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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The fields of counseling and therapy are rapidly growing with respect to the number of methodological theories developed. Since these fields continue to expand, it is important to consider the relative acceptance of these different approaches by those who have probable occasion to utilize them.

One such approach which has had considerable impact upon counseling and therapy is that of Carl R. Rogers' client-centered therapy. In 1942 Rogers published his first book, Counseling and Psychotherapy. This publication was the beginning of his influence which touched off a debate over the philosophy and techniques involved in counseling and therapy, and from which an attitude designated as "client-centered" sprang.1

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to ascertain the relative acceptance of the nondirective

orientation among various categories of students attending education and psychology classes at Fresno State College.

Analysis of the problem. The following hypotheses pertain to certain categories of students attending education and psychology classes as set forth in the statement of the problem.

With respect to their relative acceptance of client-centered therapy, there is no significant difference between:

1. Education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and those emphasizing supervision and administration;

2. Education majors specializing in counseling and guidance and psychology majors;

3. Education majors specializing in supervision and administration and psychology majors;

4. Students falling in the age category under 30, and those in the age group 31-40;

5. Students falling in the age category under 30, and those in the age range 41-50;

6. Students comprising the under 30 subdivision, and those in the age division 51 and above;

7. Students in the age range 31-40, and those in the age category 41-50;
8. Students making up the age group 31-40, and those in the age class 51 and above;

9. Students in the age subdivision 41-50, and those in the age range 51 and above;

10. Males and females;

11. Graduate psychology majors and undergraduate psychology majors;

12. Those students who have had one or more years of working experience in areas related to counseling and/or therapy and who also were at the time of the study, so employed, as compared with those who were not of such status;

13. Former undergraduate education majors who were at the time of the study current graduate education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and those who, at the time of the study, were specializing in supervision and administration;

14. Education majors emphasizing counseling and guidance and psychology majors, as opposed to all others;

15. Males and females majoring in education and specializing in counseling and guidance and supervision and administration as well as psychology majors;

16. All teaching credential candidates working on a degree, and those not working on a degree;

17. Standard teaching credential candidates, and special education teaching credential candidates.
Delimitations. The sample data was drawn from students attending education and psychology classes at Fresno State College during the summer session, 1968, and the results, conclusions, and inferences drawn from this data were in no way intended to be generalized to any larger or similar populations.

The nature of this study is relative rather than absolute; the facts included concern how much more or less one classification of students is prone to accept a client-centered orientation as compared with another. There is no intent to imply that any given category of students does or does not accept a nondirective approach.

The sources of the information in this study include an opinionnaire distributed to the sample, as well as those primary and secondary sources of information available at the time in the Fresno State College Library.

The client-centered or nondirective orientation being measured is related to Carl R. Rogers' frame of reference.

Basic assumptions. The first assumption was that although counselors and therapists are not the same, they should both have attitudes regarding client-centered therapy, as specifically related to Rogers' point of view.

The second assumption was that all the respondents involved would have attitudes regarding the various statements on the opinionnaire they rated.
The third assumption was that the theory involved in this study is important insofar as counseling and therapy are concerned.

The fourth assumption was that all theorists hold certain basic premises in common, although they still differ in many ways and in many degrees from one another; this is applicable to Rogers, as well as to others.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following terms, which appear throughout this paper, are to be read from the frame of reference of the subsequent definitions:

Client-centered.

Pertaining to the activity of a school or welfare agency [or other professional agency or individual] where the emphasis is shifted from what the agency considers best for the client to the attempt to help the client draw on his own resources for the solution of his problem.²

Client-centered counseling.

Syn. counseling, nondirective.³

Congruence.

This refers to an accurate matching of experience with awareness. In other words, it is when the therapist is fully and accurately aware of what he is


³Ibid., p. 100.
Counselee.
A person who receives counseling.\(^5\)

Counseling.
A relationship in which one person endeavors to help another to understand and to solve his adjustment problems.\(^6\)

Counseling, directive.
Counseling in which the counselor takes direct part in the solution of his client’s problem by suggesting alternative decisions and plans of action and by offering possible interpretations of the client’s attitudes, interests, and personality as indicated by tests and historical data.\(^7\)

Counseling, eclectic.
Counseling in which are used various techniques selected because of relevancy and applicability to the problems of the individual counselee, as opposed to techniques based on a unitary theory of counseling.\(^8\)


\(^6\)Ibid.

