DESCRIPTORS- *ADOLESCENTS, *COUNSELING PROGRAMS, *INDIVIDUAL
COUNSELING, FILMS, STUDENT EVALUATION, *COUNSELORS, GUIDANCE
COUNSELING, SIMULATION, GRADE 9, GRADE 12, AGE DIFFERENCES,
SEX DIFFERENCES, PROBLEM SOLVING, ABILITY GROUPING, PROGRAM
EVALUATION, *TEACHER EVALUATION, STUDENT REACTION, AUSTIN,
TEXAS, WESTCOTT PROBLEM SOLVING SCALE

SUBJECTS (398) IN THE NINTH AND 12TH GRADES, BOTH MALE
AND FEMALE, WERE ASKED TO RATE INITIAL, FILMED COUNSELING
SESSIONS AS IF THEY WERE THE COUNSELEE. FIVE DIFFERENT
COUNSELING APPROACHES WERE USED IN THE FILMED SESSIONS--(1)
ADVICE GIVING - THE COUNSELOR ADVISES THE CLIENT ON A PROGRAM
OF ACTION, (2) QUESTIONING - THE COUNSELOR POSES A QUESTION
TO THE CLIENT PRIOR TO EACH CLIENT RESPONSE, (3) REFLECTION
OF FEELING - THE COUNSELOR RESPONDS WITH FEELING APPROPRIATE
TO THE CONTENT OF CLIENT RESPONSES, (4) SUPPORTING - THE
COUNSELOR ATTEMPTS TO CONVEY TO THE CLIENT THAT THE CLIENT
HAS "WHAT IT TAKES" TO WORK A PROBLEM OUT, AND (5)
INFORMATION GIVING - THE COUNSELOR PROVIDES INFORMATION OF A
SPECIFIC RELEVANT NATURE TO THE CLIENT. AFTER COMPLETING THE
"WESTCOTT PROBLEM SOLVING SCALE," THE SUBJECTS WERE DIVIDED
INTO FOUR COGNITIVE GROUPS, BASED UPON THEIR SCORES ON THE
INSTRUMENT'S TWO DIMENSIONS--(1) THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION
REQUIRED OR DEMANDED FOR SOLVING THE PROBLEMS AND (2) THE
DEGREE OF SUCCESS IN SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS. THE GROUPS
WERE THUS LOW DEMAND-HIGH SUCCESS, LOW DEMAND-LOW SUCCESS,
HIGH DEMAND-HIGH SUCCESS, AND HIGH DEMAND-LOW SUCCESS.
ANALYSIS OF DATA OBTAINED FROM COUNSELOR RATING AND COUNSELOR
RANKING FORMS (COMPLETED BY ALL SUBJECTS AFTER VIEWING THE
FILMED SESSIONS) YIELDED INFORMATION CONCERNING THE
PREFERENCES AND REJECTIONS OF THE COUNSELING APPROACHES AMONG
THE FOUR COGNITIVE GROUPS. ALL FOUR GROUPS TENDED TO PREFER
THE ADVICE GIVING APPROACH AND TO REJECT THE REFLECTION OF
FEELING APPROACH. BOTH HIGH DEMAND GROUPS ALSO PREFERRED THE
SUPPORTING APPROACH. THE QUESTIONING APPROACH WAS REJECTED BY
ALL THE MALES. ALL FEMALES EXCEPT THE HIGH DEMAND-LOW SUCCESS
GROUP REJECTED THE INFORMATION GIVING APPROACH. YOUNGER
SUBJECTS TENDED TO RATE BOTH THE ADVICE GIVING AND SUPPORTING
APPROACHES HIGHER THAN OLDER SUBJECTS. (JH)

PERCEPTIONS BY ADOLESCENTS OF VARIOUS PROCEDURAL APPROACHES
USED IN FILMED COUNSELING SESSIONS

Cooperative Research Project No. 3284

5-0546

Oliver H. Bown
Lewis F. James
Royal B. Embree, Jr.
JoNell James
Coystal Stone

The University of Texas
Austin, Texas
1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table   Page

Table   Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Potential strengths and weaknesses of various
counselor approaches have been discussed and emphasized
for several years. McNair and Lorr, however, (1964,
p. 265) expressed disatisfaction with the fact that "Solid
research evidence for the impact of the therapist is
meager." Other researchers (Stevenson, 1959) (Astin,
1961) have stated that there have been more publications
and research indicating the scope of problems involved in
the evaluation of psychotherapy than sound results from
experimentation designed to study its effects.

Astin (1961) has inappropriately and prematurely
expressed disatisfaction with counseling research in
arguing that counseling is "functionally autonomous."
Though disenchanted with the process of counseling, he
suggests that there are basic questions about therapeutic
concepts which have not been studied thoroughly, and new
approaches in experimental design may prove more fruitful.

1

For example, the suggestion by Frank (1958) of the administration of different amounts of "independent variables" to different groups was deemed appropriate by Cross (1964) who complained of its infrequent use. The focus of research exploring variables related to successful psychotherapy has been on three different aspects of counseling:

1. Client variables and their relationship to successful therapy.

2. Counselor variables and their relationship to successful therapy.

3. Client-counselor interaction dimensions or "therapeutic relationship" and successful therapy.

Client Variables

In a review of the prognostic studies in therapy, Windle (1952, p. 464-467) offers his conclusions and estimates of the value of some of the instruments often employed to describe client variables. He stated that:

> The foregoing review of the prognostic utility of the Rorscharch has failed to disclose any very encouraging concordance among studies for any diagnostic category. Prognostic studies of psychotics using the MMPI exhibit

> a large amount of disagreement among conclu-
> sions...(some of which) can be attributed
> to differences in types of patients studied.

Continuing in his review, he (Windle, 1952, p. 467)

remarked:

> ...All in all, it does not appear that ob-
> jective criteria have been found through
> which the TAT can be of prognostic use...
> The Mosaic test has also been asserted to
> be of prognostic utility but again there
> are no studies that have demonstrated its
> value in this area. Diamond and Schmale
> have described a technique that is an off-
> shoot of the Mosaic Test but...as yet its
> usefulness remains undemonstrated.

Studies using descriptions of personality traits of

clients as variables in prognosis have proven confusing

and conflicting, although the area has been investigated

with some thoroughness.

"Expression of feeling" by the client as rated

by independent judges was found by Snyder (1961) to be

positively correlated with successful therapy but his

sample (N=5) was too small for conclusive results. In

a similar approach Blau (1950) developed a scale based on

clients' self statements from taped interviews, again

rated by independent judges. The more positive and/or

ambivalent the self reference during the interview, the

better the prediction for success.

The use of tests of mental ability as prognostic indicators has met with some success. It appears that some types of cognitive functioning are positively correlated with success of therapy. Studies using patterns of ability for prognosis indicate promise but have not yet been investigated thoroughly (Windle, 1952).

Counselor Variables

Considerable research has been related to the posture of the counselor in the process of therapy. Fiedler (1950a, 1950b) developed a Q Sort which purported to measure the degree to which different counselors approached the Ideal Therapeutic Relationship (ITR). He discovered a high correlation among therapists of different orientations; and found that as therapists gained experience, they approached the ITR. Judged or therapist reported "empathetic understanding" was found by Lesser (1961) to be unrelated to counseling progress measured by change between self and self-ideal Q Sorts. Streitfield (1959) found expressed acceptance of others and ratings of competency by superiors unrelated.

On the other hand, counselor experience has been found to be positively related with outcome of therapy

independently of ITR (Gonyea, 1962). Effectiveness
(outcome) and quality of relationship (ITR) are related
to experience but not to each other. Some earlier
studies found no relationship between sex and duration
or between sex and improvement (Lorr, Katz and Rubinstein,
1958) (Sullivan, Miller and Smelser, 1958).

When client improvement was based on pre- and
post-TAT and Butler Q Sorts, Cartwright and Vogel (1960)
found a positive correlation between success and experience
of counselors. In fact, changes in clients working with
inexperienced counselors tended to be in a negative direc-
tion. Myers and Auld (1955) and Katz, Lorr and Rubinstein
(1958) also found a relationship between counselor experience
and outcome of therapy. Though the approaches have not
yet been related empirically to outcome or quality of
relationship, Campbell (1962) discovered that female
counselor trainees practiced more information gathering
and supporting that did male trainees.

Counselor-Client Interaction: The Counseling Relationship

The agreement by therapists as to what a good
counseling relationship is has been well described in the

previously cited studies by Fiedler (1950a, 1950b);
and all counselors try to achieve the aforementioned
relationship in the counseling process. Parloff (1961)
suggested the ITR is positively related to outcome and
correlated the ITR with 14 measures of outcome using a
small N of both counselors and clients. Only three were
weakly significant, but the results suggested that the
counselor is responsible for outcome via his skill in
establishing the ITR. Gonyea (1962) deemed Parloff's
results as spurious and found that, though the quality
of the relationship may be determined by the therapist,
the ITR has no relationship to counseling outcome as
measured by self description. He further noted, however,

> ... there remains to be explained how so many
> experts have come to so much agreement about
> an apparently false or at least irrelevant
> ideal.

Eaton (1959) and Lesser (1961) both suggested that the
ITR may, in fact, result in less movement in therapy in
that the client may become dependent and attempt to remain
dependent. A "dependency-nurturing" concept, characteriz-
ing some counselors, was discussed by Steiper and
Weiner (1959).

Variations in Described Counselor-Client Relationship

Fundamental to most theories of counseling is the assumption of the necessity of the counselor-client relationship. A variety of concepts have been used to characterize and measure this relationship. Fiedler (1950) described it with dimensions such as ease of communication, emotional distance, and status. Sundland and Barker (1962) state that Fiedler's dimensions provide little discrimination among therapists. Fey (1958), using an oblique factor design, found one factor clearly resembling Fiedler's single factor "idealness" with another three factors resembling the personal, nondirective factors found by McNair and Lorr (1964).

The description of the counseling relationship in all of the above research designs was obtained from sources other than the client. Fey (1958, p. 408) expresses reservations about his results in that "...these are ways in which clinicians are willing to describe themselves." Secondly, Fey (1958, p. 409) stated that "...questionnaire items represent the language and concerns of a clinician whose orientation is largely Rogerian." This would seem reasonable since

studies previously cited indicate that counselors of different orientations attempt to achieve a similar, if not identical, Rogerian relationship with the client -- regardless of the descriptive terminology employed.

McNair and Lorr (1964) focused on the counselors "report of their preferred treatment technique." Although the items used in their questionnaire did discriminate between types of counselors, the separation was poor and correlations between descriptive factors were high. The low interval consistency of the factor scales and factor inter-correlations may indicate that their factors were multivocal, much the same as those of Sundland and Barker (1962). Another possible interpretation is that they tapped a single second order factor resembling that of Fey (1958) and Sundland and Barker (1962).

Sundland and Barker (1962) also focused on counselors' reports in the construction of the Therapists Orientation Questionnaire. The findings of this study are inconclusive due to lack of clairty of the multiple factor structure and reliance on extremely small numbers of items within those scales. Sundland and Barker take issue with Fiedler and the ITR as a simple descriptive

factor. Aside from the deficiencies of the Sundland
and Barker report, it should be noted that the report
deals with what counselors say they do; while Fiedler
(1950) rated the actual tapes of what the counselors did
in therapy.

Regardless of what differences in theoretical
points of view there are between therapists of different
orientations, they attempt to achieve the same type of
relationship with the client in therapy as judged by
other therapists. As McNair and Lorr (1962, p. 428)
sum it up, "there was little indication...(different
types of)...therapists reacted differently with their
patients."

Client Ratings of Counselor

Bown's (1954) early and continued interest in
the relevance of client perceptions of the client-
counselor relationship has indicated that clients'
perceptions more accurately distinguished between the
successful and unsuccessful cases than did those of the
therapists.

Two recent studies by Van der Veen (1961a, 1961b)
offer a different and perhaps more promising approach to

the investigations of the counseling relationship. The author uses the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) to determine how the client perceives the relationship as expressed in terms of empathy, unconditioned and positive regard, and genuineness. A positive relationship was found between BLRI scores and client movement in therapy. At the same time, no relationship was found between the clients' perception of relationship conditions and that of five psychologist judges' perception of the relationship.

The general approach in studies on the client-counselor interaction has been to estimate the relationship by the use of judges outside the counseling situation who rate the relationship which is present. The nature of the ideal therapeutic relationship has been well established, but the method of obtaining an indication of its presence has not been successful (Fiedler, 1950a; Parloff, 1961). Furthermore, the relevance of the relationship concept to therapy has been seriously questioned (Gonyea, 1962; Eaton, 1959; Lesser, 1961). The method of obtaining relationship ratings from the clients in therapy has met with a greater degree of success (Van der Veen, 1961a, 1961b).

In considering the fundamental nature of the counseling relationship to counseling theories, information concerning the development of the former is necessary to clarify some of the currently conflicting findings of research. One can argue that it is premature to discount the relevancy of the concept because previous methodology has proved to be inadequate in capturing the elusive quality or quantity of the client-counselor interaction.

Importance of Initial Interview

Investigations have rated counseling interviews over several sessions in an effort to quantify the counselor-client relationship. Although the dimensions on which the judges based their ratings may be ample in describing the relationship, the time factor may serve to confound the results. The assumption has been that the relationship will gain strength over time, but this has not been successfully established.

Reinterpretation of the results could indicate that the counselor-client relationship is established in the first few minutes of an initial counseling session and only becomes manifest to judges after several sessions.

It is plausible that an "experienced" counselor gives a

particular client what he "needs" in these first few

minutes and is not particularly bothered about the

theoretical position or style of counseling which he

(the counselor) may profess. The first few minutes

may be crucial in the eventual successful outcome.

This would account for "experience" being positively

related to outcome. The ratings of responses in later

sessions would indicate a good counseling relationship.

An "inexperienced" counselor may miss the importance of

the first few minutes either through personal concerns

or employing a style or technique, which he has adopted,

from the beginning. As ratings are made in later sessions,

the counselor has achieved some comfort; and it would

appear that the relationship has gained strength. Such

a conclusion, however, could be a misjudgment. In fact,

a "dependence-nurturing" relationship found by Eaton

(1959), Lesser (1961), and Steiper and Wiener (1959),

could be developing which would result in poor outcome.

The Problem

The problem, then, is to determine the counselee's

perceptions of the counselor's helpfulness and understanding and the willingness of the counselee to relate to the counselor. For purposes of this research, it is assumed that counselees do make distinctions between approaches and techniques in the first few minutes of an initial counseling session.

The expressed preference of counselees for particular theoretical approaches to counseling may be related to particular types of intellectual or cognitive functioning. Previously cited studies have indicated that the mental abilities of counselees is related to successful outcome. Other studies such as Betz and Whitehorn (1956) and Whitehorn and Betz (1954) (1960) have indicated that certain attitudes in counselors have desirable effects on outcome when used with certain types of counselees. It would seem plausible that individuals with varying abilities or styles in solving problems would respond favorably to certain techniques or approaches in counseling while tending to reject others.

The Counseling Process

In approaching this aspect of the problem, counseling is conceptualized as a process whereby the

counselee not only gathers but learns to use effectively

available information in the solution of problems.

Though there has been some hesitance on the part of

theorists to refer to counseling as the "gaining of

information," it has been implicit all along. Counseling

has been referred to as "communication interaction"

between the client and counselor (Bordin, 1955).

Shaffer and Shoben (1956) defined counseling as a

"situation where the client can learn new patterns of

response." Rogers (1951), through the process of

"reflection of feeling," is calling the client's attention

to relevant effective information the counselor has

picked out of the client's expressions.

There appear to be two relevant dimensions

using this conceptualization of the counseling process.

First, individuals differ in the amount of information

they find necessary (demand) in order to solve similar

problems. Second, individual differences exist in the

amount of success in problem solving when using the

same amounts of information. Plotting the two dimensions

orthogonally, four gross categories result: high

information demand-low problem solving success; low

information demand-low problem solving success; high
information demand-high problem solving success; and
low information demand-high problem solving success.

Research by Westcott and others, cited later,
indicates the differences in behavior patterns of the
groups. The question posed here is, "Do individuals
using different amounts of information from that avail-
able and varying in success of solution to problems
prefer one approach or technique in counseling over
another approach?" Are counselees of certain types
more willing to relate to counselors employing a
certain approach in preference to counselors employing
other approaches particularly in the initial sessions
when, hopefully, the relationship is being established?

Counseling Adolescents

Specifically related to adolescence, and in
addition to the above aspects of the problem, are the
difficulties encountered in counseling young people.
The adolescent has long been noted for his erratic,
confused, and somewhat rebellious nature. There has
been no research published relating the changes that

occur in adolescent development to counseling theory
or practice.

Theories of intellectual functioning and
development such as that of Inhelder and Piaget (1958)
indicate a radical change in the kind of mental function-
ing existing during adolescence. Developmental studies
of self concept have shown extreme changes occurring
over the period of adolescence, both of the ideal self
and the ideal models (Mussen and Jones, 1957). Studies
of adolescents' perceptions of adult roles, such as that
of Hemby (1965), have indicated an extensive change
during adolescence.

The problem of counseling with these young people
is ever present, and the question of how to deal most
effectively with the problem has not been approached.
The question remains, "Do the changes in attitudes,
values, role perceptions, and self concepts lead to
differences in preferences for counselor style or tech-
nique?" More specifically, what is the relationship of
differences in age, sex, and cognitive styles to
preferences for counseling techniques?

