of the above was the finding that field-dependent students were more likely to report forgetting their dreams than were field-independent students. This can be interpreted as a form of repression. Clinical groups showing global cognitive styles include alcoholics, psychosomatizers, patients with an hysterical character structure. A field-independent cognitive style has been found among paranoids and obsessive-compulsive character disorders. However, much of the reporting of this data is anecdotal or lacks information about criterion used for patient classification. There also does not seem to have been attention paid to other personality and social class variables which might confound if not contradict these observations.

Witkin also relates several problems of therapy to level of differentiation. He suggests that field-dependent people are judged less suitable for psychoanalytic therapy. Witkin (1965) also states "it is hard to accept the idea that one kind of patient is suitable for therapy and the other not---it may very well be that each will benefit from quite different treatment procedures. Focusing on the kinds of therapy that may help persons who show the characteristics associated with field dependence may aid us in
finding ways of treating at least some of the field dependent patients who now seem to be rejected en masse (p. 329). Another notion of Witkin is that field dependent people seek therapy less often, are more likely to somatize and are not as active in seeking help as field independent people.

A third aspect of psychotherapy in which more differentiated and less differentiated patients may differ is in nature of their relation to the therapist. It may be expected that less differentiated patients are more likely to be accepting of the therapist's suggestions and interpretations, with the consequence that they would feel better faster than field independent patients. Relatively differentiated patients are likely to be cautious and judgmental of the therapist.

Two studies have been done in an actual therapy setting having cognitive style as a manipulated variable (Pollack and Kiev, 1963; Witkin, Lewis, and Weil, 1968). The hypothesis that the cognitive style of the therapist also affects the interpersonal exchange was verified by Pollack and Kiev (1963). Forty male staff members of the Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic had taken both the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and the Rod and Frame test to determine their cognitive style. Those physicians who were most field independent exhibited different interest patterns than those who were less field independent. Vocations requiring precision and exacting detail were most often preferred by the
field independent physicians, as compared to field dependent physicians whose preference tended toward vocations requiring flexibility. The results also suggest that field dependent psychiatrists were more likely to form personal types of relations with patients.

A more detailed study by Witkin (1968) was designed to assess the effect of level of patient differentiation on patient-therapist interaction and on the kind of affective reactions during therapy. The hypothesis that less differentiated patients tend to be more prone to shame than to guilt, and to hostility directed against the self rather than to hostility directed outward, was confirmed. The rationale used to explain this is that shame is based on some critical other person, and the shamed person is acutely sensitive to another’s impression and feedback. Relatively undifferentiated persons who depend on others for their attitudes and concepts of self are more likely to experience this shame. Guilt, in contrast to shame, is a more personal reaction to one’s own feeling of having violated a rule. One can feel very guilty about an act that is private or unknown to others. Guilt also seems to be more self-confined to a specific act, and is accompanied by less diffuse autonomic arousal than is shame. Two groups of four highly differentiated patients and four relatively undifferentiated patients were formed with one of each being seen by one of four therapists. Therapy sessions were transcribed and scored for degree
of anxiety and hostility including measures of shame, guilt, separation anxiety, and diffuse anxiety. In this study, however, the small number of students, the criterion used to choose them, and the lack of a priori controls over therapists' cognitive style limit any generalizations to be made. However, both this study and Pollack and Kiev's (1963) study taken together suggest the usefulness of a study in which both patients and therapists are matched in a systematic way with regard to levels of differentiation.

A related concept to Witkin's is the concept of cognitive flexibility suggested by Sprinthall, Whiteley, and Mosher (1964) as a focus for research on counselor effectiveness. Cognitive flexibility represents an ability to accept and respond to new information. In trying to develop a scale of cognitive flexibility the authors concentrated on observable behaviors of counselors and teachers. They were able to relate the level of cognitive flexibility to counselor effectiveness on the basis of behavioral ratings.

Counselors' Verbal Styles

One important dimension of a counselor's verbal style is the degree to which he chooses to follow the content and/or feelings of the client. Several studies exploring the orientation of counselors emphasize that individual counselors tend to prefer one mode more than another. Grater (1963) was able to demonstrate a
relationship between a counselor's verbal style and his first interview behavior. Counselees were classified as preferring either affective or cognitive counselor characteristics according to the way they responded to a checklist of counselor characteristics. Affective characteristics included warmth, kindness, acceptance, and friendliness. Cognitive characteristics included knowledge, poise, logic, and efficiency. Counselees who preferred affective characteristics were more likely to focus on discussions of personal-social problems during the first interview than were counselees who prefer cognitive characteristics. Both Brammer and Shostrom (1960) and Bordin (1955) also stress the relationship of the cognitive and affective characteristics to the counseling relationship. Words used to describe the cognitive characteristics of a counseling relationship include scientific, psychologically distant, rational, analytic information exchange, advising, and interpreting. To describe the affective characteristics of the relationship words used included warmth, psychological closeness, feelings of mutuality, understanding and support, and expressions of feeling. Individual counselors operate between these two positions incorporating elements of both, but differ in the relative weight given to each of these in a relationship.

The distinctions between client-centered affect oriented and directive content oriented counselors to be used in this study are based on a line of research begun by Sundland and Barker (1962) and
continued by McNair and Lorr (1964) and Wallach and Strupp (1964). In trying to determine the dimensions of therapists' techniques, activities, and values, each of these researchers have found two or three major factors. These include the degree of personal distance maintained by the therapist, particularly in terms of the expression or control of affect. The second dimension relates to the degree of explicit direction imposed by the therapist. Therapists who are on the high pole of the directiveness scale are more likely than their less directive counterparts to set goals, make long range treatment plans, consider social adjustment important, and lead the interview into areas he thinks should be discussed. The less directive therapist is more likely to be inactive and leave the direction of the interview to the patient.

The factorial distinctions found by McNair and Lorr (1964), at least on the surface, seem to represent the outgrowth of different theoretical viewpoints. The directive, content oriented style of therapy appears closest to the directive schools of counseling such as Williamson's vocational counseling and Ellis' rational-emotive counseling. Williamson has said that "a distinctive feature of counseling is its problem-solving dimension with regard to associated, subjective, affect disturbances" (1961). Williamson himself talks about two types of counseling which he delineates as scientific and curative respectively. The "curative" counseling relationship has as its goal the client's obtaining insight and
understanding about himself. Williamson conjects that the counselor's role is one of permissiveness and passivity. The "scientific counseling relationship" assigns to both counselor and counselee the role of a learner, a role of collecting, sifting, evaluating, and classifying relevant facts to arrive at a description which will provide both with 'insight' or perception of the nature and circumstances of the condition concerning which the client needs counseling (1950).

Ellis' techniques in therapy are active and directly related to the client's getting rid of illogical and irrational ideas. He, as well as Williamson, sees the major function of counseling to be educative rather than curative. The client must relearn more rational ways of thinking and behaving. "Rational-emotive psychotherapy makes a concerted attack on the disturbed person's illogical position in two main ways: 1) the therapist serves as a frank counter-propagandist who directly contradicts and denies the self-defeating propaganda and superstitions which the patient has originally learned and which he is now self-instilling. 2) The therapist encourages, persuades, cajoles, and occasionally even insists that the patient engage in some activity (such as doing something he is afraid of doing) which itself will serve as a forceful counter-propaganda agency against the nonsense he believes" (1962).

What has been called non-directive affect oriented style
appears similar to the client-centered school of therapy. Verbal techniques have always been related to the attitudes and philosophical interest in client-centered theory. Thus, the relative frequency of various techniques such as encouraging, interpreting, suggesting and questioning are infrequently used. Ways of expressing and communicating acceptance, respect, and understanding are to be used by the therapist. In contrast to the style of Williamson and Ellis, the relationship is much less an intellectual or rational process. Explaining the client's verbalizations or other behaviors; or prescribing actions which he should take are not seen as valuable techniques. The counselor is more likely to engage in an experiential relationship, paying more attention to both his own feeling and the inexpressed feelings of the client than other therapists. The client is also more likely to verbalize his feelings, and share his feelings about himself and the counselor, with the counselor (Rogers, 1961).

Conclusion.

Studies on counselor-client interaction, cognitive style, and counselor verbal styles have been summarized and critiqued in the above sections, along with an overview of opinions on counseling style. It is apparent that many of the counselor-client interaction studies are either methodologically unsound or even when sound lead to contradictory results. We may also note that very few of these
studies look at both vocational and personal problems. Most either choose to look at therapy situations or vocational counseling, without defining what they mean by these categories. The same problems occur in the studies by Vitkin on cognitive style. The one or two germinal studies relating cognitive style to therapy offer a very small N and only have very limited generalizability to vocational or personal counseling as it is performed in most University settings. The basic therapy model of Witkin has been a psychoanalytic, with no exploration of more behavioral or client-centered approaches to counseling. However, within this limited framework, cognitive style does appear to have some effect on both clients and counselors, and the interaction of one with the other.