\(^7\)Good, op. cit., p. 138.

\(^8\)Ibid.
Counseling, nondirective.

Counseling based on the assumption that the individual has the capacity to solve his own problems, wherein the counselor's role is one of clarifying the feelings which he encourages the client to express freely, so as to allow the counselor to see his problem more clearly and thus work out his own solution. Syn. Client-centered counseling.9

Counselor.

One who assists individual students to make adjustments and choices, especially in regard to vocational, educational, and personal matters.10

Helping relationship.

A relationship in which one of the participants intends that there should come about, in one or both parties, more appreciation of, more expression of, more functional use of the latent inner resources of the individual.11

Opinionnaire.

A type of questionnaire designed to elicit opinions or attitudes, in contrast to objective facts; much the same as an expressionnaire.12

Psychotherapy.

Treatment of mental or emotional disorder or maladjustment by psychological means, especially involving

9Ibid., p. 138.
10Ibid., p. 139.
12Good, op. cit., p. 376.
verbal communication (as in psychoanalysis, nondirective psychotherapy, re-education, hypnosis, or prestige suggestion.\textsuperscript{13}

**Scale, attitude.**

An attitude-measuring instrument ... designed to obtain a quantitative evaluation of an attitude.\textsuperscript{14}

**Significant learning.**

Learning which makes a difference in the individual's behavior, in the course of action he chooses in the future, in his attitudes, and in his personality.\textsuperscript{15}

**Special education.**

The education of pupils (for example, the deaf, the blind and partially seeing, the mentally subnormal, the gifted) who deviate so far physically, mentally, emotionally, or socially from the relatively homogeneous groups of so-called "normal" pupils that the standard curriculum is not suitable for their educational needs; involves the modification of the standard curriculum in content, methods of instruction, and expected rate of progress to provide optimum educational opportunity for such pupils; carried on in special classes, in special curricula or in special schools.\textsuperscript{16}


\textsuperscript{14}Good, op. cit., p. 477.


\textsuperscript{16}Good, op. cit., p. 515.
Therapy.

Syn. Psychotherapy.\textsuperscript{17}

Therapy, \textit{client-centered}.

Psychological counseling in which the therapist endeavors to keep the client expressing and exploring attitudes as freely as possible; through this, the client becomes more accepting of himself and others.\textsuperscript{18}

Therapy, \textit{directive}.

Therapeutic approach in which the therapist takes an active role by aiding the uncovering of conflicts and giving interpretations and directive guidance.\textsuperscript{19}

III. ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THESIS

A general review of the literature concerning Carl R. Rogers' client-centered therapy is set forth in Chapter II. In Chapter III the procedure involved in gathering and interpreting the data is presented.

Chapter IV contains the test results and interpretation of the data in relation to the six questions asked in the analysis of the problem section of the paper. Included in the final chapter are the summary, relevant findings and conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

\textsuperscript{17}Gove, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 2372.

\textsuperscript{18}Good, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 569.

\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Ibid.}
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The opinions of the population sampled for this study are those regarding Carl R. Rogers' client-centered therapy. In the light of this concept this chapter will, first, review Rogers' theory and second, review studies which statistically measure the preference of the nondirective method or its various parts by different groupings of people.

I. LITERATURE ON ROGERS' THEORY

There are two main hypotheses upon which client-centered therapy is built. The first is philosophical in nature, and states that each individual has the internal capacity, at least latent, to understand the elements in his life which cause him pain and unhappiness and to reorganize himself in a way that will allow him to overcome those factors. The second concerns the client-counselor relationship, which must be sufficiently warm, accepting and understanding if the client's ability to realize the powers referred to under the first hypothesis are expected to develop.¹

The philosophy underlying Rogers' theory is an optimistic one, for the process of therapy is viewed by him as an orderly process, assuming his conditions have been met, during which the attitudes toward the "self" change from predominantly negative to preponderantly positive. Self-esteem is seen to improve; the personality becomes more comfortable and better integrated; the basic make-up of the personality becomes more accepting of emotionality, more unified, less neurotic, more tolerant of stress, more objective in dealing with reality, and so on.²

This orderly process which moves in a positive direction is perceived by Rogers as fluid rather than static. Man is valued as a process of becoming; he is seen as a process of gaining worth and dignity through the development of his potentialities. Each person is viewed as a self-actualizing process, moving on to additional enriching and challenging experiences. The human organism is involved in a process whereby he creatively adapts to a continuously new and altering world. Furthermore, knowledge is seen as transcending itself by new knowledge.³

The individual, then, should be provided with freedom

²Ibid., pp. 73-74.

to fulfill himself by voluntarily and responsibly taking part in the destined events of the world in which he lives. Each person must be given the opportunity to recognize that he is an emerging process, and he must be presented with the burden of being responsible for the self he chooses to be.  