Summary

Results of studies concerning the nature of the counseling relationship are unclear; however, defining the relationship in terms of counselee perceptions appears most successful.. How or when the relationship is established between the counselor and client is not known, and interpretation of the relevant research indicates that it can occur in the first few minutes of the initial interview.

Cognitive functioning of certain types is related to successful counseling outcome. When counseling is defined as the process by which the counselee gathers and learns to use available information in problem solving, specific dimensions of intellectual functioning become relevant, especially information demand and problem solving success. These two dimensions have been related to personality types which indicate the probability of varied responses to counseling style.

Theories and results of studies of adolescence have shown radical changes in attitudes, role perceptions, and self concept occurring during this period,

yet no research has been performed indicating a specific

preference or change in preference to counseling style

by adolescent counselees. Difficulties encountered in

counseling with this age group indicate a need to deter-

mine the counseling approach or approaches which would

augment the establishing of a sound counseling relation-

ship with this group. A step in this direction would

be accomplished by determining preferences at different

age levels within the adolescent period of development.

CHAPTER II

Relevant Research

This chapter contains references to research in counseling which deal with the theoretical foundation and instrumentation of the present study. Specific formulation of hypotheses is drawn from the references cited. The first part of this chapter deals with the definition of counseling approaches and counseling "leads." Previous methodology in research concerning the counseling relationship provides support for the use of such definitions of approaches or styles as representative of particular theoretical orientations.

Counselor Approach

Snyder (1945) developed classification categories for counselor responses based on the degree of permissiveness present. He employed simple acceptance, restatement of content or problem, and clarification or recognittion of

19

feeling. Seeman (1948) focused on content of
the response rather than counselor intent. In
a later study (1949) he used Snyder's categories.

Sherman (1945) also focused on the content
of counselor responses as a basis for structuring
them into "techniques of leading," She listed
the following categories: Silence, Acceptance,
Restatement, Clarification, Summary Clarification,
Approval, Tentative Analysis, Interpretation,
Urging, Depth Interpretation, and Rejection and
Assurance. Davis and Robinson (1949) defined
leading techniques as clarification, interpreta-
tion, tentative analysis, and urging acceptance
of advice.

Danskin (1955) used nine categories of
counselor roles. He listed Participating,
Diagnosing, Listening, Socializing, Reflective,
Advising, Supporting, Informing, and Information
Gathering. According to Morse (1956) this sug-
gests that the kind of role assumed by the counselor
is related to the counselor's orientation and
approach. In a study of verbal expression of

counselors representing three "schools," Morse
(1956) found considerable stereotyping of
responses corresponding to different counseling
orientations. Relating this to the present
research, the attempt is to discover the relation-
ship between preferences by adolescents for
particular counseling orientations (approaches)
and the cognitive styles of those adolescents.

Buchheimer and Balogh (1961) suggested
that counselors be trained in the use of different
types of counseling leads. Further, the above
authors discussed counselor role in the counselor-
client relationship in terms of Receiving, Accepting,
Understanding, Searching, Clarifying, Explaining,
Supporting, Advising, Predicting, Interpreting,
Investigating and Direct Questioning. Robinson
(1950) listed several similar techniques: Silence,
Acceptance, Clarification, Approval, General Leads,
Tentative Analysis, Interpretation, Unrelated
Topic, Assurance and Urging.

The duplication of types or kinds of cou
selor responses is readily seen in both the
operational definitions which undergird the research

and in the theoretical literature. In fact, part
of the confusion in the research in this area
may be due to overlapping of concepts or use of
definitions that do not adequately discriminate
one type of response from another. For example,
is there any difference between approval and
assurance found in Robinson (1950)? In Danskin
(1955) it seems probable that "socializing" could
also be "supporting."

Focus on Initial Interview

Overall and Aronson (1963) found that the
patient's evaluation of the first interview in
counseling was a better predictor of return to
psychotherapy than the discrepancy between the
patient's expectations and his therapist's percep-
tion of the interview. White, Fichtenbaum, and
Dollard (1964) used a model in which judges
rated and scored protocols of initial interviews
to predict return of counselees. The results
were highly significant and offered evidence that
the initial session may be the key to the develop-
ment of an effective counseling relationship.

Problem Solving Behavior

Logically, subjects who use different

amounts of information and vary in the effective-

ness with which it is used may have different

expectations and preferences of approach in a

counseling situation. This assumption is supported

by findings in studies (Westcott 1960a, 1962a,

1962b) concerned with personality characteristics

often associated with certain problem solving

behavior. Thus, Westcott (1962a, p. 21) concluded:

> ...That there are significant differ-
> ences in the ways in which these groups
> of individuals, identified by their
> problem-solving tactics and success,
> view their world and their relation to
> it. The successful intuitive thinkers
> are unconventional, affectively involved,
> confident and comfortable; the wild
> guessers are unconventional, affectively
> involved, but desperate and anxious;
> The steady successful problem solvers
> are cautious, orderly and confident,
> but can consider the possibility of
> behaving somewhat more erratically;
> the careful but unsuccessful problem
> solvers are cautious and compliant but
> defensive and moralistic about them-
> selves and the world.

The counseling situation or relationship is often

represented as an ideal which, if achieved should

be beneficial to every client, regardless of his

problem or personal make-up. The basic premise

of the present study, however, is that the prefer-

ence for certain types of counseling approaches

will be different, for example, for the "successful

intuitive thinkers" than the preference of the

"careful but unsuccessful problem solvers."

Westcott Scale

Based on the above rationale, this instru-

ment was chosen because of its particular relevance

in determining the way in which subjects tend

to handle information in problem solving. In

view of the stable characteristic of this dimension,

one can assume that the subject will tend to "handle"

information in the counseling situation which

he is rating much as he would in any problem solving

situation.

The Westcott Scale is a series of 15 items

(problems to solve) which are presented to the

subject. Information is available in small quantities

referred to as clues. The subject may give an

immediate answer to the problem at hand or use

some or all of the clues.

The studies by Westcott (1960a, 1960b)

and Westcott and Ranzoni (1962) support this

assumption in that subjects appeared to possess

personality characteristics describing behavior

similar to that observed on the Westcott Scale.

Westcott (1962, p. 7) stated:

> Without attempting to integrate
> these findings yet, let me simply
> say that it seems evident that people
> can operate in a very successful fashion,
> making complex discriminations and
> important shifts in behavior without
> awareness of what they are doing or
> the fact that change has taken place.
> It appears that there are, at least in
> some cases, changes in affect to accompany
> these changes in overt behavior, and
> that the entire operation can go on
> without any awareness by the subject.

Westcott (1960a, 1961) and Westcott and

Ranzoni (1962) demonstrated that there are indivi-

dual differences on the two scored dimensions

of this instrument, namely the amount of informa-

tion used from that available and success in

solution of the problems. Subjects in these studies

were categorized into four groups: Low demand-

high success (Group 1), Low demand-low success

(Group 2), High demand-high success (Group 3)

and High demand-low success (Group 4).

Westcott (1962b, p. 9) stated:

...I inquired concerning what differences
there might be among the individuals
representing the four extreme types
of problem solving performance: (1)
those who require little information and
are consistently successful--the true
intuitive thinkers; (2) those who
require significantly more information
than the average, but are also signi-
ficantly more successful--the steady,
hard working problem solvers, (3) the
individuals who demand a great deal of
information and are unable to solve the
problems--individuals possibly blocked,
or unduly rigid, or confused; (4) finally,
the subjects who ask for little informa-
tion and then leap to failure--persons
who are unsuccessful intuiters, possibly
desperate, or committed to the long shot
at whatever cost.

With reference to personality characteristics of

the types, Westcott (1962a, p. 26) said:

A self description of each group then
might be as follows: Group 1 members
see themselves as alert, quick, confident,
foresighted, informal, resourceful,
spontaneous, and independent. Members
of Group 2 see themselves as being alert,
quick, cynical, and headstrong. Group 3
members see themselves as cautious, kind,
modest, confident, foresighted, informal,
resourceful and spontaneous. Group 4 is
distinguished as being cautious, kind,
modest, and lacking in self-confidence,
while not at all cynical, sharpwitted,
demanding, or headstrong.

Westcott (1962a) reported relatively modest split-half reliability coefficients for seven experimental samples ranging from .36 to .72 for Problem-solving success scores and .70 to .91 for Information Demand Scores. They may be considered acceptable in view of the fact that these were homogeneous samples of college students, which would reduce the size of the correlations. This point, however, led to further work aimed at developing internal consistency of the measure and thus greater reliability. Pierce-Jones (1964) performed item analysis studies from large numbers of responses and reduced the length of the scale from 20 to 15 items. The revised scales when scored for ID and PSS produced normally distributed scores with more adequate reliability coefficients of .75 to .78 respectively.

The description of the widely varying personality characteristics possessed by different Westcott types, supports the hypothesis that individuals of the different types would, in the event of participation in counseling, come to

counseling with very different needs. There

would be no reason to suppose that all types would

approach the counseling situation with the same

expectations or needs in the form of relationship

with the counselor or the same preference for

counselor approach.

Background of Counselor Rating Form

Barrett-lennard (1962, p. 2) developed the

counseling Relationship Questionnaire while assuming:

> ...a basic general postulate of the
> present investigation is that the
> client's experience of his therapist's
> response is the primary focus of thera-
> peutic influence in their relationship.

Furthermore, (p. 2), he pointed out:

> ...It follows from this that the
> relationship experienced by the
> client (rather than by the therapist)
> will be most crucially related to
> outcome of therapy.

In addition (p. 2), he wrote:

> ...it would seem that his own (the
> client's) report...would be the most
> direct and reliable evidence we could
> get of his actual experience.

This provided the theoretical foundation for the

three dimensions of the Counselor Rating Form

(Appendix A) used in the present study.

The Relationship Questionnaire was based on the original Bown (1954) Relationship Q-Sort and contained both negative and positive responses. Barrett-Lennard (1962 p. 3) used content validity in support of this scale "as in other research where variables are given operational form for the first time, validation at this level is necessarily indirect."

Making use of the Barrett-Lennard findings, McCreary (1962) developed the Reliability Scale which Steph (1963) used as a basis for the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale (WROS). In its third revision, Steph used ?ive levels of "willingness to relate:"

Level 1: I would attempt to avoid any kind of interaction or relationship with this person.

Level 2: If no one else were available, I might consult this person for specific information of a factual, e.g., educational or vocational nature, but I would avoid any personal exposure.

Level 3: I would be willing to talk with this person about factual, e.g.,

> education or vocational concerns,
> and some of the personal meanings
> connected with these.

Level 4: I would be willing to talk with
this person about many of my personal
concerns.

Level 5: I have the feeling that I could
probably talk with this person
about almost anything.

Steph used judges who rated counselors
on the above dimensions and found considerable
variability in the way his judges rated the coun-
selors. It seemed that, without training, the
psychologist judges focused on the different
aspects of the counselor that were important to
their individual willingness to relate to the
counselor. By holding counseling orientation
constant, interjudge reliability estimates were
attained in the range .83 to .97. When obtained
across all judges, the correlations fell into
a range of .60 to .70.

The WROS was utilized in the pilot study,
reported later in this chapter, for the proposed
research with ample success. The results of the
pilot study indicated that subjects untrained in

psychology or judging do focus on different aspects
of counselors and thus are willing to relate to
them at different levels.

Development of Counselor Rating Forms

The dimensions of the counseling relation-
ship studied in the present research are defined
by the counselor rating form (Appendix A). This
instrument is a simply-designed form in which
the subjects are asked for a rating of five counselors,
using different counseling approaches, on three
principal dimensions. The counselee is asked
to rate each counselor, portraying a different
approach, on:

1. the degree to which the counselor is
    helpful in solving the problem,

2. the degree to which the counselor
    understands the problem, and

3. the degree to which the subject would
    feel free to discuss his problems with
    the counselor.

Item number three contains Steph's five levels of
"willingness to relate" previously mentioned.

From the pilot study data cited later in
this chapter, item intercorrelations were obtained.
Across forty subjects item-to-item correlations
for each tape rating were .50 or higher, and item-
to-total ratings were .80 or higher. Varimax
factor procedures were applied to the matrix.
This, in turn, resulted in the generation of five
factors, each accounting for an approximately
equal percentage of the total variance and unequivocally
corresponding to the five counselor approaches.
The internal consistency of the rating to be
secured from the film strips used in the present
study were expected to be as great or greater
than that obtained from the audio tapes used in
the pilot study.

Pilot Study of Counselor Approaches

The principal piece of related research
is the pilot study, already underaken and complete
(but not yet reported) at the University of Texas.
The pilot study employed a model similar to that
proposed here to determine if high school students

would express their preferences for particular

counselor approaches. More specifically, the

question explored was whether or not expressed

preferences for various counselor approaches would

be related to cognitive styles as defined by

Westcott's Information Demand and Problem Solving

Success Scale.

Procedures of Pilot Study

In the pilot study, audio tapes were pro-

duced in which male counselee responses were

identical in scripts of five four-minute initial

counseling sessions. Each of the five counselor

approaches was represented by appropriate responses

from the scripts presented by a single counselor.

A sample of 40 male high school seniors

listened to the tapes in groups of five subjects

so that the approaches could be presented in a

systematically varied order. The subjects rated

the counselor after each session. When they had

listened to and rated the approaches, all subjects

were given the revised Westcott Scale.

The two dimensions of the Westcott Scale,

Information Demand (ID) and Problem Solving Success

(PSS) were split at the medians which divided

the sample into four groups: Low ID-High PSS,

Low ID-Low PSS, High ID-Low PSS, and High ID-

High PSS.

Development of Scripts Representing Counselor Approaches

For purposes of the pilot study, the

following procedures were employed, which

resulted in the development of five scripts

representing distinct counseling approaches.

Construction of the scripts used in the pilot

study involved two departmental staff members

who worked separately with a common counselee

problem. Appropriate counselor responses were

originated for each of several approaches.

Agreement was reached, and the scripts were

revised. The scripts were then edited by a

counseling supervisor to increase the representa-

tiveness of each script for each approach.

Finally, the scripts were submitted to three

experienced counselors who were each asked to

rate each counselor response on each script as
to the degree it was clearly in keeping with the
approach designated. Categories were discarded
when counselor responses in these categories could
not be unequivocally discriminated by expert judges.

The following approaches were derived from
the above procedures:

(1) Advice Giving Approach: Advice, as
conceptualized here, is the counselor's suggestion
of a specific action of how to solve the problem.
As Williamson (1950, p. 233) has pointed out,
"...the counselor is ready to advise with the
student as to a program of action..." There is
some question in the literature as to the "purity"
of this approach. Some think that it may be
supporting to some degree.

(2) Questioning Approach: The counselor
poses a question to the client prior to each client
response. This type of approach resembles that
suggested for the initial interview by Fromm-
Reichmann (1950).

(3) Reflection of Feeling Approach: The

counselor responds with feeling appropriate to
the content of client responses. This approach
is consistent with that proposed by Rogers (1962).

(4) Supporting Approach: The counselor in
this approach attempts to convey to the client
that the client has "what it takes" to work the
problem out, and that, with a little help, every-
thing will come out all right.

(5) Information Giving Approach: The
counselor provides information of a specific
nature to the counselee which he (the counselor)
considers relevant to the problem at hand (Michael
and Meyerson, 1962).

In addition, a "blind sort" was also per-
formed by a different set of three judges to
assure agreement and "purity of approach." Defini-
tions of each of the five approaches elicited
from the previous judging were provided, and each
judge was asked to sort each of the counselor
responses of all five approaches into the type
it represented. This sort was made without any
contextual aids or knowledge of the nature of

the research. All three judges achieved a 100%

perfect sort. That is, each of the three judges

was able to identify all of the counselor responses

as belonging to a particular, defined counseling

approach.

Results of Pilot Study

The results of the pilot study indicated

that the high school seniors tested did have clear

preferences for particular counselor approaches

as shown by their rating of the counselor on the

tape as helpful and as understanding, and in

terms of the degree to which they would relate

to the counselor.

Low ID-High PSS individuals tended to

prefer Information Giving and Supporting approaches

and significantly (p=.05) rejected the Reflection

of Feeling approach. There was also a tendency

to reject Advising and Questioning approaches.

The Low ID-Low PSS group appeared to prefer

the Advising and Supporting approaches. Subjects

in this group insignificantly tended to reject

Questioning, Reflection of Feeling and Informa-
tion Giving approaches.

High ID-High PSS subjects tended to prefer
the Advising and Supporting approaches and sig-
nificar tly rejected (p=.05) Reflection of Feeling.
This group also tended to reject Questioning
and Information Giving approaches.

High ID-Low PSS subjects appeared to
accept all approaches equally except the Reflec-
tion of Feeling approach which was rejected
insignificantly. It should be pointed out that
there was extreme variation in the rating of
the Reflection of Feeling approach by this group.
This could have resulted from the discomfort
caused by the approach, or this group may be
unable to discriminate among counselor approaches.

Discussion of Results of Pilot Study

Two of the results of the pilot study
were not those one might be led to expect logically.
For example, one would not expect the Low ID-
High PSS subjects to prefer the Information
Giving approach over the other approaches.