Based on the past research, several suggestions can be incorporated into future research designs on the topic of cognitive styles and counseling. First, it is important that when matching the client and counselor on some personality variables, the variables be specific and less global than in past research. It would also be helpful to look at this matching as a primary aspect of the research with the hypothesis outlined prior to the research, not as a subsidiary component of some other question. Second, it is important to be able to tease apart the effects of the counselor style from those client reactions due to client personality variables. In other words, some control should be applied for both
client problem type and personality type. This is also applicable with respect to counselor variables, e.g., amount of experience, personality type, and theoretical bias.

In addition future research should give more attention to the problem of selection of criterion. Past research has not always indicated whether the criterion were process or outcome criterion, behavioral or non-behavioral. Any future research should make explicit the criteria chosen, why it was chosen, and what its limitations are.

These suggestions closely follow those of Kiesler (1966) who in a review of literature pertaining to research in counseling recommends that design incorporate both counselor and client variables so that one can assess which counselor behaviors are more effective with which type of client. Kiesler's recommendations for factorial design wherein different types of clients are assigned to different types of counselors, however, presents the difficulty of acquiring a sufficient number of actual counseling clients needed to accomplish the factorial design. Suggestions by Schmidt (1967) to overcome this difficulty include the establishment of data storage centers for counseling research, or the utilization of counseling analogues.

A discussion of counseling analogue research is presented below, particularly as it pertains to the methodology of the present study. The introduction of experimental analogues and the
use of controls in counseling and therapy research was initially met by controversy and doubt. Bordin (1966) reports on the reservations expressed in response to the utilization of experimental analogues as early as 1943. The question of how representative of therapy are therapeutic methods tested under research conditions was asked of Keets' study (1948). This experiment consisted of a comparison of the effectiveness of reflection versus interpretation in aiding the subject to overcome a block in short term memory. Various analogues for counseling and therapy since Keets' study are reported by Goldstein, Heller, and Sechrest (1966), including studies on interview behavior, social reinforcement, and verbal conditioning.

Strupp's experimental therapy analogue comes closest to the methodology used in the present study. The problem Strupp addresses is that of trying to make explicit the therapist's mental processes in formulating a communication to a patient in therapy (1962). Making use of typescripts of psychotherapy he has developed motion pictures of therapy interviews. The subject-therapists viewing the tape are required to offer their own responses at selected points in the interview. Keeping the stimulus (the motion picture of therapy) constant, differences observed may be attributable to therapist variables such as levels of experience, theoretical orientation, professional affiliation or attitudes of the therapist. Several motion picture sequences, each lasting fifteen minutes,
were produced by Strupp. These films show different patients and therapists. The scripts were based on actual psychiatric interviews and all the roles were portrayed by actors. In this series of films the main focus is always on the patient, with the interviewee contributing only minimally. As Strupp has asserted, "The intent is to avoid 'competition' with the film therapist and thereby to facilitate 'participation' by a vicarious interviewer and to make the situation as realistic as possible (p. 26)."

More recently, research conducted by Norman Kagan and his colleagues at Michigan State University has demonstrated the utility of films in assessing a new technique designed to accelerate growth in therapy (1969). Four different series of films simulating emotional experiences with which to confront the client have been made. An actor is used in each of the films and is instructed to portray a particular emotion at an "imaginary individual" (the client) by talking to that individual. The actor directs either hostility, affection, fear of hostility, or fear of affection at the subject-client. It is reported that most subjects have had very little difficulty involving themselves with the actor in the film, even when large groups of individuals viewed the film at the same time.

What are the advantages and disadvantages, then, of a counseling analogue which uses a filmed series of counseling interview segments? One disadvantage is the criticism of
Artificiality. Strupp notes that there is no "true" interaction between client and counselor, since the subject-viewer is reduced to a more or less passive bystander, who cannot influence the course of the interview. Along with this, either the client-viewer or the counselor-viewer is deprived of the opportunity to assess the reaction to him as an individual. Among the advantages of this method are (a) the client and the counselor's verbal communications occur in a real counseling context, (b) it provides the viewer with a fairly realistic sample of an individual's behavior while presenting him with both visual and auditory cues. While having both these advantages, the researcher can still define the phenomena he wishes to study and control their occurrence, allowing the phenomena to be observed and measured.

The present investigation attempts to incorporate some of the above suggestions. It seeks to examine the effect of subjects' cognitive styles (field dependent, field independent, and a middle range of field dependence-independence) on their viewing four counseling interviews. These interviews include two problem types (vocational and personal), each portrayed with two counseling styles. Each of these counselors portray different behaviors varying on two separate dimensions of directive - non-directive and affect-content to form composites of two different counseling styles. In addition, the control of counselor variables is accomplished by the use of an actor and advanced counseling...
psychology graduate student to portray the client and counselor respectively in the four videotape interviews. This pair of people is trained to present specific client and counselor roles, in realistic counseling interviews lasting approximately fifteen minutes each.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present study was to assess experimentally the effects of subjects' cognitive style on their judgements about various counseling interactions, each with different client problems and different counselor styles. A second aim was to gather evidence as to whether subject-observer's cognitive style is related to other behavior, such as determination of college major or future vocational choice. A third but subsidiary aim was to explore other subject variables that may relate to preferences in counselor verbal style.

Counseling Roles:

Four counseling situations were devised to display to prospective subjects (Ss). An advanced counseling psychology graduate student played the role of the counselor, and a theater major played the role of the client enacting each counseling situation. The four situations were represented the following way: a) an educational-vocational problem with a directive,
content-oriented counselor, b) an educational-vocational problem with a client-centered, affect-oriented counselor, c) a personal psychological problem with a directive, content-oriented counselor, and d) a personal psychological problem with a client-centered, affect-oriented counselor.

The "Case of Bill Davis", mentioned in Bordin's *Psychological Counseling* (1955, pp. 77-83), was chosen to represent a typical educational-vocational problem which might be explored in counseling. The problem Bill presents to the counselor is one of indecision about his career goals, and whether he should continue in his selected educational field of engineering. He is hoping that some tests will help him find out what department in a business he would be most interested in. Personal data and family background of Bill Davis are described in Appendix A. This additional information was used by the counseling psychology graduate student and the drama student to help them roleplay the situation more realistically. This same procedure was also used for the personal psychological problem, with this data also included in Appendix A.

For the personal psychological problem, a case reported in Callis' *A Casebook of Counseling* (1955, pp. 59-65) was taken as a typical representative of a psychological problem that might be explored at a counseling center. Robert Smith presents to the counselor his inability to handle his emotions, particularly anger. He talks about the reasons for his anger and his feelings
of being under a large strain.

Each of these two cases are role-played in two distinct ways. One approach is with the counseling psychology graduate student portraying a directive content-oriented counselor. Another is with the graduate student portraying a non-directive affect-oriented counselor. These approaches differ in the extent to which the counselor employs directive and non-directive techniques, and to which the counselor decides to focus in on both his and the client's personal feelings and reactions. To make videotaped recordings of this, in an attempt to specify the actual behaviors the counseling student was to follow the guidelines listed below. Each role and its guidelines were given to him prior to the roleplaying recording and discussed in detail with him by the experimenter. The videotaped segments were from 11 to 14 minutes in length, portraying the opening minutes of an opening interview.

Guidelines for Counseling Roles. When engaging in the direct, content-oriented style, the counselor followed these behavioral guidelines, as they were appropriate in the interaction:

a) led the interview into areas he thought should be discussed

b) set goals for the client, both for in and out of the interview

c) set tasks for the client, both within and outside the interview

d) focused on the social adjustment aspects of the client's
problem, by having tasks and goals relate to socially valued, external, objective criteria

e) took necessary steps to help client evaluate his problem more clearly, i.e., questioning, and classifying information

f) used encouragement, persuasion, cajoling, or insistence to help client relearn ideas about himself or others

g) contradicted or debated with client on points of disagreement

h) readily supplied useful information

i) did not get emotionally involved with the client

j) did not readily express his personal feelings as elicited by the client, i.e., rarely showed anger

k) acted in a reserved, professional manner

When engaging in the non-directive affect-oriented verbal style, the counselor:

a) allowed the client to determine the direction of the interview, and remained relatively inactive in this regard

b) stressed his understanding of the client by rephrasing and supportive statements to the client

c) acted spontaneously on the basis of his feeling with the client, i.e., expressed anger if he felt angry or walked about the room during counseling

d) felt comfortable and acted it, i.e., removing tie or jacket, or using client's first name

e) allowed aspects of his private life to become known

f) felt free to answer personal questions of opinion

g) was unlikely to supply factual or objective information

h) had the client focus in on his own feelings and reactions to events both external and internal
1) did not prescribe tasks or goals for the client
j) rarely used any persuasive technique

Following this discussion and the discussion of the actual case material with both the theater student and the counseling psychology student, the videotape segments were made. A pilot test was run to ascertain whether there were discriminable differences among the four videotape segments. A group of ten college students in an undergraduate psychology course volunteered to view the videotapes. Each of them was told that the four segments represent two different problems being approached with two different counseling styles, but were not told anything about the order of presentation. A "Counselor Behavior Checklist" composed of twenty statements reflecting the differences in counselor roles was prepared by the writer, adapted from the behavioral guidelines originally set forth to the counselor when preparing the videotapes (See Appendix A). Ten statements reflecting the direct content-oriented role and ten statements reflecting the non-directive affect-oriented verbal role were combined in a random order. Instructions were given to each volunteer to place a check in the appropriate behavioral categories observed for each segment. In addition to the checklist of behaviors two other questions were asked. These were a) did the counselor appear more comfortable in any particular sequence? If your answer
is yes, in which of the counseling sequences?, and b) can you identify the four segments you have just viewed, labeling each segment with one of the following four terms? The four terms are vocational-directive, vocational non-directive, psychological directive, psychological non-directive. They were also asked to write any additional comments or impressions they had of the counseling styles or quality of counseling.