In order to act consistently upon the hypothesis that the individual possesses adequate ability to deal constructively with all of those aspects of his life that can potentially come into conscious awareness, an interpersonal situation must be created in which information is allowed to come into the client's awareness. A meaningful exhibition of the counselor's acceptance of the client as a person who can adequately direct himself must also be demonstrated. Within this interpersonal situation, and accompanying the counselor's overt manifestation of his faith in the client, is the treatment of the latter as a person who is "becoming" and who is not bound by his past or the counselor's past.

Rogers' second basic hypothesis is germane to this interpersonal situation which is the client-counselor relationship. The type of relationship which Rogers views

---


as characteristic of almost all counselor-client relationships is that of a helping relationship.\textsuperscript{7}

There are a number of factors which Rogers feels the counselor should consider in creating a helping relationship. For one thing, within the bounds of the relationship, the therapist should be a congruent, genuine, integrated person. He is deeply and freely himself, and his actual experience ought to be accurately represented by his awareness of himself.\textsuperscript{8}

A second element involved would be that the counselor accept himself for what he is. He should be acutely aware of and permissive toward his own feelings. This acceptance of himself should then be allowed to show through to the counselee. No attempt should be made to hide these feelings, either to himself, or to the client.\textsuperscript{9}

A third point is that of experiencing a warm caring for the client; such a concern should not be possessive, neither should it demand personal gratification for the counselor. This is a basic feeling of acceptance of the

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., p. 6.


\textsuperscript{9}Rogers, "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship," \textit{op. cit.}, p. 12.
client, and has been labeled "unconditional positive regard" by Standal. Involved in this concept is an acceptance of the client's negative, abnormal, and painful feelings as well as his positive, confident, and mature feelings. The counselor, then, should accept the client in every respect.\textsuperscript{10}

A fourth ingredient in such a relationship involves a feeling, by the therapist, that he is freely and strongly a separate person from the client. In Rogers' words:

Am I strong enough in my own separateness that I will not be downcast by his depression, frightened by his fear, nor engulfed by his dependency? ... I am not destroyed by his anger, taken over by his need for dependence, nor enslaved by his love. ...\textsuperscript{11}

A fifth element involved in a helping relationship is that the therapist experience a high degree of empathy for the client's feelings. The therapist is to sense the client's fear, anger, or ambiguous feelings as if they were his own, without getting caught up in them. When this is accomplished, the therapist can then clearly communicate back to the client, feelings of which the client is both aware and unaware.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10}Carl R. Rogers, "Significant Learning: In Therapy and in Education," \textit{loc. cit.}


This communication of empathic feelings back to the client from the counselor is one of the major techniques involved in client-centered therapy, and is called "reflection." The counselor is to fully accept his client's attitudes, and accurately reflect them.\(^\text{13}\)

Tied in with this role of the counselor who is to experience a feeling of empathy for his client is the position the counselor is to fill in relation to this role. Within the client-counselor relationship, the counselor is to do away with his own selfhood. He is to place his full concentration upon understanding. The counselor becomes an "alter ego," who expresses the client's attitudes deprived of their emotions. The client is then more able to perceive himself objectively, and this paves the way to self-acceptance and self-reorganization.\(^\text{14}\)

A by-product of the therapist as an alter ego is the fact that he endeavors to leave himself out of the relationship as a separate person; his own personal distortions and maladjustments, emotional biases, and so on are much less likely to interfere with the client's therapeutic progress.