Possible explanations of this result could lie
in the brevity of the initial interview or in
the small sample of subjects. The small amount
of information given in the brief episode may
have been sufficient for, and valued by, this
Low ID-High PSS group. It is also recognized
that while the pilot study may provide directional
leads for hypotheses, the limited sample involved
demands replication of the study with larger
populations.

It is also possible that each of the five
approaches may have a psychological meaning
different from the logical implications of the
Westcott categories. That is, the High ID-High
PSS subject may have perceived the Information
Giving approach as an imposition or meddling in
his life by self-sure, adult authority, rather
than information giving in a purely quantitative
sense. Also, it is possible that this group
does not view the Information Giving approach
as providing the structure needed to organize
information for use in problem solving. The

brevity of the initial interview may not have

provided a sufficient amount of information for

the High ID-Low PSS group.

The results of the pilot study indicated

some subjects will rate two or more counseling

approaches at the same level on all three items

of the Counselor Rating Form. For this reason,

in these instances, it is not possible to deter-

mine the most preferred approach.

Varimax factoring procedures of the

Counselor Rating Form (cited earlier in this

chapter) indicated that the subjects do perceive

the counselor approaches as separate and distinct.

The alternate explanation arises that subjects

may prefer more than one approach. In addition,

the Counselor Rating Form may not be sensitive

enough to detect a single, preferred approach.

Although no females were included in the

pilot study sample, it has begun to be realized

that because of differences in life patterns of

women as contrasted with men, the counseling

of girls and women may require different approaches

than those employed successfully with men. Havig-
hurst (1965 p. 153) gives two major reasons for
this recommended differentiation in counseling:
(1) the pathways to adulthood for girls are
different from those for boys; (2) the problem
of identity achievement for girls is different
from that for boys. Thus, if different counseling
procedures are needed, then the female preferences
for the defined approaches in this study should
vary in some ways from those of the males.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are based on the
results of the pilot study and the findings of
Westcott concerning cognitive style and related
personality characteristics. Hypothesis I:
Variations in preference for counseling approaches
by subjects are related to typical cognitive
styles of subjects as defined by Information
Demand and Problem Solving Success.

A. Male Subjects

1. Low ID-High PSS subjects will tend
to rate the Information Giving approach highest.

This hypothesis was based on the findings of the pilot study previously reported in this chapter. Although this group does not "ask for" a large amount of information to solve problems or to make decisions; nevertheless, they appear to operate on an information gathering basis. That is, while they do not need much information, they appear to perceive the Information Giving approach as more helpful than the other counselor approaches.

Members of this group appear able to apply their own structure to any problematical situation or issue. As Westcott described them (1962a, p. 27), "the causes and concerns which capture their imagination appear to be sweepingly abstract issues," and "they are willing and able to create" new methods of solution. One would expect that they would tend to resist questioning as an irrelevant waste of time, refuse support as not necessary, and refuse advising because they are able and willing to structure their own decisions. Perhaps Reflection of Feeling does not provide the kind of information this group

employs in problem solving.

2. Low ID-Low PSS subjects will tend
to prefer the Advising approach. This second
group appears to be, according to Westcott
(1962a, p. 28), "fearful in crises and apparently
accept challenges and risks more with grim despera-
tion than with confident zest." In addition,
"they do not recognize changes of great significance
in themselves in spite of the fact that they
feel themselves influenced by others." In other
words, they will accept advice to reduce anxiety;
but their behavior is externally directed, and,
thus, no internalized changes occur. They find
it more comfortable to follow the advice of others
in order to accomplish their goals, but they do
not "own" the behavior in the event of error.

The concept of support implies decision-
making on the part of the counselee which is to
be supported by the counselor. This group, as
stated previously, tends to refuse to make decisions
for which they will be responsible. Thus, one
would expect them to reject the Supporting
approach. At the same time, Questioning, Reflection

of Feeling and Information Giving approaches would

be rejected because this group fails to connect

the outcome of these approaches with the

solution to the problem at hand.

3. High ID-High PSS males will tend

to rate the supporting approach highest. This

group is described by Westcott (1962a, p. 28)

as "cautious, conservative and compliant."

Further, they are "well socialized," but can

be very involved in things; however, these things

generally come from outside themselves. This

group tends to look for external support of

feedback, and the certainties of life come from

this support. There is reason to suppose that

they would feel more comfortable in a counseling

situation where the counselor provides the

feedback.

Although this group gathers a great deal

of information, they may not be able to organize

this mass of data easily enough to feel comfortable

with decisions based on such data. Nor does

Questioning or Reflection of Feeling provide the

contextual organization which they appear to seek.
Because this group is able to make its own
decisions under certain conditions, they would
tend to prefer the Supporting approach over the
Advising approach. That is, the Advising approach
does not allow them to make their own decisions.
The Supporting approach, however, may be perceived
as both a source of external feedback and a source
of organizing and structuring of information.

4. High ID-Low PSS males will tend
to accept all approaches equally. This hypothesis
was based on the findings of the pilot study
previously cited in this chapter. The aforemen-
tioned pilot study indicated that these subjects
either did not perceive differences among the
various counselor approaches or valued all
approaches equally.

This group is described as inflexible and
anxious. According to Westcott (1962a, p. 28),
they "live in a world where everything is risky
at best, and one always works to minimize risk."
It is as if they are saying, "Any counselor will

do as long as he helps reduce the risk of anxiety."
That is, the counselor himself, regardless of
approach, is perceived as a potential anxiety-
reducing agent.

B. Female Subjects

Because female subjects were not used in
the pilot study, there was no evidence from that
source, even tentative in nature, to give direc-
tional form to the hypotheses for female subjects.
In order to maintain a form consistent with that
used for male subjects, directional hypotheses
are stated for the female subjects.

1. Low ID-High PSS females will tend
to rate Reflection of Feeling highest. The
females seem more likely to prefer an approach
based on reflection of feelings and emotions
because it is more socially acceptable for the
female to respond emotionally to emotional content.

Because of the self confidence reported
by this group in Westcott's sample, one might
expect them to reject the Advising, Questioning,
Information Giving and Supporting approaches.
At the same time, their "comfortable, affective

involvement" possibly would enable them to respond
to the feeling approach with feeling responses.

2. Low ID-Low PSS females will tend
to prefer advising, and rate it higher than male
subjects of the same group. Because of develop-
mental sex role differences, females receive
more and are accustomed to more advice from
parents and significant others than males. Thus,
female individuals of this group will tend to
be more willing than males to accept the advice
of others, and rate the approach higher than males.

Using the same rationale as presented for
male subjects of this group, the females will .
accept advice to reduce anxiety. They would tend
to reject the Supporting approach because of the
decisions implied by this approach. Other approaches
would be rejected because of failure by this group
to see the relevance of the approaches to the
solution of the problem.

3. High ID-High PSS females will tend
to prefer the Supporting Approach and will probably
rate it higher than male subjects of the same group.
Although both males and females of this group are
described as "conforming," one might expect the
females, in general, to be more conforming than
the males. Crutchfield (1962) reported that females
in his studies consistently earned higher conformity
scores than did males.

Conformity, by its very nature, requires
feedback. That is, it is difficult for one to
assess the degree and success of conforming to a
social structure without external support and feed-
back. Thus, one would expect the females of this
group to prefer the counseling approach which they
perceive as providing the greatest amount of
feedback; that is, the Supporting approach.

Although this group seeks a large amount of
information in solving problems, it is possible
that the Information Giving approach does not
provide the type of information sought by this group
of females. That is, this group of females may not

be seeking unstructured, unorganized data as
represented by Information Giving. The Information
Giving approach may not be perceived as providing
the support and feedback needed to assess the success
of their conformity to existing social structures.
Thus, one might expect them to tend to reject the
Information Giving approach. Because the High ID-
High PSS group may not be able to organize a mass
of data easily enough to feel comfortable with
decisions based on such data, they may reject Question-
ing and Reflection of Feeling as lacking the contextual
organization which they appear to seek At the
same time, because this group is able to make its
own decisions under certain conditions, they will
probably prefer the Supporting approach over the
Advising approach. That is, the Advising approach
does not allow them to make their own decisions.

    4. High ID-Low PSS females will tend
to rate all approaches equally, but, at the same
time higher than the mean rating of each group of
each approach. In other words, they may tend to
be more accepting of all approaches than the other
groups.

As previously noted, this group is described
as inflexible and anxious. They may perceive the
counselor himself, regardless of approach, as a
potential anxiety-reducing agent. Considering this
group's anxiety, together with the female's general
tendency toward socially acceptable dependence and
conformity, High ID-Low PSS females may tend to
rate all approaches higher than all other males
and all other female groups. It may be that this
female group, like the corresponding male group,
either does not perceive differences among the
various counselor approaches or values all approaches
equally.

Age Differences

A variety of studies have indicated develop-
mental changes in cognitive functioning of adoles-
cents. Inhelder and Piaget (1958) have theorized
a gradual transition from concrete thinking to
formal thought or abstraction and generalization.
This theory has particular relevance for the pro-
posed study in that the change in the intellectual
functioning should change the preference of counselees

for or response to a particular type of approach
by the counselor.

Wilson (1963) found the adolescent increasing-
ly able to integrate conflicting information with
increase in age. The younger subjects manifested
a "second-hand" structure of attitudes based on
parental attitudes   Though not directly related
to counseling, Wilson's data implies developmental
changes in cognitive capacities, in addition to
characteristic differences between sexes.

Studies by Jones and Bayley (1950), Jones
(1958) and Mussen and Jones (1957) all indicated
profound changes, related to physical development,
occurring during adolescence. Differences between
early and late maturing adolescents apparently
produce lasting differences in perceptions of self,
although the physical differences disappear. In
a recent study, Hemby (1965) found dramatic changes
among adolescents from Grade Nine to Grade Twelve
in the way they perceived their adult roles in
relation to the opposite sex. How one sees the
world and himself in it should certainly affect his
expectations of counseling.

The variation in development of cognitive functioning, attitudes, self concepts, and adult role perceptions of adolescents adds to the problem of establishing a sound counseling relationship. Different age groups are not likely to perceive the same approach in the same manner. One can infer from Wilson's study, cited above, that younger adolescents tend to look to older persons as sources for providing structure. A ninth-grade counselee, for example, might wish to have a great deal more structure or direction in the solution of his problems than would a senior in high school. Thus, Hypothesis II is evolved: ninth-grade subjects will tend to rate the Advising or Supporting approach higher than twelfth-grade subjects.

The Information Giving and Questioning approaches, as defined here, may not provide the structure and organization which appears to be sought by younger adolescents. Reflection of Feeling, also, does not supply the structure and organization sought by younger adolescents. By definition, the client has the responsibility for supplying structure

in the Reflection of Feeling approach. Thus, one
would expect the ninth-grade subjects to prefer the
more organized and structured Advising and Supporting
approaches over the other less structured approaches.

CHAPTER III

Procedures

This chapter contains a description of
the procedures employed in production of the
scripts and films, in presentation of the films,
in the scoring of instruments, and in the statis-
tical tests applied to the data collected. The
reader will note in this chapter that the procedures
followed in developing the scripts for this
research are the same as those which were success-
fully employed in the previously cited pilot study.
The use of multiple counselors in varied orders
randomized the effects of counselor differences.
The randomized presentation of both counselors
and counseling approaches controlled for any
presentation order effects.

Script Production

Two pre-doctoral counselors working together
developed the dialogue of a male counselee expressing

a common-place problem involving study habits,
educational decision, and mild parent-adolescent
conflict. The two counselors, working independently,
developed counselor responses in keeping with
the approach definitions proposed for this study.
The two scripts were then revised and condensed
into one set of scripts containing five initial
counseling approaches to identical counselee
responses. The female counselee responses were
almost identical with the male responses, modified
only when it was necessary to reflect female
activities.

The scripts were then submitted to an
experienced counseling supervisor for revision
and reworking ror smoothness and naturalness of
language. The scripts were further revised and
submitted to another experienced counselor for
additional suggestions. This led to further re-
finement. The resulting scripts for each of the
five counseling approaches portrayed an initial
counseling session of approximately three minutes
in length.

In addition to the above research scripts,

two "mixed approach" scripts using a male and female counselee respectively were developed dealing with an entirely different counselee problem. Counselor responses were varied in approach or type and were entirely different from those used in the research scripts. These scripts were used for instruction and practice rating by subjects during the actual data gathering procedures.

Approach Sort

In order to obtain some indication of the "cleanness" of each counseling approach script, the following procedures were employed. Each counselor response from each of the five counseling approaches was placed on a slip of paper. The slips were then mixed thoroughly. Three experienced counselors, each with a Doctor of Philosophy degree and of different backgrounds (Ohio State University, University of Wisconsin, and University of Texas), all unfamiliar with the nature and design of the proposed research, were given the definitions of the counseling

approaches cited in Chapter II. Each judge was

instructed to draw a counselor response slip

and place it with the counselor approach defini-

tion which he felt was reflected by the response.

The accuracy with which the judges placed the

individual counselor responses into the original

categories is the index of the clarity of portrayal

by the responses of each counseling approach.

The results of these procedures are shown in

Table 1. Judge A placed 84% of the counselor

responses in the correct categories. Judge B

placed 96% in the correct approach categories;

and Judge C, 100%. It should be noted that this

sort was accomplished by the judges without the

aid of any contextual clues.

Response Rating

After completing the response sort described

above, each of the same three counselor judges

was provided a complete script of each approach

and asked to rate, on a five point scale, each

counselor response in terms of the degree to which

the response reflected the approach it was intended

Table 1

Judges' Errors in Sorting Counselor

Responses without Context

Response #	Counseling Approach					Total Error	% Error
	Adv.	Ques.	Ref.	Supp.	Info.		
1*							
2							
3							
4					A	1	
5	A			A		2	
6				B	A	2	
7	A		A			2	
8							
9					B	1	
10	A			A		2	
11							
12*							
	3	0	1	3	3	10	6.3%
Judge A	3	0	1	2	2	8	16.0%
Judge B	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.0%
Judge C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%

*Introductory and concluding remarks omitted in sorting.

to portray. The results of the above ratings
are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

This procedure was employed as an additional
test to determine if there were any single
responses which were not in keeping with a
particular approach as perceived by multiple
judges even if it could be categorized correctly.
The results of this procedure indicated that all
three judges were consistent in their ratings,
although Judge C rated all the items consistently
lower than Judges A and B. Even though Judge C
rated all the responses lower than Judges A and
B, Judge C obtained a 100% perfect sort in the
aforementioned approach sort.

Film Production

Counselors

Five post-doctoral, male counselors were
selected from the staff of the University of Texas.
As much as possible, care was taken to select
those of different orientations and training
background. Two received all of their training

Table 2

Ratings of Judges of Counselor Responses as to the Degree the Responses are in Keeping with Approaches Defined

Response #	Judge A					Judge B					Judge C				
	Ref	Adv	Ques	Info	Sup	Ref	Adv	Ques	Info	Sup	Ref	Adv	Ques	Info	Sup
2	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	3	5	4	3	5	3	3
3	4	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	5	3	4	4	3	3
4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	3	4	3	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	3
6	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
7	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	4	3	4	4
8	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	2	3	4
9	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	4
10	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	3	4
11	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	3	4
Means	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.7	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.6

Table 3

Mean of Judges Ratings of Each Response

Response #	Ref.	Adv.	Ques.	Info.	Supp.
2	4.33	3.66	5.00	3.66	4.33
3	3.33	4.66	4.66	4.00	4.33
4	4.33	4.66	3.66	4.33	4.66
5	4.00	4.66	4.33	4.00	4.00
6	4.66	4.00	4.33	3.66	4.00
7	4.66	4.66	4.33	4.00	4.66
8	5.00	4.66	3.66	4.33	4.66
9	4.66	4.33	4.66	4.33	4.66
10	4.33	4.00	4.66	3.66	4.33
11	4.66	4.00	4.66	4.00	4.66

at other institutions (University of Chicago,
Ohio State University). One had a major portion
of his work at a theological seminary. Two had
the major portion of their training and academic
work at the University of Texas, but in different
departments (Psychology and Educational Psychology).

All five of the counselors used in the
approach episodes and the one counselor used in
the mixed approach episode were mature appearing
and ranged in age from 32 to 44 years. All of
the counselors had internships in approved counsel-
ing or clinical psychology programs with length
of experience ranging from 2 to 20 years.

Counselees

One male and one female high school student
were selected from a local high school other than
those in which data were collected. Attention
was given to the quality of voice and appearance
in selection of the counselees, in order that
they could pass for either ninth or twelfth-grade
students. Both of the counselees had considerable
training and experience in drama and assumed

their roles readily and consistently. Neither
had any unusual or detracting personal character-
istics.

Photographic Equipment

Camera: The camera employed for film
production was an Auricon "Pro-600 Special"
camera head (self blimped), Model CM-77, with
a zoom lens door. Additional features included
a silenced geared footage counter, safety inter-
locked film flow, built-in electric heater with
thermostat, Auricon Driv-o-matic film take up,
and synchronous motor drive. The camera was
specially equipped with 1200-foot capacity film
magazines, model M-77-4, with adaptors for
"laboratory pack" film on plastic cores.

Sound System: A galvanometer and optical
system, model T-70-D, was installed in the camera
for recording variable density (W.E. type) optical
sound-track on film. The sound amplifying equip-
ment used was an Auricon, model RA-31-AD7, optical
sound-tract recording amplifier. This unit was
equipped with inputs for microphone, phono, volume-

indicator meter, and sound-track exposure meter.