For each of the segments the ratio of directive behaviors to non-directive behaviors checked was employed as a guideline to how reliably differences among the tapes are discriminable. It would be expected that in the two segments representing directive counseling approaches the counselor would be viewed by the volunteers as exhibiting more directive behaviors and vice-versa in the two non-directive segments. The following are the ratios for the four segments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational directive</td>
<td>69:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological directive</td>
<td>53:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological non-directive</td>
<td>24:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational non-directive</td>
<td>25:43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each segment the ten volunteers checked at least one and one-half times as many behaviors in the expected direction. In two of the segments there was a two to one margin of behaviors checked in the expected direction.

The question of perceived differences in counselor comfort across the four segments received a variety of answers, seeming to
reveal more of a projected bias in the viewer, than any real
differences in the counselor himself. Strong corroboration for
the existence of reliable differences among the four tapes was
obtained in the answers received to the question "Can you identify
the four segments that you have just viewed?" Every one of the
ten subjects was able to label correctly each of the four segments
after viewing all of the segments. Although a few of the
additional comments noted that the specific differences among the
tapes were not always very large, they were all able to identify
the different segments correctly. No one mentioned perceiving
any differences in the quality of counseling given by the counselor
to the client in each of the segments. The results of this pilot
study allowed the continued use of this tape to examine differences
in reactions to these four segments in relation to cognitive
style differences.

In addition, a second pilot study was run to ascertain in a
somewhat different manner whether there were discriminable
differences among the four tapes. Another group of ten college
students were required to view the videotapes. This group,
however, was required to respond to each tape by stating their
perceptions of the client, the counselor, and of the problem
presented by the client. This was done to determine whether
subjects would be able to differentiate counseling style and client
problem type when the response possibilities were not structured
for them by the "Counselor Behavior Checklist". Although this descriptive information was not categorized it does lend support to the results obtained in the other pilot study. The responses indicated that most subjects noted the differences in dress, degrees of support, suggestions, questioning, and other techniques. That is to say, directive content-oriented techniques were mentioned more frequently for the directive content-oriented videotape segments, and non-directive affect-oriented techniques were mentioned more frequently for the non-directive affect-oriented videotape segments. There were two subjects, however, who did not comment on the counselor styles, but only on the client problem type. There was no difficulty for any of the subjects in identifying client problem type.

Instruments. Witkin and his colleagues have developed several measures of cognitive style which relate to a range of psychological differentiation. These measures include the Rod and Frame Test (RFT), the Tilting-Room-Tilting-Chair test (TRTC), and the Embedded Figures Test (EFT), in which the amount of difficulty a subject has in distinguishing a geometric figure embedded in a more complex design is measured. The Closure-Flexibility test to be used in this study is very similar to the Embedded Figures Test, but has the advantage of group administration.

The Closure-Flexibility Test is a brief test, requiring only
ten minutes. On each line is a simple geometrical figure followed by four complex ones. The Subject places the check mark under the complex figure if it contains the simple one, a zero if it does not. The reliability data included in the manual shows a split-half reliability of .78 reported by Thurstone on an earlier form and a corrected split-half reliability of .94 reported by Pemberton (1951) on the present form. This test is published by the Industrial Relations Center of the University of Chicago.

The second task was the Object Sorting test (See Appendix B), as developed by Clayton and Jackson (1961). This test consisted of fifty words which refer to fifty concrete objects. The instructions require the S to put together the words which seem to him to belong together. Scores are the number of groups formed, measuring the degree of differentiation used in categorizing words. This sorting test is a symbolic representation of an Object Sorting test using actual objects (Gardner, 1953). This group paper and pencil test loaded as highly as did the individual Object Sort test on the same factor, in a factor analytic study of cognitive style measurements (Sloane, Gorlow, and Jackson, 1963).

An additional biographical information questionnaire constructed specifically for the present study was used to collect descriptive information such as age, major field, experience in counseling to be related to other measures used in this study. (See Appendix C) Three reasons for collecting this data were to determine the
similarity of this group of subjects to typical counseling clients, to determine whether certain preferences for counseling are related to specific behavioral data, and to assess whether certain correlates previously found to relate to cognitive style appear in this study, too. Several previous findings relate psychological differentiation to vocational behavior (Zytowski, Mills, and Paepe, 1969; Osipow, 1969). By gathering data about educational and vocational choice it would be possible to relate this data to previous findings. These previous findings would lead us to believe that field-independent subjects are more likely to choose scientific fields than field-dependent subjects.

The Post-Interview Rating Scale was filled out by each of the subjects four times, following each one of the videotaped segments. It consisted of twenty-five statements to be rated from one to seven, ranging from always true to never true (See Appendix D). A seven-point scale has been chosen based on previous experiences with the Counselor Evaluation Inventory, from which several of the items have been adapted. Gelso (1970), originally using a five point scale, found the extremes of one and five not used by most subjects, with only a narrow range of scores resulting. On modifying the scale to a seven point scale, a wider range of scores was used, allowing for clearer differentiation of subject responses. The items on this scale were chosen in an attempt to tap four different areas thought important to counseling success.
These are a) client satisfaction, b) counselor expertness, c) counseling climate, and d) generalization from counseling. The latter relates to the potential transfer of effect of counseling in teaching to the client general rules of how to deal with stress and other problems. Client satisfaction relates directly to whether the client feels he is now being helped by the counselor. Counselor expertness is related to the client's perception of the counselor evidencing those qualities which seem important to good counseling. Counseling climate relates to client perceptions of whether the counselor generates in him feelings of trust and comfort.

The twenty-five statements are a mixture of revised statements and questions from other counseling inventories, and additional new statements. Statements expressly relating to the areas of generalization and expertness did not appear on most other counseling inventories and had to be created for this inventory. Eight counseling psychology graduate students were asked to categorize twenty-seven statements into the four categories. This was done to determine whether the author's a priori categorization of statements was reliable. These eight people were given a short explanation of each category and the number of statements the author assumed was in each category. They were then asked to divide the twenty-seven statements into the four categories.

Two of the twenty-seven statements from the original pool of
statements were discarded because only three of the eight people agreed on the same category for each of the two statements. The range of agreement among judges was 63% to 100%, or total agreement among the judges as to which category a statement belonged in.

The mean per cent of agreement and the range of agreement for each of the statements in the four categories is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agreement Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>80%, 75%-88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Climate</td>
<td>75%, 63%-88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>89%, 63%-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Satisfaction</td>
<td>84%, 63%-100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D includes the questionnaire and a list of statements which belong in each category of the questionnaire.

Subjects

Ninety-three male volunteers were drawn from the students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at the Ohio State University during the 1970 Fall quarter. The students participating in this experiment did so for partial fulfillment of a course requirement. Only males were used because the experimental results pertaining to behavioral correlates of field-dependence tend to be more consistent for males than for females (Witkin et al., 1954; Witkin et al., 1962).

These ninety-three subjects were divided into three levels of field dependence-independence on the basis of their test scores. All ninety-three subjects were categorized as field independent, field dependent, or moderate on each of the field dependence-
independence tests.

Procedures

There were two experimental sessions for each subject. The first session consisted of the subject viewing four separate videotaped counseling segments, and responding to each of these sequences by completing the post-interview questionnaire. Following each segment, subjects were given time to complete the twenty-five questions on the questionnaire. The order of the segments was randomly varied each time a group of subjects viewed them. This was carried out in groups of five or six, totalling 18 different groups. These sessions were approximately one and one-half hours. Each of the ninety-three subjects viewed all four of the videotaped counseling segments. They were instructed before viewing the tapes that the general purpose of the study was to investigate individual and group differences in reactions to counseling. The Ss were instructed to imagine themselves in the position of the client while viewing the counseling segments. They were told that these cases were based on actual case material, and presented some problems typical of college students. Following the viewing of each of the tapes they were asked to complete the Post-Interview Rating Scales. Particular questions about the client, the counselor, and counseling styles were only answered at the end of this session. At the end of the session they were also told by the experimenter that 1) they
had viewed two different styles of counseling, and 2) they saw only short segments of counseling interviews. The experimenter tried to impress on the subjects the fact that this was but a small sample on which to base the utility or effectiveness of counseling for each one of them.

The second session consisted of completing the two measures of field dependence-independence and the Biographical Inventory. Toward the end of this session, the purpose and general outline of this study was explained to the Ss. This second session was approximately 3-7 days after the first session.