Rogers feels that all therapists, even those who have resolved many of their own troubles in a therapeutic relationship, still have disturbing conflicts, unrealistic attitudes concerning various things, or tendencies to project.¹⁵

A helping relationship is also seen by Rogers as non-threatening to the client. The therapist, in order not to be perceived as a threat to the client, must be sufficiently sensitive in the relationship. The client must also be freed from external evaluation. This includes positive as well as negative evaluation. Both are perceived as threatening in the long run, since letting the client know that he is good carries with it the implication that the one who has so informed him also has the right to tell him he is bad. Therefore, the counselor should neither judge nor evaluate the counselee and he should also maintain a high degree of sensitivity to the client's feelings. Freeing the client from external threat will then allow the client to experience and deal with his own internal feeling and conflicts which are threatening to him.¹⁶

Another factor considered important in a Rogerian oriented client-counselor relationship is that the attitudes

¹⁵Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy*, op. cit., p. 42.

and feelings of the therapist are considered more important than his theoretical orientation. The counselor's techniques and procedures are considered less important than his attitudes. Furthermore, it is the manner in which his attitudes are perceived that makes a difference to the client, and this perception is what is seen as crucial.  

Rogers has outlined a series of steps in relation to the way the therapeutic relationship is perceived and experienced by the client. The first discovery made by the client is that, within the confines of the relationship, he is responsible for himself. Such a discovery is made at the counselee's own pace. The second experience is one of a process of exploration of attitudes. During this search period, inconsistencies within the client will be noted; since he will be talking freely and expressing attitudes freely, previously undiscovered contradictions are noticed. They can then be faced, re-examined and a resulting self alteration can take place in order to bring about consistency. As a result of verbally exploring attitudes and problems, experienced attitudes which have been denied to awareness are discovered. The reorganization of the self is necessitated as these denied elements of experience are brought into awareness. The client is to experience progress

---

throughout this process. The experience of ending the therapy is then felt by the client. When the client is dealing with himself—his emotions, attitudes, values and goals, as they currently exist—therapy ends. The counselee is then responsible for reopening his contacts with the therapist.  

As Rogers sees it, what is to take place in the relationship between the client and the counselor is "significant learning."  

Furthermore, if the various factors involved within the relationship are consistently followed, then the client is to become:

(a) more realistic in his self perceptions; (b) more confident and self-directing; (c) more positively valued by himself; (d) less likely to repress elements of his experience; (e) more mature, socialized and adaptive in his behavior; (f) less upset by stress and quicker to recover from it; (g) more like the healthy, integrated self-functioning person in his personality structure.

II. LITERATURE ON RELEVANT RESEARCH

Stanley Lipkin made an investigation of how the client

---

18 Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, op. cit., pp. 71-88, 122 and 136.


20 Rogers, "The Place of the Person in the New World of the Behavioral Sciences," op. cit., p. 443.
perceives nondirective psychotherapy, and how he evaluates its effectiveness.\textsuperscript{21}

At the conclusion of a case, the client was asked to state in his own words:

1. What seemed to be the story before you came in;
2. What seemed to go on during your visits here; and
3. How things look to you now.
Please be as critical and as frank as you can.\textsuperscript{22}

There were a total of thirty-seven respondents involved in this study. The first finding of this study was that the clients appeared to agree in general that the nondirective process allowed them to explore independently the motives for their attitudes and behavior, permitting them to achieve insight and resolve their problems. There was, however, no uniformity of initial reaction to the counselor's "silence" and "lack of aggressiveness." Each of the subjects reported satisfying results from being given the major responsibility for his own treatment.\textsuperscript{23}

The second point was that a number of the clients had definite feelings about choosing their own course and making their own decisions. Twelve indicated that they had received


\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., pp. 137, 140.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 140.
much gratification from the discovery that they could think their own problems through and plan their own courses of action. Three stated that they would have preferred more concrete advice, and the remaining twenty-two did not mention this point.\textsuperscript{24}

E. Lakin Phillips and John W. Agnew, Jr. made a report on the responses which clinically trained and untrained people make to hypothetical counseling situations. The focus of this research was on the Reflection technique of Rogers.\textsuperscript{25}

Twenty paragraphs encompassing hypothetical counseling situations were put forth with five possible responses to the client's statement: "E (Evaluative), I (Interpretive), P (Probing), S (Supportive), and U (Understanding, or reflective, the Rogerian type response)."\textsuperscript{26} There were also two sets of directions given. The first set of directions, the simulated counselor directions, asked the respondents to choose from the five possibilities connected with each paragraph the one which they would select as a response to a person who said to them in counseling situations what was

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., p. 141.