The microphone used was an Auricon, model E-6,

"high fidelity" designed for use with the amplifying

unit.

Lens: The camera was equipped with a

Panzanar 100 Reflex Zoom L lens, F3.4-22, 25m -

100m, made by Berthiot.

Tape Recorder: As a safeguard, in the

event of sound equipment failure, a Wollensak,

model T-1500, magnetic tape recorder was in

operation during all "takes." Since camera sound

equipment was in order during film production,

the tape recordings were not needed.

Teleprompter: A 20" by 24" ground glass

screen with variable angle mirror was employed

to pick up the projection from a Thermo Fax,

model 66AG, over-head projector. In this manner

the fan noise of the projector was removed from

the room. Clear plastic overlays were prepared

from typed copies of the scripts. These were

used in projecting the copy onto the teleprompter.

The counselor had a copy of his script present

at all times. The teleprompter was placed so
that when the counselor was looking at the prompter
screen, it would appear on film that he was
looking at the counselee.

Film: The film used in the production
of the counseling sequences was Eastman TRI-X
reversal film of type 7278, single perforation
and B winding. In try-out "takes" it was found
this type was sufficient to yield high quality
films under natural lighting conditions.

Production Set: The room used in produc-
tion was located in the Counseling Center of
the University of Texas and is normally used as
a counseling office. The room was 12' by 17'
in size and was an inside office with no exterior
openings. The ceiling was of an accoustical
type. One long wall was fully draped. The
other long wall was draped with sound blankets
to reduce echo. Sound blankets were also used
over the asphalt tile floor.

Filming Process

A total of fifty episodes were produced

with each of five different counselors producing
five methodologically different episodes with
a male client and five different episodes with
a female client. That is, each of the five
counselors portrayed each of the five approaches
with a male client and each of the five approaches
with a female client. Only one counselor was
filmed during any one filming period. This enabled
the counselor to "get to know" the counselees
prior to actual filming and thus feel more at
ease. The same two counselees were used in all
filming.

Filming Order: The order in which the
different approaches were filmed was randomly
varied with each counselor. Thus, none of the
approaches was filmed at the same ordered place
with any of the counselors. By this procedure
any practice effect due to filming order for each
participating counselor was randomized. The
male and female counselees were filmed consecu-
tively, while the counselor used one approach.
The order in which the male or female was filmed,
however, was also varied randomly between approaches.

Practice Film: Two practice films (one with a male counselee and one with a female counselee) were produced employing another counselor portraying the "mixed approach" described above. These films were also of an initial counseling session and approximately three minutes in length. Although the counselees were the same in the "mixed approach" as those in the research films, a different or sixth counselor was used.

Orders of Sequences

The above procedures yielded films of five counselors each using five different counseling approaches with a male counselee and the same five counselors each using five counseling approaches with a female counselee. The original films were edited and ordered into 20 (10 male, 10 female) random variations of counselor and approach as shown in Table 4. The practice film appears first in each order. Each order, including practice film, was approximately 20 minutes in length. Two prints were

Table 4

Order of Counselors and Techniques

in Which Film Sequences Were Shown

Order Number	Orders				
1	E4	A2	C5	D1	B3
2	D4	B2	A3	C1	E5
3	A5	D2	C3	E1	B4
4	C2	D5	B1	A4	E3
5	B5	E2	D3	A1	C4
6	A1	C2	E4	B5	D3
7	C4	E1	D5	B2	A3
8	B4	C1	E3	A5	D2
9	E2	A4	B3	D1	C5
10	D4	C3	E5	B1	A2

Counselors: A,B,C,D,E,

Techniques: 1,2,3,4,5

drawn from the originals to preserve the original
and remove splices. The resulting prints were
used in data collection.

Film Presentation

Sample

Samples of 100 twelfth-grade males, 98
twelfth-grade females, 100 ninth-grade males
and 100 ninth-grade females were selected at
random from a local population of students in
the secondary schools of Austin, Texas. (Table 5).,
The student bodies of the schools from which
the samples were selected were composed of
predominantly middle-class Anglo-Americans.

Film Viewing Procedures

Each of the ten film orders were viewed
by 10 randomly selected subjects of the same
sex and grade as the counselee in the film. In
this manner, males viewed the film orders pre-
senting a male being counseled, and females
viewed the film orders of a female being counseled.

Instructions for viewing, rating, and

Table 5

Number of Subjects Classified by

Grade and by Sex

N=398

	Male	Female	Totals
Ninth	100	100	200
Twelfth	100	98	198
Totals	200	198	398

ranking were given prior to the practice film,
and the subjects were asked to put themselves
in the place of the counselee. After the prac-
tice film was shown and rated, the subjects were
again reminded to try to put themselves in the
place of the counselee while viewing the films.

After each approach was viewed, the sub-
jects were asked to rate the counselor using
the counselor rating form provided (see Appendix
A). The films were designed to give the subjects
15 seconds between approaches to make their ratings.
After viewing all approaches and completing the
rating forms, the subjects were asked to complete
the ranking form (see Appendix A).

After the ratings and rankings were
completed and collected, the subjects were asked
to complete the Westcott Problem Solving Scale
(see Appendix B). Subjects were permitted 20
minutes to complete this scale.

Scoring of Instruments

Counselor Rating Form

This instrument contains three items. The

student was asked to rate each counselor as to his helpfulness, understanding of the counselee's problem, and degree to which the subject would be willing to relate with him. The items are rated on a five point scale. The item scores were summed to yield an approach preference score.

Counselor Ranking Form

This instrument contains the same three items as the rating form. The subjects were asked to place in rank order the counselors they prefer for each of the three items. A median rank score was obtained for each approach. Each approach was then ranked again based on the median ranking score. The final rank score was obtained from the final ranked order of the approaches.

The rating scale was scheduled to be completed by all of the subjects; but due to lack of time in the public school setting, the rank order data was excluded by some subjects. The resulting sample for rank order data was 195 ninth-grade subjects and 147 twelfth-grade subjects. The omission of rank order data occurred randomly,

thus, no systematic effects should be present in the data.

Westcott Problem Solving Scale

The Westcott scale yielded two scores. The total number of correct responses is defined as Problem Solving Success. The Information Demand score is derived by summing the number of additional clues the subject desired for all fifteen items as indicated by erasures uncovering the clues.

Subjects' scores were sorted into four categories according to their performance on the two dimensions of the Westcott Scale as presented in Table 6. Problem Solving Success scores were split at the median, thus providing high and low success problem solvers. Information Demand scores were also split at the median, thus yielding a high demand and a low demand group. The resulting four types of subjects were: High ID-High PSS, Low ID-High PSS, High ID-Low PSS and Low ID-Low PSS.

Table 6

Number of Male and Female Subjects Classified by

Information Demand and Problem Solving Success on Westcott Scale

N = 398

			P S S		
			Low	High	Totals
Information Demand	High	Males	58	42	100
		Females	48	51	99
	Low	Males	42	58	100
		Females	51	48	99
	Totals		199	199	398

The reliability estimate for the Problem
Solving Success score of the Westcott Scale was
obtained by correlating odd and even scores of
the total sample and correcting by the Spearman-
Brown formula. The resulting odd-even reliability
coefficient was .79. The estimate for the Informa-
tion Demand score was obtained by number of clues
used on odd items and number of clues used on
even items. The result was corrected by the
Spearman-Brown formula for attenuation. The
corrected odd-even coefficient was .81.

Statistical Procedures

Rating Scale Scores

For Hypothesis I.A.1, I.A.2, and I.A.3,
analysis of variance was used to test for hypothe-
sized differences among the rating scores for the
five approaches. In the above, it was hypothesized
that a particular group of males would rate one
approach higher than the other approaches. A
group-by-treatments design was used with one
group (as specified in the hypothesis) and five

treatments (five approaches). For Hypothesis I.A.4,
a one-by-five-treatments F-test was employed which
compared the ratings of the five approaches
simultaneously. This hypothesis stated that High
ID-Low PSS males would rate all approaches equally.

For testing Hypothesis I.B.1 and the first
part of I.B.2, a one-group-by-five-treatments
analysis of variance was used to test for differ-
ences in rating scores for the five approaches.
It had been hypothesized that a particular group
of females would rate one approach higher than
the other approaches. The second part of I.B.2
hypothesized that the Low ID-Low PSS females would
rate the Advising approach higher than Low ID-Low
PSS males. To test this portion of the hypothesis,
a single classification analysis of variance was
used with two groups (males vs. females)-by-one-
dependent variable (rating of Advising approach).
The same statistical analysis used for Hypothesis
I.B.2 above were used for Hypothesis I.B.3 to test
whether High ID-High PSS females rated the Supporting
highest and higher than males of the same group.

Hypothesis I.B.4 stated that High ID-Low PSS females would rate all approaches equally, but at the same time, higher than the mean rating of each group of each approach. Hypothesis I.B.4 was tested with a one-group-by-five-treatments design to determine differences within the group. In the hypothesis as stated, the null hypothesis assumed would not be rejected. To test the second part of the hypothesis, a two-groups (High ID-Low PSS females vs. all other subjects)-by-five-treatments design was used.

To test for differences between ninth and twelfth graders in rating the Advising and Supporting approaches as stated in Hypothesis II, a single classification analysis of variance with two groups (ninth vs. twelfth) by two independent variables (Ratings of Supporting and Advising approaches).

Rank Order Scores

The Chi-square statistic was employed as the general procedure for testing subject's preference for hypothesized approaches, expressed in rank order form. The hypothesis that subjects of a certain

group would prefer Approach A to Approach B was interpreted as an hypothesis that the observed frequencies in a two-cell Chi-square table would depart from a 50-50 division (Guilford 1956, p. 237). One cell contained the number of subjects preferring Approach A to Approach B (ranking Approach A higher than Approach B) and the other cell of the table contained the number of subjects who did not prefer Approach A to Approach B or did not rank Approach A higher than Approach B.

The hypothesis that subjects of group A would rank a given approach higher than subjects of group B was tested using the median test (Guilford, 1956 p. 249). The rows of the two-by-two contingency table thus formed represented group A and group B; the columns represented subjects ranking the given approach above the grand median and subjects ranking the approach below the grand median.

In applying the Chi-square test of significance to both the two-by-two and two cell contingency tables, Yate's correction for continuity (Guilford 1956, p. 234) was applied.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study are reported in two sections in this chapter. The first section reports the results from tests applied to data obtained from the counselor rating and counselor ranking forms. The second section includes the results of statistical procedures applied to data from the Westcott Scale.

Analysis of variance procedures were employed to determine the significance of differences among mean ratings of the defined counselor approach by different groups of subjects (Linquist, 1956). The .05 level of confidence was used as a basis for rejection of the assumed null hypothesis. Most of the hypotheses were directional; thus, the single tailed test was considered appropriate (Guilford, 1956, p. 207). In those hypotheses which did not specify the direction of the difference between means

79

the two tailed test was employed and indicated where appropriate.

The results of tests applied to data obtained from the counselor ranking form are reported and compared with the results obtained from the rating form data for each hypothesis. Generally, a two cell Chi-square test of significance was used to determine the significance of a preferred approach within a group. Median tests were employed to determine significance of difference in ranking approaches between groups where hypothesized.

As pointed out earlier in this report, the use of ranking procedures by subjects to indicate their preference for particular approaches was intended to induce the subjects to indicate a definite preference. In contrast to the rating procedures, potential ties would be eliminated since the approaches were to be placed in rank order of preference.

The hypotheses, as stated, call for the approach in question to be ranked higher than the other four approaches. Using the non-parametric

statistic Chi-square, one would expect the hypothesized approach to obtain the greatest number of highest rankings.

This procedure resulted in the loss of part of the information, in comparison with the analysis of rating data, in that no consideration was given to the degree of higher or lower ranking of the various approaches. Also, no separate consideration was given to equal ranking when individual rank order preferences were summed for each subject, since the hypotheses call for "highest" rank. Even though ties were to be eliminated and possibly greater discrimination obtained from ranking procedures, a large number of ties did result through required procedures in obtaining the median ranking score. Possibly the subjects were forced to make discriminations which were not psychologically meaningful to them. Some evidence indicated that subjects were procedurally forced to make a rank difference where no difference in preference existed.

The second section of the chapter reports the results of statistical procedures applied to the data

obtained from the Westcott Scale. Included in this section are the reports of factoring procedures applied to the counselor rating scale to determine if the subjects were responding to the film episodes as separate and unique counseling approaches.

Tests of Hypotheses

The data have been analyzed to provide information about the preferences of different groups of adolescent subjects for various counseling approaches. In reporting the results each hypothesis and sub-hypothesis is considered separately.

Hypothesis I: Variations in preference for counseling approaches by subjects are related to typical cognitive styles of subjects as defined by Information Demand and Problem Solving Success.

A. Male Subjects

1. Low ID-High PSS subjects will tend to rate the Information Giving approach highest. In testing this hypothesis, the mean of the ratings of the Information Giving approach was compared separately with each of the other four approaches. The levels

Table 7

Means of Low ID-High PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches

and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	11.14	.155
Questioning	9.93	.102
Reflection of Feeling	9.67	.043
Supporting	10.81	.380
Information Giving	10.63	

F=2.11   p=.08

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of the Information Giving approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

of significance for each of the four tests are shown
in Table 7. At the .05 level of confidence, the null
hypothesis could not be rejected. Thus, hypothesis
I.A.1 was not supported.

To test this hypothesis using ranking form data,
the number of subjects ranking Information Giving the
highest was compared to the number of subjects assign-
ing equal or lesser rank to that approach when compared
to each of the other four approaches. Table 8 illus-
trates the number of subjects preferring one approach
over another as indicated by assigned rank. This
procedure, outlined in Chapter III, yielded four sep-
arate two celled Chi-square values, none of which
were significant. The results failed to support the
hypothesis.

Inspection of the means presented in Table 7
would indicate that this group of males tend to prefer
the Advising approach and reject the Questioning and
Reflection of Feeling approaches. Supporting and Informa-
tion Giving approaches are neither preferred nor rejected.

The hypothesis that this group of subjects
would prefer Information Giving was based on the

Table 8

The Number of Low ID-High PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference
and Non-Preference for the Information Giving Approach
by Rank Score When Compared to all Other Approaches

N=43

	Pref-erence	Non Pref-erence*	x^2	P
Information Giving vs. Reflection of Feeling	20	23	.09	.76
Information Giving vs. Advising	19	24	.37	.54
Information Giving vs. Questioning	25	18	.83	.36
Information Giving vs. Supporting	18	25	.83	.36

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal
ranks to the two approaches compared

findings of the previously cited pilot study of a much smaller number of subjects. These subjects may perceive Advising as providing possible alternatives in decision making while Information Giving and Supporting do not provide any new or possible alternatives. Their anticipated rejection of the Questioning and Reflection of Feeling approaches, discussed in Chapter II, was supported by the results.

2. Low ID-Low PSS subjects will tend to prefer the Advising approach. As in hypothesis I.A.1, each of the approaches was compared to the hypothesized preferred approach. In this hypothesis, the mean rating of the Advising approach by this group of subjects was compared with each of the other four approaches. The means and confidence levels of differences can be seen in Table 9. The Advising approach was significantly preferred beyond the .05 level of confidence when compared to Questioning, Reflection of Feeling, and Information Giving; but it was not significantly preferred to the Supporting approach. Partial support for this hypothesis was indicated.

Table 9

Means of Low ID-Low PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches

and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	11.04	
Questioning	9.23	.006
Reflection of Feeling	8.71	.002
Supporting	10.57	.217
Information Giving	9.78	.011

F=4.07   p=.003

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of the Advising approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

A comparison of the number of subjects ranking the Advising approach highest on the ranking form compared to the other four approaches resulted in four separate Chi-square tests of significance shown in Table 10. A significant (p=.02) number of this group preferred the Advising approach when compared to Reflection of Feeling. All other preferences were in the hypothesized direction but not significant at the .05 level.

By referring to the means presented in Table 9, one can infer that the Advising approach appears to be the most preferred approach with Questioning, Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving being clearly rejected. The Supporting approach is neither the most preferred nor is it rejected.

With reference to the personality description of this group, as presented in Chapter II, an alternate explanation might be that these subjects wished to place the responsibility for their behavior externally. If they were advised or directed as to a plan of action, or if they were supported in what they were currently doing, then they would not have to assume

Table 10

The Number of Low ID-Low PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference
and Non-Preference for the Advising Approach
When Compared to all Other Approaches

N=36

	Preference	Non Preference*	x^2	P
Advising vs. Reflection of Feeling	23	13	2.25	.12
Advising vs. Questioning	24	12	3.36	.06
Advising vs. Information Giving	21	15	.69	.41
Advising vs. Supporting	19	17	.02	.85

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks
to the two approaches compared.

the responsibility for unsuccessful endeavors.
Regardless of their reasons for preference, it does
exist in the hypothesized direction, and this may
suggest that a rapid method of successfully establish-
ing a counseling relationship with this group
initially would appear to be through specific
advice and support of positive aspects of their
behavior.

3. High ID-High PSS males will tend to
rate the Supporting approach highest. At the .05
level of confidence, this group of subjects rejected
both Questioning and Reflection of Feeling approaches
when compared to the Supporting approach. The null
hypothesis could not be rejected for differences
between the Supporting approach and the Advising
and Information Giving approaches.