Rationale

The cognitive style literature indicates that the field independent person perceives himself and others in a less global diffuse way than field dependent persons. Also there is evidence to suggest that the defenses used by the field dependent person tend to be more affective than intellectual or rational. On the basis of this data it is hypothesized that a non-directive counseling style would better match the generally more global and diffuse style of the field dependent person. Similarly, it is hypothesized that the directive content-oriented verbal style of the counselor would be a more effective match with the field independent person than the field dependent person.
Hypothesis I. Field dependent subjects will have significantly higher mean scores on the post-interview rating scales than will either of the other two groups of subjects when responding to the psychological non-directive segment.

Hypothesis II. Field dependent subjects will have significantly higher mean scores on the post-interview rating scales than the other two groups of subjects when responding to the vocational non-directive segment.

Hypothesis III. Field independent subjects will have significantly higher mean scores on the post-interview rating scales than the other two groups of subjects when responding to the psychological directive segment.

Hypothesis IV. Field independent subjects will have significantly higher mean scores on the post-interview rating scales than the other two groups when responding to the vocational directive segment.

Each of the above four hypotheses is tested in several different ways. First, differences in the total mean score on the post-interview rating scale will be analyzed by a one-way analysis of variance with respect to the three groups of field dependence-independence. The mean scores of the four categories of counseling
climate, counselor expertness, counseling generalization, and client satisfaction on the post-interview rating scale will also be analyzed by a one-way analysis of variance with respect to the three groups of field dependence-independence.

Rationale

Based on the previous work of Witkin et al. (1962), Osipow (1969), and Zytowski et al. (1969), differences in vocational choice can be predicted as a function of cognitive style. Using different measures each has related field independent people to the science fields and field dependent people to the non-science fields. The following hypotheses are based on these past findings.

Hypothesis V. The frequency of field dependent and field independent subjects who are enrolled in the sciences as compared to the liberal arts and social sciences will be significantly different.

Hypothesis VI. The frequency of field dependent and field independent subjects whose future career choice is in the science field as compared to the liberal arts and social science field will significantly differ from each other.

A chi square test is used to analyze the data. According to subjects' responses to questions three and four on the Biographical
Inventory Questionnaire they are classified as belonging to a science, non-science, or as yet undecided educational or vocational field. The science field includes biological science, mathematics and physical science, and engineering. The non-science field includes are, humanities, and social and behavioral sciences. Subjects in the science and non-science fields are also categorized according to their scores on the field dependence-independence measures.

Rationale

The null hypothesis is predicted in the following hypothesis because there is no theoretical rationale appropriate to predict directionality. It was of interest, however, to determine whether differences in subjects' ratings of counselor effectiveness would differ based on prior experiences with counseling.

Hypothesis VII. There will be no significant differences in post-interview rating scores based on prior experience with counseling.

A t-test comparing post-interview rating scores of subjects with counseling experience to subjects without counseling experience will be done. Responses to question six of the Biographical Inventory Questionnaire are used to categorize subjects into groups who have had counseling experience and those who have not had
Rationale

Based on the concept of similarity in styles producing more positive counseling effects, affective persons are hypothesized to prefer affective counseling styles rather than a cognitive one. It is also assumed that subjects who prefer more affective than cognitive characteristics in counselors will prefer non-directive affect-oriented counseling to directive content-oriented counseling. Some support in the literature is found, particularly in studies done by Witkin (1968), and by Grater (1964).

Hypothesis VIII.

(a) Subjects who describe themselves as affective will rate the non-directive affect-oriented counselor higher than the directive content-oriented counselor.

(b) Subjects who describe themselves as cognitive will rate the directive content-oriented counselor higher than the non-directive affect-oriented counselor.

Hypothesis IX.

(a) Subjects who rate counselor affective characteristics as more important than
counselor cognitive characteristics will rate the non-directive affect-oriented counselor higher than the directive content-oriented counselor.

(b) Subjects who rate counselor cognitive characteristics as more important than counselor affective characteristics will rate the directive content-oriented counselor higher than the non-directive affect-oriented counselor.

T-tests are done comparing post-interview rating scores obtained by the non-directive affect-oriented counselor to the directive content-oriented counselor. This is done for both the vocational problem type and the personal problem type. Two sets of subjects, classified as either affective or cognitive, are used to make each of the comparisons. The classification of subjects as either affective or cognitive is based on subjects' responses to questions eight and nine on the Biographical Inventory Questionnaire.

Rationale

Witkin's description of the field dependent person is that of someone operating on a more affective level, using psychological defenses such as hysteria and global denial more frequently than does the field independent person. The field independent person is
described as someone more likely to intellectualize and use defenses which are more likely to relate to cognitive referents.

Hypothesis X. The frequency of subjects with preference for either affective or cognitive self-referents will be significantly different for field dependent and field independent persons.

A chi square test is used to compare the frequency of field dependent subjects to field independent subjects who have expressed a preference for either affective or cognitive self-referents. The classification of subjects into groups of those who prefer affective and cognitive self-referents is based on question eight of the Biographical Inventory Questionnaire. The field dependence-independence classification is based first on the Closure Flexibility Test and then on the Object Sorting Test.
Table 1
Steps in Developing Counseling Analogue Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Videotape Productions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist (N=10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects view four videotape segments and complete PIRS 4 times.  
(N=93, or per group= 5 or 6)  
(i.e., Segment 3-PIRS>Segment 4-PIRS>Segment 2-PIRS>Segment 1-PIRS)

Subjects respond to  
two measures of field dependence-independence  
3-7 days after viewing videotapes.  
Additional biographical information is collected.  
Debriefing occurs.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The ten hypotheses presented in the previous chapter are presented below along with the results relevant to each hypothesis. Discussion of these results and an attempt to integrate and interpret the findings of the study will be continued in the following chapter.

H I. Field dependent subjects will have significantly higher mean scores on the post-interview rating scales than will either of the other two groups of subjects when responding to the psychological non-directive segment (segment 1).

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations on the Post-Interview Rating Scales (PIRS) of subjects in each of the three strata of field dependence-independence. It should be noted that the higher the score on the PIRS the more favorable the evaluation of counseling and of the counselor. The means and sd's for the PIRS total score and each of the four factors are presented separately for subjects who are categorized as high, medium, or low field independent as based on each of the two separate measures.
Closure Flexibility Test and Object Sort Test.

Inspection of Table 2 reveals that for the total score and the factor scores on the PIRS, subjects in each of the field independent strata based on the Closure Flexibility Test evaluated the counseling very similarly. Only a .1 difference on the PIRS total score exists between the high and low field independent groups. Based on the Object Sort Test, as compared to the Closure Flexibility Test, there is a larger mean difference on the PIRS total score between the low and high field independent groups although this does not hold true across the factor scores.

Tables 3-11 present separate ANOVA's for the total scores and the four factors on the PIRS for each of the two measures of field independence. These PIRS scores are based on responses to the psychological non-directive counseling segment, hereafter referred to as segment 1. Tables 3 and 8 indicate that, on the whole, subjects' overall evaluation of the counseling viewed in segment 1 is not affected by the degree of subjects' field independence. For field independence scores based on both the Closure Flexibility Test and the Object Sort Test the between group scores do not significantly differ from each other.

Tables 4-7 and 9-12 reveal no significant differences between groups for each of the four PIRS subfactors based again on responses to segment 1 of the four counseling segments. For neither set of field independent groups formed on the basis of Closure Flexibility
Table 2

Means and SD's on the PIRS Total Score plus Factors.
Based on Response to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measure of Field Independence</th>
<th>Post-Interview Rating Scale Scores</th>
<th>LOW F-I</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Closure Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Expertness</td>
<td>Closure Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Climate</td>
<td>Closure Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Satisfaction</td>
<td>Closure Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Generalization</td>
<td>Closure Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=87; n per strata of field independence = 29
F-I = field independence
Test scores or Object Sort Test scores were any of the results significant. The F ratio needed to attain the .05 level of significance is 3.11, and the highest F ratio yielded by our data in Tables 3-12 is 1.4. Taken together, the results presented lead to a rejection of Hypothesis I. That is, the Hypothesis did not receive even partial support from any of the ANOVA's for PIRS factor scores, nor from the ANOVA's for PIRS total score.

H II. Field dependent Ss will have significantly higher mean scores on the PIRS than the other two groups of subjects when responding to the vocational non-directive segment (segment 2).

Table 3

ANOVA for PIRS Total Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Groups Response to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>288.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>144.2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>65911.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>784.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
ANOVA for PIRS Counselor Expertness Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Groups Response
to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3851.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Climate Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Groups Response
to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>208.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6204.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
ANOVA for PIRS Client Satisfaction Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Groups Response
to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5662.6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Generalization Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Groups Response
to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5041.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8

ANOVA for PIRS Total Score
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response
to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>461.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>230.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>68070.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>810.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9

ANOVA for PIRS Counselor Expertness Score
Based on Object Sort Groups Response to
Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4059.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Climate Score Based on Object Sort Groups Response to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6975.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

ANOVA for PIRS Client Satisfaction Score Based on Object Sort Groups Response to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5973.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Generalization Score Based on Object Sort Group Response to Segment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4868.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The summary of the evaluation of Hypothesis II is shown in Tables 13-23. Table 13 presents the means and sd's on the PIRS scales of subjects in each of the three strata of field dependence-independence who have viewed the vocational non-directive segment (hereafter referred to as segment 2). Examination of this table reveals that the means and sd's based on field independence groups formed by Closure Flexibility Test scores are very similar to those based on Object Sort Test scores.