\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., pp. 281-282.
stated in the paragraphs. The other set of directions, the simulated counselee directions, asked the subjects to choose the response they would expect to hear if they (the respondents) had said to a counselor or therapist what was stated in the paragraph.\textsuperscript{27}

The population sampling consisted of one class of eighty-seven high school juniors and seniors who followed the simulated counselor directions, and another class of forty-one high school juniors and seniors who followed the simulated counselee directions. Also included were three university classes who simulated counselor's role, $N=62$; simulated counselee's role, $N=66$; and simulated the counselor's role in responding to the questionnaire twice to check for consistency, $N=50$. The expert group was made up of twenty-one clinicians with at least approximately five years' experience in psychotherapy. All of this expert category had had a minimum of two years of psychoanalysis. The group of clinical-students consisted of twenty-eight first and second year graduate students with an amount of clinical experience ranging from very little to four or five years. All these clinical students had taken a number of courses in clinical subjects. Both clinical groups simulated the counselor's role in therapy when reacting to the

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid.
questionnaire. A chi-square test was used to compare the empirical with the theoretical results in the choice of categories.\textsuperscript{28}

The first hypothesis "that untrained people will respond to hypothetical counseling situations primarily in terms of nonreflective choices" was supported. The two high school and the two university groups made up the untrained sample. Each of these four subdivisions was found to deviate significantly from the theoretically expected and, furthermore, the U category was shown to be the smallest of the five by an appreciable margin in each of the four categories.\textsuperscript{29}

The second hypothesis was "that untrained people will respond to hypothetical counseling situations in essentially the same manner whether they simulate the counselor's or the counselee's role." In comparing the two high school classes with each other, and the two university classes with each other, the differences in each case were found to be relatively minor except the "University Counselee" group, which most nearly approximated a theoretical distribution but showed the smallest percentage of choices in the U category. The preferential direction in both groups was the same. The

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., p. 283.

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., pp. 282-283.
U response, then, was the least preferred by these groups, for both sets of directions.\textsuperscript{30}

The final hypothesis stated "that trained clinicians (psychologists, social workers, psychiatrists) will choose the reflective responses at a level significantly greater than chance." This hypothesis was also substantiated.\textsuperscript{31}

Daniel C. Grady wrote a thesis on the perceptions of nondirective counseling by the Catholic Church and Catholic writers. A question appearing in Grady's study was found to be relevant to the present study: "What are the views of Catholic writers toward nondirective counseling?"\textsuperscript{32}

A questionnaire was utilized in which four essay questions were asked of the respondents. The question germane to this study asked for information concerning the Church's attitude relative to nondirective counseling.\textsuperscript{33}

The responses to the questionnaire demonstrated that Catholic writers question nondirective counseling as related to moral issues. They indicated that the counselor does not become nonjudgmental in the use of the client-centered

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., p. 283.

\textsuperscript{31}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., p. 20.
approach. The writers felt that when moral values become involved, the counselor will not be able to avoid being judgmental. Also the permissiveness condition, as they see it, demands strict professional control on the part of the counselor.  

A study was made by John Earle Jones in order to answer the following two question:

1. Are school counselors homogeneous with respect to the ways in which they respond to clients in interviews? and

2. Do members of various occupational groups respond differently in quasi-counseling situations?  

An instrument called the "Helping Relationship Inventory" which yields five subscores was used. The five subscores were Understanding, Probing, Interpretive, Supportive, and Evaluative. The respondent was presented a client statement followed by five alternatives classified according to the subscale descriptions. The alternatives were then marked in order of preference. There were 370 subjects involved, and their distributions on each subscale were analyzed by Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by ranks,

Ibid., pp. 33-34.

Mann-Whitney U-tests, and by graphic methods. On each sub-scale, differences among the eleven occupational groups were found to be significant beyond the .001 level.36

Through studying the group profiles on the graphs, it was found that (1) persons studied who worked in the helping professions showed similar helping relationship response tendencies; (2) persons in other occupations involved in the study tended to be more similar to one another than to those of the helping professions; (3) lawyers were found to be different from both helping profession groups and the others; (4) there was much overlap among occupational groups concerning counseling preferences; and (5) counselor candidates and school counselors were found to be very similar in their verbal response tendencies.37

Preferences for Understanding and Probing responses were shown by counselors, nursing instructors, and ministers, who rejected Supportive and Evaluative responses. The other groups, firemen, housewives, secretaries, and undergraduate students showed a preference for Evaluative and Probing statements and lacked preference for Understanding responses. Lawyers yielded either the highest or the lowest median on each subscale and their tendency was to prefer Probing and