The number of subjects of this group preferring
the Supporting approach over the other four approaches
on the ranking form are shown in Table 11. Only the
difference in the number of subjects who preferred
the Supporting approach over the Reflection of Feeling
approach was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Table 11

Means of High ID-High PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches

and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	10.83	.475
Questioning	9.16	.001
Reflection of Feeling	9.14	.001
Supporting	10.85	
Information Giving	10.02	.080

F= 4.42   p= .003

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of
the Supporting approach and the mean of each of the other
four approaches.

The findings appear to be in keeping with the logic offered for the hypothesis except for the high preference indicated for the Advising approach. The means presented in Table 12 seem to indicate an almost equal preference for Advising and Supporting approaches. Apparently the Advising approach is also perceived as external feedback for the conservative behavior of this group. As hypothesized, Reflection of Feeling, Questioning and Information Giving approaches evidently do not provide the external support and direction from significant adult figures desired by this group.

4. High ID-Low PSS males will tend to accept all approaches equally. The hypothesis as stated indicated that the null hypothesis would <u>not</u> be rejected in a one-group-by-five treatments F-test comparing the ratings of the five approaches simultaneously. The F-ratio thus obtained, shown in Table 13, indicated a difference among the ratings of the approaches by this group well beyond the .05 level of confidence; thus, the hypothesis was not supported.

The two cell Chi-square procedure was applied to the ranked data which compared the number of

Table 12

The Number of High ID-High PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference
and Non-Preference for the Supporting Approach When Compared
to all Other Approaches

N=36

	Pref- erence	Non Pref- erence*	x^2	P
Supporting vs. Reflection of Feeling	22	14	1.36	.24
Supporting vs. Advising	17	19	.02	.85
Supporting vs. Questioning	28	8	10.02	.01-
Supporting vs. Information Giving	20	16	.25	.62

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks
to the two approaches compared.

Table 13

Means of High ID-Low PSS Male Ratings

of Counselor Approaches

Approach	Means	F-ratio	p
Advising	10.41	5.513	.001-
Questioning	9.15		
Reflection of Feeling	8.79		
Supporting	10.96		
Information Giving	10.67		

subjects who assigned a higher rank to a given

approach with the number of subjects that assigned

equal or higher ranks to all other approaches. The

numbers of subjects preferring each approach, along

with those not preferring that approach in each

comparison, are shown in Table 14. In order for the

hypothesis to be supported, all Chi-square values

had to remain insignificant; thus, the null hypo-

thesis would not be rejected. The comparison between

the number of subjects preferring the Questioning

approach compared to the number of subjects ranking

the Supporting approach equal to or less than the

Questioning approach was significant at the .03

level. This was a result of ties which can readily

be seen when the Supporting approach is compared to

the Questioning approach. The same thing occurred

when Questioning was compared to Information Giving,

resulting in a significant difference at the .01

level of confidence. When the reverse comparison

was made, the confidence level fell to .06. This

ind... ↑ a tendency to reject the Questioning approach

but not at the desired level of confidence. Thus

Table 14

The Number of High ID-Low PSS Males Indicating Preference

for Specific Approaches in Comparison to all Other Approaches

N=43

	Pref-erence	Non Pref-erence	x^2	P
Advising vs. Reflection of Feeling	23	20	.09	.76
Advising vs. Questioning	23	20	.09	.76
Advising vs. Information Giving	19	24	.37	.54
Advising vs. Supporting	17	26	1.48	.22
Reflection of Feeling vs. Advising	17	26	1.48	.22
Reflection of Feeling vs. Questioning	21	22	.00	1.00
Reflection of Feeling vs. Information Giving	15	28	3.34	.06
Reflection of Feeling vs. Supporting	17	26	1.48	.22
Questioning vs. Reflection of Feeling	20	23	.09	.76
Questioning vs. Advising	15	28	3.34	.06
Questioning vs. Information Giving	13	30	5.95	.01
Questioning vs. Supporting	14	29	4.55	.03
Information Giving vs. Reflection of Feeling	25	18	.83	.36
Information Giving vs. Advising	24	19	.37	.54
Information Giving vs. Questioning	28	15	3.34	.06
Information Giving vs. Supporting	24	19	.37	.54
Supporting vs. Reflection of Feeling	26	17	1.48	.22
Supporting vs. Advising	26	17	1.48	.22
Supporting vs. Questioning	24	19	.37	.54
Supporting vs. Information Giving	16	27	2.32	.12

the hypothesis is partially supported by the results
of the Chi-square statistic, but is not supported
by the results of the ranking data. Considering the
lack of sensitivity and loss of information in non-
parametric data, the failure to discover differences
where differences do exist would be expected.

High ID-Low PSS male subjects (Westcott's
"anxious ones") were expected to fail to differentiate
among the counseling approaches. That is, they would
perceive any approach as help for their difficulties.
Possibly Reflection of Feeling and Questioning approaches
were too threatening, and the subjects found greater
comfort in the direction offered by the counselors
in the other approaches. There is also the possibility
that the Reflection of Feeling approach conveys
passivity on the part of the counselor when the coun-
selee needs tangible evidence that the adult cares
and is involved with him. Questioning may be construed
as prying into personal matters that are considered
irrelevant by the student.

    B. Female Subjects

        1. Low ID-High PSS females will tend to

rate Reflection of Feeling highest. The mean ratings of this group of subjects for the different approaches are reported in Table 15. The mean of each approach was tested independently against the mean of each of the other four approaches. Confidence levels of the tests are also shown in Table 15. The hypothesis was not supported since the mean rating for the Reflection of Feeling approach was the lowest of the five approaches.

The ranking form data also failed to support the hypothesis since the non-preferred rankings were more numerous than preferred ranking when the Reflection of Feeling approach was compared to all other approaches. As can be seen in Table 16, the number of non-preference rankings was significant beyond the .05 level of confidence when Reflection of Feeling is compared to the Advising and Supporting approaches and at the .08 level when compared to the Questioning approach.

Inspection of the means indicates that the Advising approach was the most preferred approach. Reflection of Feeling, Information Giving, and

Table 15

Means of Low ID-High PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches

and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	10.87	.001
Questioning	9.95	.024
Reflection of Feeling	8.91	
Supporting	9.64	.087
Information Giving	9.52	.159

F=4.09   p=.004

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of the Reflection of Feeling approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

Table 16

The Number of Low ID-High PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference
and Non-Preference for the Reflection of Feeling Approach When
Compared to all Other Approaches

N=42

	Pref-erence	Non Pref-erence*	x^2	P
Reflection of Feeling vs. Advising	10	32	10.05	.01-
Reflection of Feeling vs. Questioning	15	27	2.89	.08
Reflection of Feeling vs. Information Giving	17	25	1.16	.27
Reflection of Feeling vs. Supporting	14	28	4.02	.04

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks
to the two approaches compared.

Supporting approaches appear to be rejected, with Questioning neither preferred nor rejected.

2. Low ID-Low PSS females will tend to prefer the Advising approach and rate it higher than male subjects of the same group. The first part of the hypothesis was partially supported, as shown in Table 17. This group of subjects tended to prefer the Advising approach above all the other approaches. The difference between the mean ratings of the Supporting and Advising approaches was not significant at the .05 level with $p=.085$.

The results of the test between mean ratings of male and female subjects of this group for the Advising approach are shown in Table 18. This portion of the hypothesis was not supported at the .05 level of confidence.

In addition, the counselor ranking form data did not support the hypothesis. There appeared to be a tendency in the hypothesized direction when Advising was compared with Reflection of Feeling, Questioning and Information Giving, but the Chi-square values presented in Table 19 failed to reach the desired level of significance.

Table 17

Means of Low ID-Low PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches

and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	11.56	
Questioning	10.54	.042
Reflection of Feeling	9.05	.001-
Supporting	10.70	.085
Information Giving	9.72	.001-

$F = 4.23$ $p = .003$

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of Advising approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

Table 18

Means of Low ID-Low PSS Male and Female Ratings

of Advising Approach

Male	Female	p
11.04	11.56	.19-

Table 19

The Number of Low ID-Low PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference
and Non-Preference for the Advising Approach When
Compared to all Other Approaches

N=50

	Pref-erence	Non Pref-erence*	x^2	P
Advising vs. Reflection of Feeling	31	19	2.42	.11
Advising vs. Questioning	28	22	.50	.48
Advising vs. Information Giving	30	20	1.62	.20
Advising vs. Supporting	22	28	.50	.48

*Non-preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks
to the two approaches compared.

The second part of the hypothesis was also not supported by the analysis of ranked data. Applying the statistical procedures outlined in Chapter III, resulting in a two-by-two contingency table represented by Table 20, no difference was evident in the way males and females ranked the Advising approach.

The means presented in Table 17 indicate that the Advising and Supporting approaches are the most preferred approaches, with the Questioning approach neither preferred nor rejected. Both Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving were significantly rejected. The Supporting approach specifically used content which referred to the counselor working together with the counselee on specific aspects of the counselee's problem. The Advising approach clearly specified steps which were to be taken by the counselee. Both approaches offered a good deal of structure and decision-making by the counselor. Thus, the possibility exists that the desire for structure by the subjects of this group may constitute the basis for their

Table 20

Number of Low ID-Low PSS Females and Males Ranking the
Advising Approach About the Grand Median Rank Score Obtained
From Both Groups Combined

	Above Median	Below Median
Female (N=50)	23	27
Male (N=36)	20	16

$X^2=43$ P=.51

preference. The rejection of the Reflection of
Feeling and Information Giving approaches may be
due to lack of structure provided by these approaches
or, as reasoned in Chapter II, failure to see the
relevance of such approaches to the solution of
the problems at hand.

The second part of the hypothesis dealt with
differences between male and female responses to
the Advising approach. The failure of females to
rate the Advising approach significantly higher than
males of the same group may have occurred because
of the inclusion of ninth grade subjects in the
data. The younger group rated Advising higher;
therefore, they were in closer agreement. In other
words, as young people get older, it may be less
acceptable for boys to accept advise from signifi-
cant others than for girls.

3. High ID-High PSS females will tend
to prefer the Supporting approach, and will rate it
higher than male subjects of the same group. The
results of the tests among the mean ratings for
the Supporting approach and each of the other four

approaches are shown in Table 21. At the .05 level of confidence, the first portion of the hypothesis was not supported.

In a test of the second part of the hypothesis, the mean rating of males for the Supporting appioach was compared to the mean female rating of that approach and illustrated in Table 22. The hypothesis was not supported at the .05 level of confidence, but the difference was in the hypothesized direction (p=.12).

The number of preferred rankings assigned to the Supporting approach by this group of subjects, presented in Table 23, was significantly (beyond the .01 level of confidence) greater than the number of non-preference rankings when compared to Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving approaches, and had a significantly greater number of preferred rankings at the .06 level of confidence when compared to Questioning. It did not appear to be significantly preferred over the Advising approach.

The second part of the hypothesis was not

Table 21

Means of High ID-High PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches

and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Mean	p*
Advising	10.78	.123
Questioning	10.37	.012
Reflection of Feeling	9.01	.001-
Supporting	11.60	
Information Giving	9.11	.001-

F=3.94   p=.005

*Level of confidence of differences between the
mean of Supporting approach and the mean of each of the
other four approaches.

Table 22

Means of High ID-High PSS Male and Female Ratings

of Supporting Approach

Male	Female	p
10.85	11.60	.12

Table 23

The Number of High ID-High PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference
and Non-Preference for the Supporting Approach When
Compared to all Other Approaches

N=50

	Pref-erence	Non Pref-erence*	x^2	P
Supporting vs. Reflection of Feeling	35	15	7.22	.01-
Supporting vs. Advising	28	22	.50	.48
Supporting vs. Questioning	32	18	3.38	.06
Supporting vs. Information Giving	34	16	5.78	.01

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks to
the two approaches compared.

supported by ranked data. The number of female and
male subjects ranking the Supporting approach above
a median rank obtained from these two groups com-
bined is shown in Table 24. The difference in
number of males and females above and below the
median failed to approach significance.

Inspection of the means presented in Table 21,
indicates that the Supporting and Advising approaches
are the approaches preferred by this group, with
Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving being
rejected. The Questioning approach is neither
preferred nor rejected. Although not significant
at the .05 level of confidence, the difference between
the mean ratings of the Supporting and Advising
approaches was in the hypothesized direction. The
rank score data appeared to be in agreement with the
rating score findings. Possibly the Advising approach
was perceived as highly supportive; hence, the
insignificant distinction made between preferences
for the two approaches. If this were the case, then
the premise on which the hypothesis was drawn still
hol: This group of females is "conforming" and
.sees Advising as a form of supportive feedback.

Table 24

The Number of High ID-High PSS Females and Males Ranking
the Supporting Approach About the Grand Median Rank Score
Obtained from Both Groups Combined

	Above Median	Below Median
Female (N=50)	27	23
Male (N=36)	16	20

$X^2=.43$ $P=.51$

The second part of the hypothesis predicted differences between males and females of this group in rating the Supporting approach with females predicted to rate it higher. The means were in the expected direction, although p was only at the .12 level of confidence. The results obtained from the rank score data were in agreement, but not as significant as the rating scale data. Again, as in previous hypotheses, it may be that the inclusion of the younger sample, in which males and females would both rate the Supporting approach higher than twelfth graders, has produced little difference within the total sample.

4. High ID-Low PSS females will tend to rate all approaches equa'ly, but at the same time, higher than the mean ratings of each other group of each approach. The mean ratings of this group of subjects for all counseling approaches are shown in Table 25. A one-group-by-five-treatments F-test comparing the ratings of the five approaches simultaneously was employed to test for differences. The resulting F-ratio, shown in Table

Table 25

Means of High ID-Low PSS Female Ratings

of Counselor Approaches

Approach	Means	F-ratio	p
Advising	10.68	2.894	.023
Questioning	11.06·		
Reflection of Feeling	8.85		
Supporting	10.27		
Information Giving	10.02		

25 indicated that this portion of the hypothesis
was not supported. Thus, the null hypothesis was
rejected.

The test of the second part of the hypo-
thesis called for a comparison of the mean rating
of each group on each approach with the mean rating
of the High ID-Low PSS group on each approach. The
means of each group for each approach are shown in
Table 26, along with the confidence level of
differences of all means compared to the mean rating
of the High ID-Low PSS females. This portion of
the hypothesis was not supported.

The first part of the hypothesis was not
supported by results of the ranking data. It can
be seen in Table 27 that the Reflection of Feeling
approach was not preferred over Questioning and
that Questioning approach was preferred by a sig-
nificant (at the .01 level) number of subjects over
the Reflection of Feeling approach. Also, the
Reflection of Feeling approach was not preferred
over the Supporting approach, but the Supporting
approach was preferred over the Reflection of

Table 26

Mean Ratings of all Groups of all Counseling Approaches

	Advising Means (p*)	Questioning Means (p*)	Reflection Means (p*)	Supporting Means (p*)	Information Means (p*)
Female					
High ID-Low PSS	10.68	11.06	8.85	10.27	10.20
Low ID-Low PSS	11.56 (.07)	10.54 (.19)	9.05 (.38)	10.76 (.24)	9.72 (.32)
High ID-High PSS	10.79 (.44)	10.37 (.12)	9.01 (.40)	11.60 (.02)	9.11 (.07)
Low ID-High PSS	10.87 (.39)	9.95 (.03)	8.19 (.46)	9.64 (.18)	9.52 (.23)
Male					
High ID-Low PSS	10.41 (.33)	9.15 (.001)	8.79 (.46)	10.96 (.15)	10.67 (.13)
Low ID-Low PSS	11.04 (.30)	9.20 (.004)	8.71 (.42)	10.57 (.34)	9.78 (.35)
High ID-High PSS	10.83 (.41)	9.10 (.002)	9.14 (.34)	10.85 (.21)	10.02 (.49)
Low ID-High PSS	11.13 (.46)	9.93 (.007)	9.67 (.39)	10.81 (.45)	10.63 (.29)

*Level of confidence of two tailed test shown in parenthesis of each Mean tested against Low ID-High PSS Mean within one approach.

Table 27

The Number of High ID-Low PSS Females Indicating Preference

for Specific Approaches in Comparison to all Other Approaches

N=42

	Pref-erence	Non Pref-erence	x^2	P
Reflection of Feeling vs. Advising	15	27	2.88	.08
Reflection of Feeling vs. Questioning	11	31	8.59	.01-
Reflection of Feeling vs. Information Giving	17	25	1.16	.27
Reflection of Feeling vs. Supporting	14	28	4.02	.04
Advising vs. Reflection of Feeling	26	16	1.92	.16
Advising vs. Questioning	21	21	.02	.87
Advising vs. Information Giving	24	18	.59	.44
Advising vs. Supporting	20	22	.02	.87
Questioning vs. Reflection of Feeling	29	13	5.35	.01
Questioning vs. Advising	21	21	.02	.87
Questioning vs. Information Giving	21	21	.02	.87
Questioning vs. Supporting	19	23	.21	.64
Information Giving vs. Reflection of Feeling	24	18	.59	.44
Information Giving vs. Advising	16	26	1.92	.16
Information Giving vs. Questioning	18	24	.59	.44
Information Giving vs. Supporting	18	24	.59	.44
Supporting vs. Reflection of Feeling	28	14	4.02	.04
Supporting vs. Advising	17	25	1.16	.27
Supporting vs. Questioning	18	24	.59	.44
Supporting vs. Information Giving	22	20	.02	.87

Feeling approach at the .04 level of confidence.