The ANOVA's in Tables 14-23 indicate that the predictions under Hypothesis II are not confirmed. The hypothesis leads to the expectation of a significant difference among PIRS total scores as well as factor scores for both the Closure Flexibility Test groups and the Object Sort Test groups. However, only one of the possible ten effects emerged, with a significant difference in the amount of expected counseling generalization by the three groups formed on the basis of the Object Sort Test. This resultant difference does not hold true for the three groups formed on the basis of the Closure Flexibility Test, which had the smallest F ratio of any of the ten ANOVA's. Generally the F ratio obtained on the basis of Object Sort Test groups were larger than the ones obtained on the basis of Closure Flexibility Test groups. This convergent directionality on the basis of Object Sort Test groups suggests only guarded rejection for Hypothesis II.
Table 13

Means and SD's on the PIRS
Total Scores plus Factors,
Based on Responses to Segment 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measure of Post-Interview Rating Scale Scores</th>
<th>Field Independence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low F-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>108.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>107.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Expertness</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Climate</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Satisfaction</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Generalization</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 87; n per strata of field independence = 29
F-I = Field independence
### Table 14
ANOVA for PIRS Total Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>522.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>261.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>73385.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>873.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15
ANOVA for PIRS Counselor Expertness Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4415.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Climate Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>231.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6253.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17
ANOVA for PIRS Client Satisfaction Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5940.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Generalization Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5795.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 19
ANOVA for PIRS Total Score
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3060.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1530.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>72954.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>868.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20
ANOVA for PIRS Counselor Expertness Score
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response
to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4280.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Climate Score
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response
to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>204.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6337.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22
ANOVA for PIRS Client Satisfaction Score
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response
to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>152.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6019.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Generalization
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response
to Segment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>444.85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>222.4</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5525.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

H III. Field independent subjects will have significantly higher mean scores on the PIRS than the other two groups when responding to the psychological-directive segment (segment 3).

Table 24 presents the means and sd's on the PIRS of subjects in each of the three strata of field dependence-independence who have viewed segment 3. Means and sd's are presented across strata for PIRS Total score and factor scores based on the Closure Flexibility Test groupings and the Object Sort Test groupings. The means based on the Object Sort groupings are very similar (within one point) of means based on Closure Flexibility groupings. The means for the subjects in the low field independence groups are all larger than for the high field independence groups, for each of the factors and Total score of the PIRS. This is contrary to the predicted direction.

Tables 25-34 present the ANOVA's employed to test Hypothesis III.
Table 24

Means and SD’s on the PIRS
Total Scores plus Factors
Based on Responses to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measure of Field Independence</th>
<th>Post-Interview Rating Scale Scores</th>
<th>Low F-I M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Medium F-I M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>High F-I M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>123.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>125.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>132.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>125.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Satisfaction</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 87; n per strata of field independence = 29
F-I = field independence
Table 25
ANOVA for PIRS Total Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>496.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>61677.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>734.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26
ANOVA for PIRS Counselor Expertness Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2669.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Climate Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>8586.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28  
ANOVA for PIRS Client Satisfaction Score  
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5071.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29  
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Generalization Score  
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5205.4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30  
ANOVA for PIRS Total Score  
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1912.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>956.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>56969.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>678.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 31

ANOVA for PIRS Counselor Expertness Score  
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response  
to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2222.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 32

ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Climate Score  
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response  
for Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>8139.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 33

ANOVA for PIRS Client Satisfaction Score  
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response  
to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>186.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4925.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34

ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Generalization Score
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response
to Segment 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4876.4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio for the differences between the three groups' response to segment 3 on each of the factors as well as the Total score do not approach significance. These data lead to a rejection of Hypothesis III.

H IV. Field independent subjects will have significantly higher mean scores on the post-interview rating scales than the other two groups when responding to the vocational-directive segment (segment 4).

Subjects' means and sd's on the PIRS Total score and factor scores are presented in Table 35. These mean differences based on Object Sort Test groupings are all in the direction predicted, with high field independent groups having larger mean scores than low field independent groups. However, the reverse is true for the Closure Flexibility groupings, though these differences are similar. The ANOVA's in Tables 36-45 bear out what might be
expected on the basis of the means and sd's represented in Table 35. Significant F ratios (p<.05) occur in Tables 41 and 43, indicating different response among field dependent and field independent Ss to vocationally directive counseling, with the field independent Ss more favorable to the directive counselor. The factor score based on Counseling Climate questions also shows significant differences among groups in a similar direction. These results are not supported on the basis of Closure Flexibility groupings, thus leading to rejection of Hypothesis IV.

H V. The frequency of field dependent and field independent subjects who are enrolled in the sciences as compared to the liberal arts and social sciences will be significantly different.

Table 46 presents the frequency of subjects enrolled in the sciences which include biological sciences, natural sciences and engineering majors as compared to subjects enrolled in the liberal arts and social sciences which include humanities, social science and art. As stated previously, the lower scores on the Object Sort Test and Closure Flexibility Test represent subjects who were more field dependent, and higher scores represent subjects who were more field independent. Neither of the $X^2$ based on Closure Flexibility or Object Sort Test groups is significant. Significance at the .05 level requires a $X^2=3.84$. 
Table 35
Means and SD's on the PIRS
Total Scores plus Factors,
Based on Responses to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measure of Field Independence</th>
<th>Post-Interview Rating Scale Scores</th>
<th>Low F-I</th>
<th>Medium F-I</th>
<th>High F-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>136.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>138.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Expertness</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Climate</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Satisfaction</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Generalization</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 87; n per strata of field independence = 29
F-I = field independence
Table 36
ANOVA for PIRS Total Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Groups Response to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3661.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1830.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>110446.4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1314.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37
ANOVA for PIRS Counselor Expertness Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Score Response to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>127.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3303.6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Climate Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Score Response to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>244.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>8736.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 39
ANOVA for PIRS Client Satisfaction Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Score Response
to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6451.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40
ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Generalization Score
Based on Closure Flexibility Test Group Response to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>132.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4802.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41
ANOVA for PIRS Total Score
Based on Object Sort Test Group Response to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>7933.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3966.9</td>
<td>3.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>107285.6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1277.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
### Table 42
**ANOVA for PIRS Counselor Expertness**  
Based on Object Sort Test Response  
to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>142.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3436.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 43
**ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Climate Score**  
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response  
to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>776.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>388.4</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>8433.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

### Table 44
**ANOVA for PIRS Client Satisfaction Score**  
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response  
to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>6471.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 45

ANOVA for PIRS Counseling Generalization Score
Based on Object Sort Test Groups Response
to Segment 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>222.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4499.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H VI. The frequency of field dependent and field independent subjects whose future career choice is in the science field as compared to the liberal arts and social science field will significantly differ from each other.

The frequency of subjects enrolled in science and non-science areas are listed in Table 47. The science and social science categories in Table 47 contain the same vocational fields listed under the previous Hypothesis V categories of science and social science. These data were obtained from the Biographical Information Questionnaire, Question 4.

Hypothesis VI is not supported with neither of the $x^2$ approaching significance. For both this hypothesis and the one prior to it the $N$ per cell was smaller than had been anticipated, leading to a guarded rejection of Hypothesis VI.
H VII. There will be no significant differences in PIRS scores based on prior experience with counseling.

Subjects' means, sd's, and t scores categorized according to their responses to Question 6 on the Biographical Inventory Questionnaire are presented in Table 48. As indicated earlier, this item asks clients, "Have you had any personal experience with professional counseling or therapy?" Nineteen of the 93 did have this experience and were compared to a random sample of nineteen other subjects from the remaining 74. Table 48 indicates that the mean PIRS scores for subjects having experience with counseling on segments 1 and 3, vocational directive and psychological non-directive respectively, are larger than the PIRS mean scores for the group of non-counselors. However, these directional results are not significant. There is no support therefore for Hypothesis VII.

Table 46

$\chi^2$ Comparing Frequency of Field Dependent and Field Independent Subjects' Choices of College Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closure Flexibility</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lower 1/3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper 1/3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object Sort

| lower 1/3 | 13 | 8 | .02 |
| upper 1/3 | 12 | 8 |     |
Table 47

Χ² Comparing Frequency of Field Dependent and Field Independent Subjects' Area of Future Vocational Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closure Flexibility</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lower 1/3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper 1/3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object Sort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lower 1/3</th>
<th>upper 1/3</th>
<th>Χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48

Means, SD's, and t-tests Comparing Counseling and No Counseling Groups' Response to the PIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Counseling N=19</th>
<th>No-Counseling N=19</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRS 1</td>
<td>135.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>126.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRS 2</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>125.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRS 3</td>
<td>114.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRS 4</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H VIII. (a) Subjects who describe themselves as affective will rate the non-directive affect oriented counselors higher than the directive content oriented counselor.

(b) Subjects who describe themselves as cognitive will rate the directive content oriented counselor higher than the non-directive affect oriented counselor.