36Ibid.
37Ibid.
Evaluative responses as opposed to Supportive, Interpretive, and Understanding modes.\textsuperscript{38}

A study by Michael Reiter involved an examination of certain personality characteristics as they related to preferences expressed by subjects for the degree to which the therapist is directive. A Therapist Behavior Scale consisting of thirty-two items was constructed. It focused on the dimension of therapist activity versus client activity. Item analysis and selection from a much larger pool of items was used in the construction of the instrument. The test was administered to 220 college freshmen consisting of 104 males and 116 females, followed by the MMPI.\textsuperscript{39}

Females were found to prefer the less directive therapist. Younger females (mean age 17 years) had a strong preference for nondirective approaches, while the opposite held true for males. As age increased, this contrast was considerably lessened.\textsuperscript{40}

High self-ideal discrepancy males were found to prefer the noncontrolling therapist significantly more than did low self-ideal discrepancy males. The opposite was true for

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., p. 6848.

\textsuperscript{39}Michael Reiter, "Variables Associated with the Degree of Preferred Directiveness in Therapy" (abstract of unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, 1966) Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII, p. 3679-B.

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid.
females. Females with high ego strength preferred a non-controlling therapist; for the lows, it was the opposite. Males showed no difference. Nondefensive males were found to prefer a noncontrolling therapist, while defensive ones preferred the opposite. Females did not differ. Females with high social desirability preferred nondirectionality, while a curvilinear relationship was found for males.41

For females in general, preferences regarding the therapist's degree of directiveness were related to overall degree of adjustment, while for males, they were related to defensiveness.42

A study was made by LeRoy Duane Holden to find out if counselors, principals, superintendents, and school board members differed in their perceptions of ideal pupil-personnel strategies and to see if the ideal pupil-personnel strategies perceived by educators were different from those employed in actual practice.43

Two high school counselors, two secondary school principals, two school board members, and the superintendent

41Ibid., p. 3679-B
42Ibid.,
from each of five school districts were interviewed. The interview consisted of ten typical hypothetical problem situations. Each respondent was to indicate how he would handle the problems if he were a counselor operating under ideal counseling conditions. Three university professors classified each response as directive or nondirective. The statistical measures utilized were the binomial test and the chi-square test.\(^4^4\)

The first two hypotheses, stating that there would be no significant differences within and between the four groups tested, were rejected with differences significant at the one percent level of confidence. The third hypothesis, that there would be no significant differences between actual and ideal pupil-personnel strategies within the following three groups--school superintendents, secondary school principals, and secondary school counselors--was accepted.\(^4^5\)

All groups were more directive than nondirective when asked to describe how they would counsel under ideal conditions. Actual pupil-personnel strategies employed by counselors, principals, and superintendents had all been more directive than nondirective. Differences between actual and

\(^{44}\)Ibid., pp 955-A, 955-A.

\(^{45}\)Ibid., p. 955-A.
ideal pupil-personnel strategies were found not to be consequential. In both ideal and actual categories, counselors were found to be significantly more nondirective than the other groups. 46

A report resume of a study done by Oliver H. Brown and others revealed the preferences of adolescents for various procedural approaches used in filmed counseling sessions. The group was divided into four cognitive groups on the basis of the "Westcott Problem Solving Scale" two dimensions: (1) the quantity of information demanded or required for solving the problems, and (2) the amount of success in solving problems. The groups consisted of "low demand-high success," "low demand-low success," "high demand-high success," and "high demand-low success." The subjects watched the filmed sessions and then completed counselor rating and ranking forms, which consisted of five counseling approaches: Advice-giving, Reflection of feeling, Questioning, Information-giving, and Supporting. 47

Analysis of the data in the light of the above counseling approaches revealed that all four groups tended to prefer the Advice-giving approach, and to reject the

46 Ibid.

Reflection of feeling approach. All the males rejected the Questioning approach, and all the females except the "high demand-low success" group rejected the Information-giving approach. Younger subjects tended to rate both the Advice-giving approach and the Supporting approach higher than did older subjects.*®

III. SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

Summary of Rogers' theory. Rogers' client-centered therapy is built upon an optimistic philosophy which places faith in the individual to be able to cope with the various problematic areas of his life. The individual is involved in an orderly process, moving in a positive direction towards self-actualization, and realization of his potentialities.