In order to test the second part of this hypothesis, the number of subjects in this group ranking a given approach was compared to the number within every group ranking the same approach. A median ranking score was obtained from the two groups combined in each case. The number of subjects of different groups assigning ranks above and below the medians for each group and approach is presented in Tables 28-34. In only two instances of thirty-five two-by-two Chi-square tests were significant results obtained in the hypothesized direction. The High ID-Low PSS females ranked the Questioning approach higher in greater number of instances than did High ID-Low PSS males (.02 level of confidence) and High ID-High PSS males (beyond the .01 level of confidence). This portion of the hypothesis, therefore, is not supported.

Inspection of the means in Table 25 indicated that all approaches were rated about the same, except the Reflection of Feeling approach. These findings were supported by the rank score data.

Table 28

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-High PSS Males

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	26	16
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	16	27
	$X^2=4.24$ P=.03		
Advising	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	20	22
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	22	21
	$X^2=1.99$ P=.15		
Questioning	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	17	25
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	25	18
	$X^2=1.99$ P=.15		
Information Giving	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	21	21
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	21	22
	$X^2=.01$ P=.90		
Supporting	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	21	21
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	21	22
	$X^2=.01$ P=.90		

Table 29

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-Low PSS Males

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	23	19
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	19	24
	x^2=.57　　P=.54		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	22	21
	x^2=.01　　P=.90		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	15	27
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	27	16
	x^2=5.19　　P=.02		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	18	25
	x^2=1.42　　P=.23		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	20	23
	x^2=.10　　P=.74		

Table 30

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-High PSS Males
Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	15	21
	X^2=1.28 P=.25		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	15	21
	X^2=1.28 P=.25		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	14	28
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	25	11
	X^2=8.71 P=.01-		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	18	18
	X^2=.05 P=.81		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	23	19
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	16	20
	X^2=.46 P=.50		

Table 31

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-Low PSS Males

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	18	18
	$x^2=.05$ P=.81		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	15	21
	$x^2=1.28$ P=.25		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	18	24
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	21	15
	$x^2=1.28$ P=.25		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS males (N=36)	17	19
	$x^2=.05$ P=.81		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	17	19
	$x^2=.05$ P=.81		

Table 32

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-Low PSS Females

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	24	26
	x^2=.04 P=.82		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	24	26
	x^2=.04 P=.82		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	26	24
	x^2=.04 P=.82		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	26	24
	x^2=.04 P=.82		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	24	26
	x^2=.04 P=.82		

Table 33

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-High PSS Females

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	$x^2=.94$ P=.82		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	$x^2=.04$ P=.82		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	$x^2=.04$ P=.82		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	$x^2=.00$ P=1.00		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	$x^2=.00$ P=1.00		

Table 34

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-High PSS Females

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	22	28
	$x^2=1.09$ P=.29		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	24	26
	$x^2=.04$ P=.82		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	26	24
	$x^2=.04$ P=.82		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	19	23
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	27	23
	$x^2=.39$ P=.53		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	22	28
	$x^2=1.09$ P=.29		

Assuming that this group are anxious and threatened
as Westcott describes them, a possible interpreta-
tion of the results would be that dealing with feel-
ings presents too great a threat to these subjects.
It would also indicate that almost any approach is
acceptable as long as it is not on a feeling or
emotional level.

The second portion of the hypothesis for
this group of subjects was more than ambitious.
The mean rating of each approach by the High ID-
Low PSS females was expected to be higher than the
mean ratings by all other groups of each approach.
There were, then, thirty-five chances of failure
for support of the hypothesis.

As indicated in Table 26, few of the
differences tested were significant; and in most
cases, those that were significant were in the
wrong direction. The startling exception was the
high rating given to the Questioning approach by
this group of females, particularly in comparison
with all groups of males. The same finding was
supported by the rank score data. The confidence

level of differences in means of this group compared
to Low ID-Low PSS, High ID-High PSS, and Low ID-
High PSS females were p=.19, p=.12 and p=.03,
respectively, in the hypothesized direction. Even
among females alone, the trend, though not highly
significant, was evident. The comparison of the
Low ID-Low PSS female group mean rating with the
male group mean rating resulted in significance
between means beyond the .05 level of confidence.

The question posed here seems to be a two-
sided one. Why do the females of this group rate
Questioning higher than other groups of females
and males and/or why do males tend to rate the
Questioning approach so low? Females may have
found this approach quite natural, while males were
responding in a rather defensive manner. Together
with the apparent rejection of Reflection of
Feelings by this group, the preference for
Questioning may indicate that Questioning helps
reduce anxiety by focusing on small portions of
problems, namely, through answers to questions.
The implication is that Questioning may be a highly

useful approach in establishing a counseling relation-
ship with females.

Hypothesis II: Ninth-grade subjects will
tend to rate Advising and Supporting approaches
higher than twelfth-grade subjects. The assumption
was supported, and the null hypothesis was rejected.
The results of the mean comparisons are shown in
Table 35. Ninth-grade subjects rated both Advising
and Supporting approaches significantly higher than
did twelfth-grade subjects.

The number of subjects in each group ranking
the Advising approach above and below the median of
the combined groups are shown in Table 36. The
difference in ranking between these groups was in
the hypothesized direction, but failed to achieve
the required level of confidence for the rejection
of the null hypothesis.

The results of the same subjects ranking the
Supporting approach are presented in Table 37.
Again, as in the first part of the hypothesis, the
numbers are in the hypothesized direction, but failed
to reach the desired level of significance.

Table 35

Mean Ratings of all Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects

on Advising and Supporting Approaches

| | Means | | $?^*$ |
	Ninth Grade	Twelfth Grade	
Advising	11.31	10.51	.005
Supporting	11.25	10.15	.001-

*Single tail test.

Table 36

The Number of Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects Ranking the
Advising Approach Above or Below the Median
of the Combined Groups

	Below Median	Above Median
Ninth Grade Subjects (N=195)	90	105
Twelfth Grade Subjects (N=147)	81	66

$$X^2=2.33 \qquad P=.12$$

Table 37

The Number of Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects Ranking
the Supporting Approach Above and Below the Median
of the Combined Groups

	Below Median	Above Median
Ninth Grade Subjects (N=195)	93	102
Twelfth Grade Subjects (N=147)	78	69

$$x^2=.76 \qquad P=.61$$

Hypothesis II was primarily concerned with the developmental aspect of adolescent perceptions. The assumption on which the hypothesis was based simply stated that the younger the subject, the more advice and support is sought and expected. The Advising and Supporting approaches were rated higher by ninth-grade subjects, when compared to twelfth-grade subjects, well beyond the .01 level of confidence. This clear-cut result is one which counselor's of younger students might wish to consider. The reader is reminded that the approaches rated in this study were only three-minute portrayals of initial counseling sessions. What the results have in common with the establishment of the counseling relationship in its fullest meaning or in later sessions is not touched upon in this study. It seems safe to suggest that counselee preferences play some part on the client's side of the relationship establishing process.

Although all hypotheses were by no means unequivocally supported, considerable information was obtained concerning the preferences for and

rejections of specific counseling approaches by adolescents in the first few minutes of the counseling interview. The findings are summarized in Table 38 for convenient perusal.

Both male and female adolescents indicated a preference for the Advising approach when asked to place themselves in the role of the counselee in the film. The Supporting approach was also preferred by all groups except the Low ID-High PSS subjects who neither preferred nor rejected it.

The Reflection of Feeling approach was rejected by all groups, both male and female. Consistently that approach was rated lower by all groups of subjects.

Males consistently rejected the Questioning approach, while females rated it somewhat higher. In one instance, High ID-Low PSS females, it was rated as one of the preferred approaches.

The Information Giving approach was rejected by all females except the High ID-Low PSS group. On the other hand, High ID-Low PSS males indicated a preference for the above approach; while Low ID-Low PSS males rejected it; and Low ID-High PSS males

Table 38

Summary of Preferences for and Rejections of all Counseling Approaches

by all Cognitive Groups and by Sex

		Low ID High PSS	Low ID Low PSS	High ID High PSS	High ID Low PSS
Preferred Approaches	Males	Advising	Advising	Advising Supporting	Advising Supporting Info. Giving
	Females	Advising	Advising Supporting	Advising Supporting	Advising Supporting Questioning Info. Giving
Approaches Neither Preferred Nor Rejected	Males	Supporting Info. Giving	Supporting	Info. Giving	
	Females	Questioning	Questioning	Questioning	
Rejected Approaches	Males	Questioning Refl. of Feeling	Questioning Refl. of Feeling Info. Giving	Questioning Refl. of Feeling	Questioning Refl. of Feeling
	Females	Refl. of Feeling Info. Giving Supporting	Refl. of Feeling Info. Giving	Refl. of Feeling Info. Giving	Refl. of Feeling

and High ID-High PSS males neither preferred nor
rejected Information Giving.

Although not originally hypothesized, inspec-
tion of the number of preferred and rejected approaches
by High ID and Low ID groups (Table 38) indicates
that the number of acceptable approaches is posi-
tively related to information demand. By making
a comparison of number of approaches preferred and
rejected with the High PSS and Low PSS groups, it
appears that an inverse relationship is present.
In other words, as information demand decreases and
success in problem solving increases, there appears
to be less preference for different kinds of
approaches. When information demand increases and
success in problem solving decreases, there appears
to be greater acceptance of and preference for
different kinds of counseling approaches. These
findings need further research specifically related
to the covariance of the two cognitive dimensions
and preference for different counseling approaches.
It should also be noted that the Advising approach
was preferred by all cognitive groups of males

and females. At the same time, the Reflection of
Feeling approach was rejected by both males and
females of each cognitive group.

Further research is necessary to determine
the degree to which the expressed preference when
viewing a counseling situation is the same as
preference when actually in a counseling situation.
The findings in the present study indicate that
subjects do have preferences for specified
approaches, but do not indicate that these
preferences would be the same as in a real counsel-
ing session.

The relationship among cognitive style,
counselor approach, counseling process and eventual
outcome of counseling also needs to be researched.
For example, if the present findings of preferences
for different approaches by different cognitive
groups are the same as those subjects in real
counseling situations, what kinds of relationships
evolve? Do the preferences change over several
counseling sessions? When subjects with specific
cognitive styles are confronted with specific coun-
seling approaches, which pairings become most

successful? While this study provides some valuable
information about the relationship between cognitive
styles and adolescents' expressed preferences for
various counseling approaches, it is really only
a beginning.

Factor Analysis of Rating Scale Responses

The absence of significant differences among
mean ratings of approaches suggested the possibility
that the subjects were not responding to the differ-
ent films as distinct counseling approaches.
Factoring procedures (Fruchter, 1954) were applied
to determine if the approaches were functioning as
distinctively as the face validity of items estab-
lished by judges would indicate. In consideration
of the possibility of differences in ratings because
of differences in sex, male ratings and female
ratings were factored separately, matched together,
and then matched with the pilot data (Kaiser, 1958).

Males

The results of factoring male film ratings
are summarized in Table 39. The procedures employed

Table 39

Factor Loadings by Item Scores and Total Scores of

all Males on Counselor Rating Scale

N=200

Item	Factors				
	I Sup.	II Ref.	III Info.	IV Quest.	V Adv.
1	90*	01	01	09	13
2	89	07	11	09	18
3	90	02	03	15	09
Total	98	02	05	12	15
1	02	86	00	13	05
2	01	86	06	01	08
3	01	86	07	09	09
Total	01	99	04	09	04
1	05	10	90	00	08
2	06	03	87	06	08
3	03	00	84	07	05
Total	05	05	99	05	08
1	12	11	02	89	08
2	08	07	04	90	11
3	11	07	09	88	01
Total	11	09	04	98	08
1	14	02	04	11	88
2	09	06	11	11	89
3	17	04	11	02	85
Total	15	04	09	07	97

Percent of variance extracted 83.97.

*All decimals omitted, figures carried to two
decimal places.

resulted in the generation of five factors which
corresponded to the five counseling approaches. It
should be noted that there were no factor loadings
of less than .84 for any item from the rating
scale and no loadings of less than .97 for the
total rating score.

Females

The same procedures were applied to the
female sample that were used with the male sample,
and results are presented in Table 40. Again,
five factors were generated which corresponded to
the five counselor approaches. Item loadings
on the respective factors were above .83, while
total score loadings were above .99 on their res-
pective factors.

Pilot Study Males

The ratings of the pilot study (Chapter II)
sample of forty males were factored using the same
procedure previously applied to males and females
of the study sample. The results of this analysis
are shown in Table 41. The item loadings on the

Table 40

Factor Loadings by Items Scores and Total Scores of

all Females on Counselor Rating Scale

N=198

| Items | Factors | | | | |
	I Sup.	II Ref.	III Info.	IV Quest.	V Adv.
1	93*	08	02	03	01
2	90	02	03	10	05
3	86	07	02	08	03
Total	99	01	03	08	01
1	04	89	00	02	08
2	07	91	03	02	10
3	04	87	01	02	09
Total	03	99	01	01	10
1	08	03	83	06	02
2	03	00	88	03	06
3	00	02	83	11	00
Total	04	02	99	07	01
1	01	04	03	85	04
2	07	06	00	88	04
3	18	00	10	84	01
Total	08	01	05	99	03
1	01	00	04	01	88
2	02	11	00	02	91
3	05	16	00	05	83
Total	00	10	01	03	99

Percent of variance extracted 83.97

*All decimals omitted, figures carried to two decimal places.

Table 41

Factor Loadings by Item Scores and Total Scores of

Pilot Study Males on Counselor Rating Scale

N=40

Item	Factors				
	I. Sup.	II Ref.	III Info.	IV Quest.	V Adv.
1	92*	01	05	10	04
2	88	02	06	00	18
3	89	03	04	04	15
Total	95	07	04	10	19
1	14	84	22	16	02
2	14	81	14	02	09
3	11	90	05	06	08
Total	02	98	12	07	01
1	15	04	86	19	04
2	02	16	92	01	02
3	04	13	58	13	48
Total	06	13	95	12	19
1	01	00	41	79	22
2	10	09	04	82	03
3	05	08	01	87	06
Total	06	06	16	97	06
1	16	22	12	01	82
2	19	03	28	13	73
3	14	09	07	01	83
Total	19	06	13	05	95

Percent of variance extracted 83.44.

*All decimals omitted, figures carried to two
decimal places

five extracted factors were generally above .79.
Item number one of Factor IV loaded at .41 on
Factor III, and Item number three of Factor III
loaded .48 on Factor V. The majority (12 of 15
item loadings) were above .80. All remaining
loadings were below .22 and mostly below .10. The
total rating scale scores loaded .95 or above on
the respective factors corresponding to the five
counselor approaches.

Factor Matching

Although five factors were extracted from
male, female and the pilot study male sample data,
and it appeared as though the factors were the same
for all three samples; there was no statistical
assurance that this was so. In order to determine
the similarity of the factors of the three samples,
factor matching procedures were employed. The
results of the factor matching are summarized in
Tables 42, 43 and 44. Comparisons were made of
Males vs. Females, Males vs. Pilot Study Males, and
Females vs. Pilot Study Males respectively. All
five factors extracted from each of the three samples

Table 42

Factor Matching Males vs. Females of Five Factors

Extracted from Each Sample

Females	Males (N=200)				
(N=198)	I Sup	II Ref	III Info	IV Ques	V Adv
Sup I	.99				
Info II			.99		
Ques III				.99	
Ref IV		.99			
Adv V					.99

All invariance coefficients less than .01 were omitted from the table.

Table 43

Factor Matching Males vs. Pilot Study Males of Five

Factors Extracted from Each Sample

Pilot Males (N=40)	Males (N=200)				
	I Sup	II Ref	III Info	IV Ques	V Adv
Sup I	.99				
Ref II		.99			
Ques III				.99	
Info IV			.99		
Adv V					.99

All invariance coefficients less than .02 were omitted from the table.

Table 44

Factor Matching Females vs. Pilot Study Males of

Five Factors Extracted from Each Sample

Pilot Males		Females (N=198)				
(N=40)		I Sup	II Info	III Ques	IV Ref	V Adv
Sup	I	.99				
Ref	II				.99	
Ques	III			.99		
Info	IV		.99			
Adv	V					.99

All invariance coefficients less than .02 were omitted from the table.

matched. All three groups of subjects responded to each of the five approaches to counseling as separate and distinct techniques.

The results of the factoring procedures applied to the counselor rating scale were interpreted as an indication that the subjects were responding to the different approaches as separate and distinct constructs. The tendency to rate two or more approaches high (or low) was not a result, then, of not seeing the difference, but the results of a willingness to rate them equally if the subjects felt that way.

The high factor loadings on rotated factors indicated an extremely high internal consistency of the three items in the rating scale. Often, of course, there is a tendency to base one's willingness to relate to a counselor on the counselor's helpfulness and understanding.

Another reason for the high rotated factor loadings is the inclusion of three scores linearly related to the total score in the factor matrix. This procedure artificially raises the level of the

factor loading. Inspection of the item inter-
correlations, however, indicates that neither the
factor stureture nor the factor loadings would
change appreciably if the total score had been left
out of the matrix.