Table 49 presents the means and sd's of subjects' scores on the PIRS for different counseling styles in vocational and psychological counseling. The vocational non-directive counselor is compared with the vocational directive oriented counselor and the psychological non-directive oriented counselor is compared to the psychological directive oriented counselor in terms of PIRS total scores. Subjects were divided into either a "cognitive" or an "affective" set on the basis of their answers to question 8 of the Biographical Inventory Questionnaire. Question 8 asked each subject to circle four of eight words "which best describe yourself", the words being affective and cognitive self-referents.

Inspection of Table 49 reveals that three of the four comparisons between means are significant. The largest difference between means occurs between the psychological directive and psychological non-directive PIRS scores in favor of the psychological directive PIRS score. In all cases the vocational directive and psychological directive PIRS scores are higher than scores for the vocational non-directive and psychological non-
directive segments. There was a significant difference, however, between the vocational directive and vocational non-directive segments for "cognitive" subjects. The directions of the differences are not as predicted in Hypothesis VIII. Since three of the four results are different from what had been predicted, we must reject Hypothesis VIII.

Table 49
Means, SD's, and T Scores Based on PIRS Total Scores for Cognitive and Affective Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Type</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Non-Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>122.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.01
** p<.05
H. IX. (a) Subjects who rate counselor affective characteristics as more important than counselor cognitive characteristics will rate the non-directive affect-oriented counselor more highly than the directive content-oriented counselor.

(b) Subjects who rate counselor cognitive characteristics as more important than counselor affective characteristics will rate the directive content-oriented counselor more highly than the non-directive affect-oriented counselor.

Means, sd's, and t scores of the subjects' PIRS scores for each of the four segments are presented in Table 50. Question 9 of the Biographical Inventory Questionnaire asks each subject to "circle four of the following eight words which best describe counselor characteristics most important to you." On the basis of this response, the subjects were divided into two groups, those preferring a "cognitive counseling style" and those preferring an "affective counseling style", with those subjects exhibiting no strong preference removed from the comparison. Inspection of Table 50 reveals all four comparisons were statistically significant. For both groups of subjects, those preferring "affective" and those preferring "cognitive" styles, the directive style of counseling prompted higher mean scores on the PIRS than did the non-directive segments. For those subjects preferring a "cognitive" counselor the preference for the psychological
directive over the psychological non-directive counselor and the preference for the vocational directive over non-directive counselor was at the .01 level of significance, in the predicted direction. Contrary to prediction, even the subjects who stated a preference for counselors with affective characteristics rated cognitive directive counselors on the PIRS significantly more highly than the non-directive counselors on both the vocational and psychological segments. This preference was at the .05 level of significance, as compared to the .01 level for subjects who preferred cognitive characteristics. Hypothesis IX (a) is therefore rejected as stated with some guarded reservations. Hypothesis IX (b) is supported.

H. X. The frequency of subjects with preference for either affective or cognitive self-referents will be significantly different for field dependent and field independent subjects.

\( X^2 \) were done for subjects who scored in either the high or low third on both the Closure Flexibility and the Object Sort Tests. The frequency of subjects whose scores placed them in affective and cognitive categories (as defined by answers to BIQ item 8) are given in Table 51. Inspection of Table 51 indicates that the frequency distributions along the affective-cognitive continuum do not differ significantly to yield a significant \( X^2 \).

The preference for both groups of subjects classified as field dependent and field independent was to characterize themselves as
more affective. That is to say, most subjects in both groups use more affective adjectives than cognitive adjectives to describe themselves.

Table 50

Means, SD's, and T Scores Based on PIRS Total Scores for Subjects Preferring Affective or Cognitive Counselor Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Counseling Style</th>
<th>Vocational Directive M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Vocational Non-Directive M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>124.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.4**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Counseling Style</th>
<th>Psychological Directive M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Psychological Non-Directive M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>126.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>4.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>127.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>2.1**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01

N = 58
Table 51

$X^2$ for Frequency of Affective and Cognitive Reference Among Field Dependent and Field Independent Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Type</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An attempt is made in this section to integrate the results of this study and offer explanations of them. The variables relating to the four major hypotheses are discussed first. This is followed by an examination of the subsidiary variables (i.e., affective self-referents, experience with counseling) and their effects on Post-Interview Rating Scale scores.

The results of this study indicate that for subjects in general, the level of field dependence-independence has no effect upon their overall evaluations of counseling. Responses to the non-directive segments (segments 1 and 2) yielded no significant differences except for PIRS counseling generalization scores based on Object Sort Test groupings. For overall evaluation of the counselor, counseling climate, counselor expertness, counseling generalization, and client comfort, different scores on field dependence-independence tests do not differentially affect the potential clients' perceptions. Thus, although subject-clients may be classified as field dependent or independent, they perceive
the counseling climate as equally warm, accepting, empathic, see their counselors as being equally confident and "at ease", and are equally satisfied with the counseling experience they observed.

Similarly, for subjects' responses after viewing the psychological directive and vocational directive segments (segments 3 and 4) we can conclude that the level of field dependence-independence has little or no effect upon the overall evaluation of the counseling experience. That is, there are no significant differences among the different groups of subjects overall evaluation of counseling, counseling climate, counselor comfort, counselor expertness, or counselor generalization after viewing the psychological directive segment. For the vocational directive segment only two significant differences emerge, both on the basis of Object Sort Test groupings. For both the PIRS total score and the PIRS counseling climate score the F is significant with the means for the groups indicating that the field independent subjects rated the PIRS more favorably than the field dependent subjects. However, these results are contradictory to results obtained with groupings of subjects based on the Closure Flexibility Test which shows no significant differences among field dependent and field independent subjects upon viewing either segment 3 or segment 4.

It can be concluded from the results of testing Hypotheses L-IV that differences in degree of field dependence-independence has almost a negligible effect on subjects' responses to different
counseling styles. Only three of 40 comparisons based on responses to a post-interview rating scale completed by subjects were significant. By chance alone it might be expected that three significant results could occur when doing this number of statistical tests.

Relating more directly to the rationale for the first four hypotheses, it may have been incorrect to assume a simple linear relationship between the attributes of the field-dependent or field-independent person and the kinds of styles he would appreciate and evaluate positively in others. Witkin (1965) has indicated that the kinds of psychological defenses used by persons who are more field dependent or more field independent may be conceived in terms similar to those characterizing their cognitive and perceptual functioning. It seems more true of field-dependent persons than field-independent persons that feelings strongly influence thoughts and perceptions, and these feelings are not kept discrete from thoughts and perceptions. This is congruent with their inability to separate figure and ground on such tasks as the Embedded Figures Test or Closure Flexibility Test. A particular example of this lack of separation of feelings and perceptions is found in their tendency to be slower than field-independent persons in recognizing tachistoscopically presented words that carry an emotional connotation. Field-independent persons, however, show no difference in speed of perception of
neutral and charged words, suggesting discreteness of percept and feeling. In addition, the descriptions given by Witkin of how field-dependent and field-independent persons act during the first session of therapy are markedly different. Field-dependent persons often "pour out" a great deal, and what they tell often comes out in "eruptive bursts." In contrast, field-independent persons typically come to the first session with a well thought out account of their problems, with the presentation sounding similar to a prepared lecture. Both descriptively and theoretically the field-dependent person as contrasted to the field-independent person has more of an affective than cognitive verbal style. He also has more affective global psychological defenses than the field-independent person.

It has been assumed that these differences of field-dependent and field-independent persons would be reflected in preferences for particular counselor verbal styles. The data do not support a model of similarity between counselor verbal style and client cognitive style. Nor do the data support a model of complementary styles between counselor and client. That is to say there is no indication that combinations of field-independent subjects viewing non-directive affect-oriented counseling or field-dependent subjects viewing directive content-oriented counseling show significantly higher subject ratings of counselor effectiveness. No major differences among the field-dependent and field-independent subjects
who viewed these tapes were noted.

Further analysis of the same data used to discuss Hypotheses I-IV is used to discuss Hypotheses VIII-IX. No effect upon the ratings of counselors classified as either non-directive affect-oriented or directive content-oriented was found on the basis of subjects' self-description (as affective or cognitive). Neither was such an effect found on the basis of subjects' ratings of preferred counselor characteristics (Tables 49 and 50). An unpredicted result was that for all groups of subjects the directive content-oriented style of counseling prompted a more positive evaluation than did the non-directive affect-oriented style.

It may be that naive subjects, most of whom stated they had never experienced any form of professional counseling, had expected a form of counseling which reflected their prior experiences with seeking help. The more active, direct, content-oriented form of counseling may have satisfied their initial expectancies. The directive content-oriented counselor was more likely to give information, offer advice, and approach the problem in a logical problem-solving manner. The non-directive affect-oriented counselor who tried to personalize the situation very quickly, and used reflective and supportive techniques may have "turned off" the subjects. It also may be that the positive effects of a non-directive affect-oriented style do not occur as rapidly and cannot be observed by subjects as rapidly as can a direct content-
Several studies support the notion that client satisfaction, at least initially, is in part a function of conformance of the counselor's role to the client's expectations (Severinsen, 1966; Overall and Aronson, 1963). The findings of Severinsen based upon a single preregistration educational oriented interview suggest that dissatisfaction is related to dissimilarity of expected and perceived counselor behavior. Overall and Aronson found, in a medical setting, that patients who failed to return for a second scheduled interview showed greater discrepancies between their expectations and their view of the interview than did those who did return. Most of the discrepancy was in the categories of "active" and "information giving", with the therapists' behavior in each less than was anticipated. Viewed together, these studies lend support to the notion that the subject's expectancies are of importance, and that if they are discrepant with the behavior of the counselor they have a negative effect on the counseling relationship.