One of the major implications of the factor
study is that five counseling approaches have been
established to which adolescent subjects respond
as distinct approaches. This finding is in contrast
with the considerable volume of counseling liter-
ature which suggests that the discreet responses of
the counselor are much less important than counselor
attitude, ability to relate, or experience. The
evidence presented here suggests that subjects do
respond to different counselor statements in quite
different ways.

Conclusions and Implication for Research

Chapter IV contained the results and dis-
cussions of the findings of this study. Analysis
of the data obtained from the counselor rating
and counselor ranking forms yielded considerable

information concerning the preferences and rejections
of the four cognitive groups as defined by the West-
cott Problem Solving Scale. All four of the cognitive
groups tended to prefer the Advising approach and to
reject the Reflection of Feeling approach. In
addition, High ID-High PSS and High ID-Low PSS sub-
jects also preferred the Supporting approach.

Several sex differences were also noted when
the data was analyzed. The Questioning approach was
rejected by all males. All females except the High
ID-Low PSS group rejected the Information Giving
approach. The Questioning approach was neither
rejected nor preferred by all females except the
High ID-Low PSS group who preferred it.

Analysis of the data supported the hypothesis
that younger subjects tend to rate the Advising and
Supporting approach higher than older subjects.
Ninth-grade subjects rated both Advising and Supporting
approaches significantly higher than did twelfth-
grade subjects.

In general, then, the adolescent subjects in
this study indicated a preference for the Advising

approach. This particular preference was evident in ninth- and twelfth-graders of both sexes and all four cognitive groups. In addition, the Reflection of Feeling approach was rejected by all subjects, regardless of age-grade, sex, or cognitive group.

In order to determine if the five counseling approaches were functioning as distinctively as the face validity of the items established by judges would indicate, factoring procedures were applied. Male ratings and female ratings were factored separately, matched together, and then matched with the pilot data. All five factors extracted from each of the three samples matched. The results of the factoring and matching procedures were interpreted as an indication that the subjects were responding to the different approaches as separate and distinct constructs. One of the major implications of the factor study is that five counseling approaches have been established to which adolescent subjects respond as distinct approaches. This finding is in contrast to much of the counseling

literature which suggests that the discreet

responses of the counselor are much less impor-

tant that counselor attitude, ability to relate,

or experience.

The data in this study was collected from

adolescents who were asked to rate an initial,

filmed counseling session as if they were the

counselee. Additional research, however, is

needed to ascertain the degree to which the

expressed preference when viewing the filmed,

initial session is the same as when actually

in a counseling session. Further research is also

needed to investigate whether expressed preferences

remain the same or change as the counseling

situation continues over a period of time. Another

question which is in need of study is "what is

the relationship of expressed preferences and

rejections of approaches to the continued develop-

ment of the client-counselor relationship and to

successful outcome?" While this study provides

some valuable information about the relationship

between cognitive styles and adolescents'

expressed preferences for various counseling

approaches, sound generalization to actual

counseling situations must await answers to the

questions posed above.

Appendix A

Instructions for Film Rating

Name _____

The films you see will be those of a counselor and a high school student in an initial counseling session. You are to view each episode carefully, trying to put yourself in the part of the student.

After viewing each episode you are to rate the items on the rating sheet as follows:

1. The degree to which _you_ feel the counselor is helpful
   1. not helpful   to   5. very helpful
2. The degree to which _you_ feel the counselor understands the student
   1. very little understanding to 5. very much understanding
3. Indicate the level at which you would feel free to relate to the counselor.
   1. I would attempt to avoid any kind of interaction or relationship with this person.
   2. If no one else were available, I might consult this person for specific information of a factual, e.g. educational or vocational nature, but I would avoid any personal exposure.
   3. I would be willing to talk with this person about factual, e.g. educational or vocational concerns, and some of the personal meanings connected with these.
   4. I would be willing to talk with this

153

person about many of my personal
concerns.

5. I have the feeling that I could
probably talk with this person about
almost anything.

Are there any questions?

The first episode you see will be for practice.
Listen and watch carefully; then mark the items on
the rating sheet provided. Each episode is numbered.
Write the episode number in the space provided on
the rating sheet.

Counselor Rating Form

Episode Number _____

1. Degree you feel counselor is helpful:

not helpful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very helpful

2. Degree you feel counselor understands the problem:

not under-standing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | very under-standing

MARK ONE ONLY

3. Degree to which you would place your confidence in the counselor to help you with your problems:

____ Level 1: I would attempt to avoid any kind of interaction or relationship with this person.

____ Level 2: If no one else were available, I might consult this person for specific informa-tion of a factual, e.g. educational or vocational nature, but I would avoid any personal exposure.

____ Level 3: I would be willing to talk with this person about factual, e.g. educational or vocational concerns, and some of the personal meanings connected with these.

____ Level 4: I would be willing to talk with this per-son about many of my personal concerns.

____ Level 5: I have the feeling that I could probably talk with this person about almost anything.

Appendix B

Westcott Problem Solving Scale (Revised)

Instructions

Enter your name in the upper right corner in the space provided on the test.

Here are 15 problems for you to solve. Each numbered problem is separate from the others. Clues are provided to help you arrive at the solution for each problem. You are to solve each problem using as few clues as possible.

For each problem the clues which will help you solve it are covered by silver boxes. Erasing the silver box allows you to see the clue. There is a clue under each silver box.

In some of the problems part of the answer is already printed in the Answer Column, so be sure to look at the Answer Column before you attack each problem. In reaching your solution to any problem you must reach a final solution as though you had used ALL THE CLUES for that problem--both those you have seen and those you have not seen.

If you think you know the solution to a problem without looking any any clue, go ahead and write it in the Answer Column. If you want to see a clue, erase the first silver box. If, when you see the clue, you think you know the answer, write it down. If not, erase the next box, and so on until you either reach a solution or you have exhausted the supply of clues. Use the clues in order. Give a solution to each problem no matter how unsure you may be.

Your first reaction may be--"but what is
the problem?" The use of clues will help you decide
what the problem is-- and then help you arrive at
the solution to it.

YOU MAY USE THE BACK OF THIS SHEET FOR SCRATCH PAPER
IF YOU WISH.

REMEMBER: THE OBJECT IS TO WORK OUT THE SOLUTION
TO EACH PROBLEM USING AS FEW CLUES AS POSSIBLE.

Westcott Problem Solving Scale (Revised)

(without overlay)

Name _____

	PROBLEM	CLUES				ANSWERS
1.	over under	in out	short long	down up	black white	high
2.	12321	23432	34543	45654	56765	
3.	DRAB BAR	LOT TO	TRAP PAR	TAPS SPA	TRAM MAR	STEM
4.	Carouse	arouse	rouse	ouse	use	
5.	no tone	ma name	at star	lo fold	mi time	___ wasp
6.	325-1957	732-6195	573-2619	957-3261	195-7326	
7.	BC	CD	DE	EF	FG	
8.	carts cart	holds hold	form for	howl how	bar ba	so
9.	FAT	GET	HAT	IET	JAT	
10.	Stripe 123456	Strip 12345	Trip 2345	Pier 5463	Pest 5613	Sip
11.	N	NE	E	SE	s	
12.	DOC DUD	RID ROE	SEW SIX	COD CUE	TAM TEN	TAR
13.	312-4	8-2	15-4	351-1	242-2	216
14.	9N	8E	6S	4F	7S	2
15.	3692-4	216874-6	31-2	26915-5	9-1	6857392

Appendix C

Definitions of Counseling Approaches

<u>Advice Giving Approach</u>:

There is some question in the literature as to the "purity" of this approach. It is thought that it may be supporting to some degree. Advice as conceptualized here is the counselor suggestion of a <u>specific action</u> of how to solve the problem. As Williamson has pointed out "... the counselor is ready to advise with the student as to a program of action...."

<u>Questioning Approach</u>:

The counselor will pose a question to the client prior to each client response. This type of approach resembles that suggested for the initial interview by Fromm-Reichman (1950).

<u>Reflection of Feeling Approach</u>:

The counselor will respond with feeling appropriate to the content of client responses. This approach is consistent with that proposed by Rogers (1 52).

<u>Supporting Approach</u>:

The counselor in this approach attempts to convey to the client that the client has "what it takes" to work the problem out and with a little help everything will come out all right.

<u>Information Giving Approach</u>:

       The counselor provides information of a
specific nature to the counselee which he (the
counselor) considers relevant to the problem at
hand. (Michael & Meyerson, 1962).

Appendix D

Film Production Scripts

PRACTICE
(male)

Co: How can I help you Tom?

Cl: Well, last week our teacher passed out the choice slips for next year, and I am not sure what courses I ought to take.

Co: In making decisions of this kind you should keep in mind what you intend to do after high school.

Cl: Yes...I know. I plan on going on to State University.

Co: Have you given much thought about what you want to study when you get to the University?

Cl: I kinda thought I'd like to go into law, but there are a lot of opportunities in business management also.

Co: It's difficult to prepare for something when you don't know exactly what it is you're preparing for.

Cl: Yes sir, that's about the way I feel .. ' don't know what to take 'cause I don't know what I'll need.

Co: Do you have the suggested list of courses for college preparatory work that was sent out with the choice slips?

Cl: Yes ... I have looked that over ... the required courses in math, English, and social studies are pretty well set. It's the electives that I'm not sure about.

Co: Are there any courses on the list that particularly attracted your interest?

Cl: Yeah -- ha ha (little laugh) I like P.E. ... but then, that won't help me much in college.

Co: You feel these electives are important in getting you ready for college.

Cl: That's right. I think they will be the difference between a good solid background and a weak one.

Co: Sounds like you already have a good idea as to which of the courses listed for next year would give you the best background.

Cl: Well...I thought speech would help me in any occupation...and I like speech, particularly debate. (Pause) Then there's that special composition class Mrs. Brown teaches ... that's hard but the kids say she really gets you ready for college.

Co: Looks like you have done some fairly serious thinking. Those appear to be pretty sound choices for anything you might meet later on.

Cl: Yeah ... even if I change my mind about law or management, those would still be pretty good.

Co: Have you talked about these choices with your parents?

Cl: Yeah, well they want me to go to college, but they have pretty much left it up to me as to what I want to study. They wanted me to talk to you to see what ideas you had though.

Co: Fine, I suggest that you talk to your parents
about these two particular choices. If they
are alright with them, then go ahead and put
them down as your choices for electives for
next year.

Cl: O.K. I'll do that ... thanks for the help.

Co: Come by any time.

ADVISING
(male)

Co: Hello, John. Sit right down and relax. What can
I do for you?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh).
I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe
you'd help me out with my studies....

Co: I can probably advise you of some steps to take.
First, suppose you tell me what it's about.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework. I'm just
lazy I guess.

Co: Perhaps you should set a regular time to do your
homework.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in
with the other guys, or playing ball.

Co: Well, we all need to balance work with a reasonable
amount of recreation and leisure, so let's set up
a schedule that will help you to use your time
more efficiently.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework. I
just do it any time--and sometimes let it go until
after supper. Then I can only do the important
ones and just let the others go.

Co: We could plan certain subjects before dinner and
the rest afterwards. Then you could study them
all easily.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--
Sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if you just
read the books on certain points you know it--and
I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't
do it.

Co: Well, it's sometimes hard to see the value of care-
ful, thorough study immediately, but I suspect in
the long run you'll do much better if you try harder
in an organized, planned way.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need
to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to
college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause
I got a sister in college.

Co: Then I think it's especially important that we do
some long-range planning...

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college, and
boys can make their way easier than girls--so if
I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my
way through school. Dad really rides me about my
grades.

Co: There are several alternative ways of financing
a college education if you really want one. But
first, let's lay out some specific steps you can
take to assure better results with your present
studies. This might help reassure your Dad, too.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't
want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I
don't know.

Co: I would advise every young person to look ahead
and get as much education as possible.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever
make as good grades as my sister did--so I get
tired of trying.

Co: With some sensible planning, and then sticking to
what you set for yourself to do, I think you'll
find your grades will improve.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and
Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: Let's make some definite plans and then you can
talk to him. Perhaps if you tried to talk to him
in a different way.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me,
I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely--we'll make an appointment.

QUESTIONING
(male)

Co: Hello, John. What brings you in to see me today?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh).
I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd
help me out with my studies.

Co: What seems to be the trouble?

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just
lazy, I guess.

Co: Do you find it hard to get started on your home-
work or is sticking with it more the problem?

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time down at the
drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball?

Co: You do this every afternoon?

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--I
just do it anytime--and sometimes let it go until
after supper--then I can only do the important
ones and just let the others go.

Co: Does this fairly--uh--casual attitude bother you
sometimes?

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about home-
work--sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if
you just read the books on certain points you
know it--and I don't feel that I need it actually,
so I don't do it.

Co: Do you mean that you're really getting just about
everything out of school that you want, ... that
you think is important?

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need
to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to
college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause
I got a sister in college.

Co: Do you want to win a scholarship for college?

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls== so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: How far did your father go in school?

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Do you and your father agree that it would be best for you to get a college education?

Cl: I just don't like school much--I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: Do you think not doing as well as your sister grade-wise has affected your whole outlook in school?

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: How do you try to talk to him?

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

INFORMATION GIVING
(Male)

Co: Hello, John. What can we offer you today?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh).
I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe
you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: O.K., I probably have the information you need.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm
just lazy I guess.

Co: Poor study habits result in poor grades usually.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time down at the
drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball.

Co: Well, certainly some play is good for you and
your work. But the trouble usually comes when
things get out of balance.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--
I just do it anytime, and sometimes let it go
until after supper--then I can only do the
important ones and just let the others go.

Co: The best results are obtained from regular, con-
sistent study of all subjects.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about home-
work. Sometimes I know most of the stuff--and
if you just read the books on certain points
you know it, and I don't feel that I need it
actually, so I don't do it.

Co: But regularity seems to be the key to better grades.

Cl: I really do want to make better grades, 'cause
I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me
to go to college. He can't do it the way things
are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Grades are important for scholarships because colleges want to know you can do the work but the financial needs of the student are usually taken into consideration also in the granting of many scholarships.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls, so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: Well, I can get scholarship information for you, and also find out exactly what the trouble is in your courses. Your Dad probably reacts that way because he knows the importance of grades and is worried about finances also.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: It is a pretty well known fact that college graduates have much better incomes than high school graduates.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: When your grades get better, I believe you will like school better. We usually like the things we do well.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: He probably needs more specific information so there won't be so many unknowns in the situtation. In a situation like this, knowing the facts usually makes everyone feel more on top of things.

Cl: Well I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely,--we'll make an appointment.

REFLECTION OF FEELING
(male)

Co: Hello, John. You look a little bit bothered this morning. Can I help?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: You're not quite sure, but you felt I might help you with your studies.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy, I guess.

Co: You mean it's your own outlook or maybe habits that get in your way.

Cl: Yeah, well...I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball.

Co: Uh-huh. It is a lot of fun being with the gang, but then you feel bad later because you don't have your homework done.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework-- I just do it any time--and sometimes let it go until after supper, then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: You mean you usually feel like putting it off, like it isn't really important.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework. Sometimes I know most of the stuff, and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: In other words, you feel fairly confident that you get what's important without a lot of work, and the rest of it seems like a waste of time anyway.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: These grades really are important to you--and to your Dad.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls-- so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: ...A lot of pressure on you--school work and dad...

Cl: Well Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Sometimes you wonder about it--not sure that it's what you want to do.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I just get tired to trying.

Co: Feel like there's not much use in trying when you don't like it--and it never works anyway...

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: You mean he has his mind set one way--can't really understand your feelings about the situation.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy, which reminds me, I've got to get to class--can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

SUPPORTING
(male)

Co: Hello there, John. You're looking good this
morning. Nice to see you. How can I help you?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh).
I figured, I came here 'cause I figured maybe
you'd help me out with my studies...

Co: Together we ought to be able to work it out.
Can you tell me a little more about it.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework. I'm
just lazy I guess.

Co: Maybe you're jumping to too quick a conclusion
about yourself, John.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time down at the
drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball.

Co: There's nothing wrong with playing ball and
visiting. Playing ball is lots of fun and good
exercise too, and if we organize your time a
little better, I'm sure you can get better
grades also. We can work that out together.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework.
I just do it anytime, and sometimes let it go
until after supper. Then I can only do the
important ones and just let the other go.

Co: So you do keep up with some of them.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about
homework--sometimes I know most of the stuff,
and if you just read the books on certain points
you know it, and I don't feel that I need it
actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Yes, I'm sure there is some of it that you
already know and it probably would not help your
grades to study it.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship. My father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: There are lots of scholarships available these days, John, and I don't know why you shouldn't have as good a chance as the next person.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls-- so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: I can see you're in kind of a tough spot, but I think that together we can get things worked out. This might make your Dad feel more relaxed about the whole thing.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Your father is thinking of your best interests the same as I am. All three of us working together should be able to find the solution.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did, so I get tired of trying.

Co: You can probably do as well as she did, or even better and then things will be better for you.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: Your father probably wants to talk to you but may not know how. We can figure out a way to get him to listen--we'll try.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

PRACTICE
(female)

Co: How can I help you Betty?

Cl: Well, last week our teacher passed out the choice
slips for next year, and I am not sure what
courses I ought to take.

Co: In making decisions of this kind you should
keep in mind what you intend to do after high
school.

Cl: Yes ... I know. I plan on going on to State
University.

Co: Have you given much thought about what you want
to study when you get to the University?

Cl: I kinda thought I'd like to go into teaching,
but I'm not sure yet what subject I want to teach.

Co: It's difficult to prepare for something when you
don't know exactly what it is you're preparing
for.

Cl: Yes sir, that's about the way I feel ... I
don't know what to ﾠ.e 'cause I don't know what
I'll need.

Co: Do you have the suggested list of courses for
college preparatory work that was sent out with
the choice slips?

Cl: Yes ... I have looked that over ... the required
courses in math, English, and social studies are
all pretty well set. It's the electives that
I'm not sure about.

Co: Are there any courses on the list that particularly
attracted your interest?

Cl: Yeah -- ha ha (little laugh) I like modern dance, but then that won't help me much in college.

Co: You feel these electives are important in getting you ready for college.

Cl: That's right. I think they will be the difference between a good solid background and a weak one.

Co: Sounds like you already have a good idea as to which of the courses listed for next year would give you the best background.

Cl: Well ... I thought speech would help me in any occupation ... and I like speech--particularly drama. (Pause) Then there's that special composition class Mrs. Brown teaches ... that's hard but the kids say she really gets you ready for college.

Co: Looks like you have done some fairly serious thinking. Those appear to be pretty sound choices for anything you might meet later on.

Cl: Yeah ... even if I change my mind about teaching, those would still be pretty good.

Co: Have you talked about these choices with your parents?

Cl: Yeah, well they want me to go to college, but they have pretty much left it up to me as to what I want to study. They wanted me to talk to you to see what ideas you had though.

Co: Fine, I suggest that you talk to your parents about these two particular choices. If they are alright with them, then go ahead and put them down as your choices for electives for next year.

Cl: O.K. I'll do that ... thanks for the help.

Co: Come by any time.

ADVISING
(female)

Co: Hello, Joan. Sit right down and relax. What can I do for you?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh) I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: I can probably advise you of some steps to take. First, suppose you tell me what it's about.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework. I'm just lazy I guess.

Co: Perhaps you should set a regular time to do your homework.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group, or talking with the girls.

Co: Well, we all need to balance work with a reasonable amount of recreation and leisure, so let's set up a schedule that will help you to use your time more efficiently.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework. I just do it any time--and sometimes let it go until after supper. Then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: We could plan certain subjects before dinner and the rest afterwards. Then you could study them all easily.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about home-work--sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if you just read the books on certain points you know it--and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Well, it's sometimes hard to see the value of careful, thorough study immediately, but I suggest in the long run you'll do much better if you try harder in an organized, planned way.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Then I think it's especially important that we do some long-range planning....

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should all go to college; so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: There are several alternative ways of financing a college education if you really want one. But first, let's lay out some specific steps you can take to assure better results with your present studies. This might help reassure your Dad, too.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: I would advise every young person to look ahead and get as much education as possible.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: With some sensible planning, and then sticking to what you set for yourself to do, I think you'll find your grades will improve.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: Let's make some definite plans and then you can talk to him. Perhaps if you tried to talk to him in a different way.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds
me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back
again?

Co: Surely--we'll make an appointment.

QUESTIONING
(female)

Co: Hello, Joan. What brings you in to see me today?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: What seems to be the trouble?

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy, I guess.

Co: Do you find it hard to get started on your home-work or is sticking with it more the problem?

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group, or talking with the girls.

Co: You do this every afternoon?

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework-- I just do it anytime--and sometimes let it go until after supper--then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: Does this fairly --uh--casual attitude bother you sometimes?

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--sometimes I know most of the stuff-- and if you read the books on certain points you know it--and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Do you mean that you're really getting just about everything out of school that you want, ... that you think is important?

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Do you want to win a scholarship for college?

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should all go to college; so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: How far did your father go in school?

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Do you and your father agree that it would be best for you to get a college education.

Cl: I just don't like school much--I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: Do you think not doing as well as your sister grade-wise has affected your whole attitude in school?

Cl: Well--I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: How do you try to talk to him?

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely--we'll make an appointment.

INFORMATION GIVING
(female)

Co: Hello, Joan. What can we offer you today?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh).
I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe
you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: O.K., I probably have the information you need.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm
just lazy I guess.

Co: Poor study habits result in poor grades usually.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-
in with the group, or talking with the girls.

Co: Well, certainly some play is good for you and
your work. But the trouble usually comes when
things get out of balance.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--
I just do it anytime, and sometimes let it go
until after supper--then I can only do the
important ones and just let the others go.

Co: The best results are obtained from regular, con-
sistent study of all subjects.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about
homework. Sometimes I know most of the stuff--
and if you just read the books on certain points
you know it, and I don't feel that I need it
actually, so I don't do it.

Co: But regularity seems to be the key to better
grades.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I
need to get a scholarship--my father wants me
to go to college. He can't do it the way things
are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Grades are important for scholarships because colleges want to know you can do the work but the financial needs of the student are usually taken into consideration also in the granting of many scholarships.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college; and if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: Well, I can get scholarship information for you, and also find out exactly what the trouble is in your courses. Your Dad probably reacts that way because he knows the importance of grades and is worried about finances also.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: It is a pretty well known fact that college graduates have much better incomes than high school graduates.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: When your grades get better, I believe you will like school better. We usually like the things we do well.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: He probably needs more specific information so there won't be so many unknowns in the situation. In a situation like this, knowing the facts usually makes everyone feel more on top of things.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely--we'll make an appointment.

REFLECTION OF FEELING
(female)

Co: Hello, Joan. You look a little bit bothered this morning. Can I help?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: You're not quite sure, but you felt I might help you with your studies.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy, I guess.

Co: You mean it's your own outlook or maybe habits that get in your way.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group, or talking with the girls.

Co: Uh-huh. It is a lot of fun being with the gang but then you feel bad later because you don't have your homework done.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework-- I just do it anytime--and sometimes let it go until after supper--then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: You mean you usually feel like putting it off, like it isn't really important.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--Sometimes I know most of the stuff, and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: In other words, you feel fairly confident that you get what's important without a lot of work, and the rest of it seems like a waste of time anyway.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: These grades really are important to you--and to your Dad.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should all go to college; so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: ... A lot of pressure on you ... school work and Dad ...

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Sometimes you wonder about it--not sure that it's what you want to do.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I just get tired of trying.

Co: Feel like there's not much use in trying when you don't like it--and it never works anyway...

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: You mean he has his mind set one way--can't really understand your feelings about the situation.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy, which reminds me, I've got to get to class--can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

SUPPORTING
(female)

Co: Hello there, Joan. You're looking good this morning. Nice to see you. How can I help you?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured, I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies...

Co: Together we ought to be able to work it out. Can you tell me a little more about it?

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework. I'm just lazy I guess.

Co: Maybe you're jumping to too quick a conclusion about yourself, Joan.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group or talking with the girls.

Co: There's nothing wrong with talking and visiting. Having friends is fun and important, and if we organize your time a little better I'm sure you can get better grades also. We can work that out together.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework. I just do it anytime, and sometimes let it go until after supper. Then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: So you do keep up with some of them.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--sometimes I know most of the stuff, and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Yes, I'm sure there is some of it that you already know and it probably would not help your grades to study it.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship. My father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: There are lots of scholarships available these days, Joan, and I don't know why you shouldn't have as good a chance as the next person.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should all go to college; so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: I can see you're in a kind of a tough spot, but I think that together we can get things worked out. This might make your Dad feel more relaxed about the whole thing too.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't got to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Your father is thinking of your best interests the same as I am. All three of us working together should be able to find the solution.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did, so I get tired of trying.

Co: You probably can do as well as she did, or even better and then things will be better for you.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: Your father probably wants to talk to you but may not know how. We can figure out a way to get him to listen--we'll try.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

REFERENCES

Arbuckle, D. S. Counseling: an introduction. Boston:
    Allyn Bacon, Inc., 1961.

Astin, A. W. The functional autonomy of psychotherapy.
    Amer. Psychologist, 1961, 16, 75-78.

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of therapist response
    as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychol.
    Monogr., 1962, 76, No. 43 (Whole No. 562).

Betz, B. J. & Whitehorn, J. C. The relationship of the
    therapist to the outcome of therapy in schizophrenia.
    Psychiat. Res. Rep., 1956, 5, 89-140.

Blau, T. H. Report on a method of predicting success
    in psychotherapy. J. clin. Psychol., 1950, 6, 403-406.

Bordin, E. S. Psychological counseling. New York:
    Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955, Ch. 11.

Bown, O. H. An investigation of therapeutic relationship
    in client-centered therapy. Unpublished doctoral
    dissertation, Univer. of Chicago, 1954.

Buchheimer, A. & Balogh, S. C. The counseling relation-
    ship. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1961.

Campbell, R. E. Counselor personality and background
    and his interview subrole behavior. J. counsel.
    Psychol., 1962, 9, 329-334.

Cartwright, Rosalind D. & Vogel, J. L. A comparison of
    changes in psychoneurotic patients during matched
    periods of therapy and no therapy. J. consult.
    Psychol., 1960, 24, 121-127.

Cross, H. J. The outcome of psychotherapy: a selected
    analysis of research findings. J. consult. Psychol.,
    1964, 28, 413-417.

Crutchfield, R. S. Conformity and character. Amer.
Psychol., 1955, 10, 191-198.

Danskin, David G. Roles played by counselors in their
interviews. J. counsel. Psychol., 1955, 2, 22-27.

Davis, S. E. & Robinson, F. P. A study of the use of
certain techniques for reducing resistance during
the counseling interview. Educ. psychol. Measmt.,
1949, 9, 297-306.

Eaton, J. W. The client-practicioner relationship as
a variable in the evaluation of treatment outcome.
Psychiat., 1959, 22, 189-195.

Fey, W. F. Doctrine and experience: their influence
upon the psychotherapist. J. consult. Psychol.,
1958, 22, 403-409.

Fiedler, F. E. A comparison of therapeutic relation-
ships in psychoanalytic, non-directive and Adlerian
therapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1950, 14, 436-445.
(a)

Fiedler, F. E. Quantitative studies on the role of
therapists' feelings toward their patients. In
O. H. Mowrer (Ed.), Psychotherapy theory and re-
search. New York: Ronald Press, 1953, Pp. 296-316.

Frank, J. D. Problem of controls in psychotherapy, as
exemplified by psychotherapy research project of
Phipps Psychiatric Clinic. In E. A. Rubinstein &
M. B. Parloff (Eds.), Research in psychotherapy.
Vol. 1. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological
Association, 1958, Pp. 10-26.

Fromm-Reichmann, Frieda. Principles of intensive psycho-
therapy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,
1950.

Fruchter, B. Introduction to factor analysis. New York:
Van Nostrand, 1954.

Gonyea, G. G. The "ideal therapeutic relationship" and
counseling outcome. The University of Texas Test-
ing and Counseling Center, Research Report No. 12,
April 20, 1962.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology
and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company,
Inc., 1956.

Havighurst, R. J. Counseling adol:e.ent girls in the
1960's. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1956, 13,
153-160.

Hemby, Jo Nell Schutz. Adolescents' perceptions of the
feminine role in today's society. Unpublished
master's thesis, Univer. of Texas, 1965.

Inhelder, Barbel & Piaget, J. The growth of logical
thinking. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1958.

Jones, M. C. A study of socialization patterns at high
school level. J. genet. Psychol., 1958, 93, 87-111.

Jones, M. C. & Bayley, Nancy. Physical maturing among
boys as related to behavior. J. educ. Psychol.,
1950, 41, 129-148.

Kaiser, H. G. The varimax criterion for analytic rota-
tion in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1958,
23, 187-200.

Katz, M. M., Lorr, M., & Rubinstein, E. A. Remainer
patient attributes and their relation to subsequent
improvement in psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol.,
1958, 22, 411-413.

Lesser, W. M. The relationship between counseling prog-
ress and empathetic understanding. J. counsel.
Psychol., 1961, 8, 330-336.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments in
psychology and education. Boston: Houghton
Mifflin, 1956.

Lorr, M., Katz, M. M., & Rubinstein, E. A. The predic-
    tion of length of stay in psychotherapy. J. consult.
    Psychol., 1958, 22, 321-327.

McCreary, W. E. An empirical derivation of hypotheses
    related to individually characteristic approaches
    to school counseling situations. Unpublished doc-
    toral dissertation, Univer. of Wisconsin, 1962.

McNair, D. M. & Lorr, M. An analysis of professed psycho-
    therapeutic techniques. J. consult. Psychol.,
    1964, 28, 265-271.

Michael J. & Meyerson, L. A behavioral approach to
    counseling and guidance. Harvard Educ. Rev., 1962
    32, 382-402.

Morse, J. A study of verbal expression of value judg-
    ments by counselors during counseling interviews.
    Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univer. of Texas,
    1956.

Mussen, P. H. & Jones, M. C. Self conceptions, motiva-
    tions, and interpersonal attitudes of late and early
    maturing boys. Child Develpm., 1957, 28, 225.

Myers, J. K. & Auld, F. Some variables related to out-
    come of psychotherapy. J. clin. Psychol., 1955,
    11, 51-54.

Overall, B. & Aronson, H. Expectations of psychotherapy
    in patients of lower socio-economic class. Amer.
    J. Orthopsychiat., 1963, 33, 421-430.

Parloff, M. B. Therapist-patient relationships and out-
    come of psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1961,
    25, 29-38.

Pierce-Jones, John. Personal Communication, 1964.

Robinson, F. P. Principles and procedures in student
    counseling. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Rogers, C. R. Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston:
    Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Rogers, C. R.   The interpersonal relationship: the
     core of guidance.   _Harvard Educ. Rev._, 1962, _32_,
     417-429.

Seeman, J.   A study of preliminary interview methods in
     vocational counseling.   _J. consult. Psychol._,
     1948, _12_, 321-330.

Seeman, J.   A study of the process of non-directive
     therapy.   _J. consult. Psychol._, 1949, _13_, 157-168.

Shaffer, L. F. & Shoben, E. J., Jr.   _The psychology of
     adjustment_.   Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956.

Sherman, Dorothy.   An analysis of the dynamic relation-
     ship between counselor techniques and outcomes in
     larger units of the interview situation.   Unpub-
     lished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State Univer.,
     1945.

Snyder, W. K.   An investigation of the nature of non-
     directive psychotherapy.   _J. gen. Psychol._, 1945,
     _33_, 1930224.

Snyder, W. U.   _The psychotherapy relationship_.   New York:
     Macmillan, 1961.

Steph, Josaph A.   Responses to hypothetical counseling
     situations as a predictor of relationship orienta-
     tion in school counselors.   Unpublished doctoral
     dissertaion, Univer. of Wisconsin, 1963.

Stevenson, I.   The challenge of results in psychotherapy.
     Amer. J. Psychiat., 1959, _116_, 120-123.

Steiper, D. R. & Wiener, D. N.   The problem of inter-
     minability in out-patient psychotherapy.   _J. consult.
     Psychol._, 1959, _23_, 237-242.

Streitfield, J. W.   Expressed acceptance of self and
     others by psychotherapists.   _J. consult. Psychol._
     1959, _23_, 435-441.

Sullivan, P. L., Miller, Christine, & Smelser, W. Factors in length of stay and progress in psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 1-9.

Sundland, D. M. & Barker, E. N. The orientations of psychotherapists. J. consult Psychol., 1962, 26, 201-212.

van der Veen, Ferdinand. The perceptions by clients and by judges of conditions offered by the therapist in the therapist relationship. Discussion papers, Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, No. 15, September, 1961, The University of Wisconsin. (a)

van der Veen, Ferdinand. The conditions offered by the therapist as perceived by clients and by judges. Paper presented at the National Convention of the APA in New York, September, 1961. (b)

Westcott, M. R. A method for the study of creativity as a special case of problem solving. Paper presented at APA meetings, New York, April, 1960. (a)

Westcott, M. R. On the measurement of intuitive leaps. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association meetings, New York, April, 1960. (b)

Westcott, M. R. On the measurement of intuitive leaps. Psychol. Reports, 1961, 9, 274.

Westcott, M. R. Inference, guess work and creativity. Cooperative Research Project 684, U. S. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962. (a)

Westcott, M. R. Empirical studies of intuition. Talk given at the 1962 University of Utah Research Conference on the Identification of Creative Scientific Talent, held at Mount Majestic Lodge, Brighton, Utah, June, 1962. (b)

Westcott, M. R. & Ranzoni, J. H. Correlates of intuitive thinking. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association meetings, Atlantic City, New Jersey, April, 1962.

White, A. M., Frichtenbaum, L. & Dollard, J. Measure for predicting dropping out of psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1964, 28, 326-332.

Whitehorn, J. C. & Betz, B. J. A study of psychotherapeutic relationships between physicians and schizophrenic patients. Amer. J. Psychiat., 1954, 111, 321-331.

Whitehorn, J. C. & Betz, B. J. Further studies of the doctor as a crucial variable in the outcome of treatment with schizophrenic patients. Amer. J. Psychiat., 1960, 117, 215-223.

Williamson, E. G. Counseling adolescents. New York: McGraw Hill, 1950.

Wilson, C. W. The development of structure in attitudes in adolescence. Paper presented at APA meetings, Philadelphia, Pa., 1963.

Windle, C. Psychological tests in psychopathological prognosis. Psychol. Bull., 1952, 49, 451-475.