In light of this evidence, the results of Hypotheses VIII and IX may also help explain the lack of significant results in Hypotheses I-IV. If the subjects' expectations of counseling were in the direction of most other social relationships then this variable of expectancy may have had a moderating effect on the PIRS scores, overruling the effects of field dependence-
Negative results were also found for those hypotheses relating field dependence-independence to educational and vocational interests (Tables 46 and 47). Other studies which have found relationships between these variables have used standardized tests such as Holland's VPI or the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) to measure vocational interest (Zytowski, Mills, and Paepe, 1969). Even in these studies there was no clear-cut relationship between patterns of vocational interest scores and cognitive style scores. The present nonsignificant results lend some confirmation to the notion that the relationship between cognitive style and measures of vocational choice is at best a tenuous one. However, lack of relationship in the present results may also be related to our use of a smaller number of subjects than were used in the other two studies.

Results on the PIRS for subjects with prior experiences in counseling were not significantly different from the results of those who did not have personal experience with counseling. Only nineteen of the ninety-three subjects reported any personal experience with counseling and their experiences were a conglomerate of educational, vocational, and personal counseling. Perhaps due to the small number in each category and the lack of any specific information about the duration of counseling, or style of counseling, no conclusive results were found.
The question as asked now appears too global to really add much to this study.

Nonsignificant results were found when comparing the preferences of subjects for either affective or cognitive self-referents and levels of field dependence-independence. Most subjects in both field-dependent and field-independent groupings used more affective than cognitive words to describe themselves. It appears that no direct linkage occurs between the individual's self-description of himself and the degree to which he may actually be field-independent or field-dependent. Some degree of social desirability may also have occurred with the affective words including "warm", "kind", "accepting", "friendly." Subjects may have experienced more of a negative evaluation of themselves with the cognitive self-referents.

Witkin's theory of psychological differentiation has generated much research as indicated earlier in the review of literature. The results of this research indicate that a person's mode of perception is related to many other characteristics assumed to reflect the extent of differentiation. This study was particularly based on the past research relating cognitive style to forms of pathology, and to the relationship of cognitive style to patient-therapist interactions. It appears, based on the data of this study, that though characterizing a person as more or less field-independent may say a great deal about him, it is far from a
sufficient account to predict the effectiveness of counseling relationships. It would seem necessary to add a number of individual qualifications to the statement that an individual showing a particular characteristic or set of characteristics indicative of a particular cognitive style is predictive of how he might interact with another individual. Previous empirical studies of Witkin and others relating cognitive style to counseling process have dealt mainly with both well-defined and narrowly defined conceptual and operational aspects of interaction. For example, Witkin (1968) studied the hypothesis that less differentiated persons tend to be more prone to shame than guilt, and to hostility directed against the self than hostility directed outward. It does not appear that Witkin's theory as it is now developed lends itself to looking at the effectiveness of therapeutic relationships as a whole. However, it may still be useful to study the relationship of cognitive style to specific behavioral interactions which occur within the context of therapeutic relationships.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations have already been mentioned in the prior section. For specific hypotheses (Hypothesis VI) the N may have been too small. The n per cell were barely enough to permit doing a $X^2$ in this instance. The other limitation already mentioned includes the possible sources of error due to the use of such short
videotaped segments. This limitation encompasses three questions. What is the effect of using videotaped counseling interviews and asking subjects to personally react as if it were their own counseling? What is the effect of this with a repeated measures design? What is the effect of showing only a fifteen minute segment of counseling as compared to one or more hours of each problem type and counseling style?

The negative results of this study lead to several additional questions. Why are the results, in the main, contrary to those predicted in the hypothesis? Why doesn't problem type make a difference in the reporting of subjects' evaluation of counseling? In addition, is there any other possible explanation for the results which were significant, other than by chance?

One basis of the contradictory findings may lie in the instruments and methods used to measure the overall evaluations of counseling. Although the analogue seems an appropriate way of testing the hypotheses, it is possible that the segments were too short for subjects to be able to respond differentially to each of the segments. If people are to be able to evaluate different styles of counseling in terms of expertness, generalization, counseling climate, and client comfort, as well as an overall evaluation more time may be needed to view the counseling. Each of the segments in this study was no longer than twelve to thirteen minutes. Although the practical tests indicate that
people can note differences in counselor style among the four tapes, this may be very different from evaluating the counselor style which may be a more complex cognitive process.

An additional explanation may be that subjects were not able to place themselves in the situation of the client with each of the counseling tapes. Although able to view each tape separately, individual subjects may not have been able to respond as if they were having that particular vocational or psychological problem represented in the videotape segments. The subjects in this study were required to switch sets four times for all of the segments. Although statistically handled by randomizing the order of presentation for every five or six subjects, it may have created some difficulties in responding meaningfully to the segments.

Related to the above questions is the issue of using introductory psychology students as potential clients when these students enrolled in the experiment, at least in part, to fulfill research requirements for the introductory course they were taking. Were these problems in fact real and meaningful to them? Do such students represent typically counseled students at the University Counseling Center? While the questions raised above are clearly important, research does not exist which would allow complete answers. Although the use of analogue research has increased, not much research has focused on differential results comparing analogue research to more naturalistic studies.
The value of several of the instruments used to measure the effects of counseling may be questioned. Many of the items on the PIRS appear to rate high on social desirability. The same problem applies to items 8 and 9 on the Biographical Inventory Questionnaire. Similarly, it would be well for future research to factor analyze the PIRS to determine whether the four scales which were reliably differentiated by a small sample of subjects would also exist in a similar fashion when factor analyzed.

Another obvious limitation is also the use of only male counselors and male subjects, including only one of four possible sex combinations. For purposes of experimental simplicity and limitations of subject availability, controlling for sex appeared to be the best approach in a germinal study.

Future research in this area would incorporate several additions and changes, based on this study. The implications in this portion of the chapter as to a more refined criterion measure are apparent. The need to experiment with variations on the counseling analogue approach and compare these variations to each other is also necessary, not only in this area of study but with other counseling research, too. Finally, the need to corroborate findings based on limited sexual or ethnic groups is needed. It would have been fruitful to preselect clients into groups who had experiences with counseling and those who did not, and to define this clearly. This would have provided us with more of a basis for
looking at the relationship between the effects of counseling and responses to counseling styles.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The relevance of the relationship between specific personality variables of clients and specific verbal styles of counselors has been given little attention in counseling research. The present study examined the relationship of one important client personality variable to an important counselor variable; the cognitive style of subjects' relationship to a non-directive affect-oriented style and to a directive content-oriented style.

During the past twenty years there have been many alternate hypotheses advocating that similarity or dissimilarity of counselor-client pairs improves the counseling process and counseling outcome. It has become a tempting supposition that success ratios in counseling could be improved by informed and systematic matching of clients and counselors according to some personality measure. However, most of these studies have referred to global personality as reflected in a complex pattern of personality test performances, and to global success criterion for counseling.

The present study had three general purposes: (a) to study
the relationship between the effects of subjects' various levels of field dependence-independence to counseling effectiveness; (b) to determine if the subjects' levels of field dependence-independence interact with client "problem-type" (educational-vocational or personal-psychological) or counselor "verbal style" (non-directive affect-oriented or directive content-oriented) in affecting subjects' responses to counseling effectiveness; (c) to determine the relationship between several subsidiary variables such as educational-vocational choice, prior experiences with counseling, and adjectival self-referents to cognitive style and to ratings of counseling effectiveness.

Ninety-three introductory psychology students were subjects in this experiment, although only eighty-seven of these had completed all the forms correctly. The subjects were all males, mostly freshmen, attending The Ohio State University.

The experiment was arranged so that all the subjects viewed four videotaped segments including (a) vocational non-directive affect-oriented segment, (b) vocational directive content-oriented segment, (c) psychological non-directive affect-oriented segment, and (d) psychological directive content-oriented segment. These segments were role-played by a counseling psychology graduate student and a theater student. For all segments subjects were assigned to one of three levels of field dependence-independence based on first the Closure Flexibility Test and second the Object
Sort Test. The possible confounding effects of the counselor variable were controlled by having the same set of individuals role-play the counselor and client under all four conditions. Also, the order of viewing the segments was randomized each time a group of five or six subjects viewed the tapes. All subjects were seen twice for one and one-half hours each time, first viewing the videotapes and then completing the instruments used to measure cognitive style.

The dependent variable in this study was the PIRS completed by each subject after each viewing of the four segments of counseling. The independent variables included both measures of field dependence-independence and several questions on the Biographical Inventory Questionnaire.

Under the conditions of this study, the findings support the following conclusions:

1. For subjects in general, the degree of cognitive flexibility as measured by paper and pencil instruments was not related to subjects' ratings of counseling effectiveness based on viewing videotaped counseling segments.

2. No differential evaluation of counseling occurred among subjects as a function of client problem type.

3. For subjects in general, the verbal style of the counselor had a significant effect on subject's evaluation of counseling. Although this observation must be cautiously interpreted,
it does appear that a directive content-oriented style was rated to be more successful than a non-directive affect-oriented style within the limits of an initial brief contact with counseling.

4. Prior experience with counseling was not related to differential ratings of counseling effectiveness for different styles of counseling.

5. The degree to which subjects were willing to ascribe affective or cognitive self-referents to themselves or to their ideal counselor was not related to differential ratings of counseling effectiveness (with affective or cognitive counselor verbal styles).

6. Educational and vocational choices of subjects were not related to the degree of field dependence-independence of these subjects.

7. The degree to which subjects were willing to ascribe affective or cognitive self-referents to themselves were not related to their degree of field dependence-independence.

An effort was made to integrate the above results and to offer possible explanations for them. The limitations of this experiment were noted, along with the implications for future research.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Counselor Behavior Checklist
Let me thank you for participating in the viewing of these videotaped segments of counseling. You will view four different segments, each approximately twelve minutes. These segments represent two distinct problem types, one representing an educational-vocational problem, the other representing a personal-psychological problem. Each of these types is played with a counselor portraying two different counseling styles. For both the ed-voc problem and the personal-psychological problem the counselor on the tape portrays 1) a directive counselor and 2) a non-directive affect-oriented counselor. Thus, there are four segments, representing two different problems, being approached with two different counseling styles. While viewing these tapes you are to attend mostly to the behaviors of the counselor.

The list that follows is a list of possible behaviors engaged in by the counselor during the counseling sessions. In each of the segments, the counselor engaged in several of these behaviors. You are requested to mark each of the counselor behaviors you observe in each segment. Not all behaviors are present in each segment. You are to note which behaviors you observe on the checklist provided, during your viewing of each segment. Once a segment has been viewed and we have proceeded to the next one, you are not to make additional checkmarks pertaining to behaviors viewed in the former segment.
**COUNSELOR BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lead the interview into areas he thinks should be discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Set goals for the client both in and out of the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Allow the client to determine the direction of the interview, and remain relatively inactive in this regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Set tasks for the client, both in and out of the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stress his understanding of the client by rephrasing and supportive statements to the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Take necessary steps to help client evaluate his problem more clearly, i.e., questioning, and classifying information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Act spontaneously on the basis of his feelings with the client, i.e., express anger or walking about room during counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Use encouragement, persuasion, or insistence to help client relearn ideas about himself or others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Feel comfortable and act it, i.e., removing tie or jacket, or using client's first name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Allow aspects of his private life to become known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>May contradict or debate with client on points of disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Readily supplies useful information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Feels free to answer personal questions of opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unlikely to supply factual or objective information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does not get emotionally involved with the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Have the client focus in on his own feelings and reactions to events, both external and internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does not readily express his personal feelings as elicited by the client, i.e., rarely shows anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Does not prescribe tasks or goals for the client</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNSELOR BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST

19. Acts in a reserved professional manner

20. Rarely uses any persuasive techniques

Did the counselor appear more comfortable generally in any particular sequency?

Yes       No

If your answer is yes, which one of the counseling sequences?

1       2       3       4

Please write any additional comments or impressions you had of the counseling styles, or quality of counseling the client was receiving.
APPENDIX B

Object Sort Test
INSTRUCTIONS TO OBJECT SORT TEST

First of all, I want you to know that there is no answer to this test. Everyone does it in his own way. I want you to do it in the way that seems most natural, most logical, and most comfortable to you. The instructions are simply to put together into groups the objects which seem to you to belong together. You may have as many or as few objects in a group as you like, as long as the objects in each group belong together for one particular reason. If after you have thought about all the objects a few do not seem to belong together with any of the others, you may put those objects into groups by themselves. Please sort all the objects, indicating clearly which belong together and indicating clearly the separate groups by drawing a line between groups of objects. Use the other side of the paper if necessary.

 matches  paper  candle  folder  insect
 rosebush  checkbook  boat  paperbag  envelope
couch  chair  lightbulb  bottle  dollar
 horse  bed  globe  pan  magazine
 student  lamp  saucer  tile  radio
 thimble  car  paperclip  stove  frame
desk  leaf  pen  bicycle  post
 book  child  pin  photograph  piano
 letter  pencil  lion  concrete  applesauce
 iron  table  handle  grass  tape
APPENDIX C

Biographical Inventory Questionnaire
BIOGRAPHICAL INVENTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME__________________________

Instructions: Answer every question as best you can. If your answer to any question does not exactly fit one of the multiple choice answers, give the answer which best approximates your exact answer. Answer all questions honestly and, above all, thoughtfully. Fill in your one response to each question at the left of the question number.

1. My age, to the nearest full year, is

2. The approximate income of my parents is
   a) less than $5,000
   b) $5,000-$9,999
   c) $10,000-$14,999
   d) $15,000 or above

3. I am enrolled in the college of
   a) Administrative Sciences
   b) Agriculture and Home Economics
   c) Art
   d) Biological Science
   e) Education
   f) Engineering
   g) Humanities
   h) Mathematics & Physical Sciences
   i) Social & Behavioral Sciences
   j) University College
   k) Other

4. My current occupational preference will most relate to
   a) Administrative Sciences
   b) Agriculture and Home Economics
   c) Art
   d) Biological Sciences
   e) Education
   f) Engineering
   g) Humanities
   h) Mathematics & Physical Sciences
   i) Social & Behavioral Sciences
   j) University College
   k) Other
5. My cumulative grade point average is
   a) 3.0 or above
   b) 2.0 - 2.99
   c) 1.99 or below
   d) cannot answer

6. Have you had any personal experience with professional counseling or therapy
   a) Yes
   b) No

7. If your answer to 6 is Yes what type of problem most represents your presenting problem?
   a) Vocational
   b) Study skills
   c) Psychological-interpersonal
   d) Other

8. Please circle four of the following eight words which best describe yourself
   a) warm
   b) knowledgeable
   c) kind
   d) poised
   e) accepting
   f) logical
   g) friendly
   h) efficient

9. Please circle four of the following eight words which best describe counselor characteristics most important to you
   a) warm
   b) knowledgeable
   c) kind
   d) poised
   e) accepting
   f) logical
   g) friendly
   h) efficient
APPENDIX D

Post-Interview Rating Scale
115.

POST-INTERVIEW RATING SCALE

Based on what you have just viewed, complete the following form. Fill in each of the twenty-five scales. Do not leave any blank. You are to place a single checkmark ( ) along the seven-point scale for each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Your response will be based on your perceptions of the counselor and the counseling interview. You are to imagine yourself in the position of the client, as you respond to these statements.

1. The counselor appeared competent and knowledgeable.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   always true
   never true

2. I could not talk about some of the personal things about myself, because I was afraid the counselor couldn't understand.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   always true
   never true

3. The counselor had a great deal to offer me.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   always true
   never true

4. I doubt if many people with similar problems could get much help from this counselor.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   always true
   never true

5. I expect that I will feel more comfortable in my day-to-day life and generally happier after having concluded counseling.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   always true
   never true

6. The counselor was not very perceptive, and at times missed the main point I was trying to express.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   always true
   never true
7. I really do not think that the counselor helping me with this particular problem will make any difference when I have other problems.

[Blank]
always true
never true

8. Other students could be helped by talking with this counselor.

[Blank]
always true
never true

9. The counselor gave the impression of feeling at ease.

[Blank]
always true
never true

10. In our talks the counselor acted as if he were better than I.

[Blank]
always true
never true

11. The counselor expressed himself in a way that was easy to understand.

[Blank]
always true
never true

12. I have told the counselor a lot but he does not give me much help.

[Blank]
always true
never true

13. Because of counseling I will be able to get along better at other times in the future.

[Blank]
always true
never true

14. I would like to spend more time with the counselor because he could really help me with my problems.

[Blank]
always true
never true
15. I felt the counselor was objective and intelligent, which helped me.
   always true never true

16. Our counseling relationship was brusque and businesslike.
   always true never true

17. I can't see that the counselor could do much to help me solve my problems.
   always true never true

18. The counselor's comments helped me see more clearly what I need to do to gain my objectives in life.
   always true never true

19. The hour I spend with the counselor could not affect the way I act when outside his office.
   always true never true

20. The counselor was the type of person who insisted on always being right.
   always true never true

21. I felt the counselor was not very skilled - almost as if he were practicing on me.
   always true never true

22. The counselor acted as though he thought my concerns and problems were important to him.
   always true never true
23. I expect that I will be able to deal more effectively with other people, because of my relationship with the counselor.

______________________________
always true never true

24. I felt at ease with the counselor.

______________________________
always true never true

25. I distrusted the counselor.

______________________________
always true never true
Post-Interview Rating Scale

Expertness Items:
1, 6, 11, 15, 21

Counseling Climate Items:
2, 9, 10, 16, 20, 22, 24, 25

Client Satisfaction Items:
3, 4, 8, 12, 14, 17

Generalization Items:
5, 7, 13, 18, 19, 23
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