In order for an individual to be able to realize these powers, he must be involved in a warm and accepting relationship which is helping in nature. Within this relationship, the counselor must be accepting of himself and of the counselee. The counselor must experience a deep empathic feeling for the counselee's expressed attitudes in a nonjudgmental atmosphere, and must reflect these feelings back to the client. In this manner, the therapist takes on the role of an alter ego who has removed his own personality,
and who is now merely attempting to fully understand. The attitudes of the counselor are considered more important than his techniques.

The therapeutic process is to be perceived by the client as moving through a series of steps in which the client discovers he is responsible for himself in the relationship, experiences an exploration of his attitudes, notes inconsistencies, re-examines them, alters himself, and progresses to the end of therapy. When therapy has been completed the client is more able to deal with himself and his situation, for he has experienced significant learning.

**Summary of relevant research findings.** The studies reviewed brought out the perceptions and attitudes of various groupings of people towards client-centered therapy and/or its various aspects.

The first study reviewed was by Lipkin. At the conclusion of counseling, each of the clients involved reported satisfying results from being given the major responsibility for his own treatment. Furthermore, of the thirty-seven subjects, twelve mentioned that they were gratified in discovering that they could think their own problems through, and plan their own courses of action. More concrete advice would have been preferred by three of them; the remaining twenty-two did not bring this point up.
The second study was by Phillips and Agnew and was concerned with the responses that clinically trained and untrained people make to hypothetical counseling situations in relation to Rogers' Reflection technique. Untrained people were found to react to hypothetical counseling situations mainly in terms of Nonreflective choices. Furthermore, responses to hypothetical counseling situations by untrained people were basically made in the same way, whether they simulated the counselor's or the counselee's role. The last finding was that Reflective responses were chosen by trained clinicians at a level significantly greater than chance.

Grady conducted the third study mentioned. In relation to perceptions of nondirective counseling by the Catholic Church, he found that Catholic writers question the client-centered approach as related to moral issues. These writers indicated that the counselor does not become non-judgmental in the use of the nondirective approach. They felt that when moral problems become involved, the counselor would not be able to avoid being judgmental. They also felt that the permissiveness condition demands strict professional control by the counselor.

Jones' study revealed diverse reactions by people from various occupational groupings in relation to helping relationship responses. Scores from the "Helping Relationship
Inventory" with five subscores--Understanding, Probing, Interpretive, Supportive, and Evaluative--indicated that persons working in the helping professions showed similar helping relationship response tendencies; persons in other occupational areas included in the study tended to be more similar to each other than to those of the helping professions; lawyers turned out to be different from both helping profession groups and the others; and school counselors and counselor candidates were found to be quite similar in their verbal response tendencies. Counselors, nursing instructors, and ministers tended to prefer Understanding and Probing responses, and to reject Supportive and Evaluative responses. The other groups tended to prefer Evaluative and Probing statements and to reject Understanding responses. Lawyers turned out either the highest or the lowest median on each subscale and they showed preference for Probing and Evaluative responses over Supportive, Interpretive and Understanding responses.

Reiter's dissertation which was based on responses of students toward a Therapist Behavior Scale focusing on therapist activity versus client activity as well as the MMPI, showed that females manifested a preference for the less directive therapist. Younger females (mean age 17 years) strongly preferred nondirective approaches; the opposite was true for males. With increasing age, this
disparity was considerably lessened. High self-ideal discrepancy males were found to prefer the noncontrolling therapist significantly more than did low self-ideal discrepancy males; for females, the opposite held true. A noncontrolling therapist was preferred by females with high ego strength; for the lows, it was the antithesis. Males showed no difference in this respect. Females with high social desirability preferred nondirectionality, while a curvilinear relationship was found for males. In general, females' preferences regarding the therapist's degree of directiveness were related to overall amount of adjustment, while for males, the relationship was to defensiveness.

The dissertation by Holden based upon information collected by interviews shows that within and between the four groups of counselors, principals, superintendents, and school board members there were significant differences with respect to their perceptions of ideal pupil-personnel strategies as related to directive and nondirective responses. Another finding was that there were no significant differences between actual and ideal pupil-personnel strategies within the following three groups: school superintendents, secondary school principals, and secondary school counselors. When asked to describe how they would counsel under ideal conditions, all groups were more directive than nondirective. Actual pupil-personnel strategies utilized by counselors,
principals, and superintendents had all been more directive than nondirective. In both ideal and actual subdivisions, counselors turned out to be significantly more nondirective than the other groups.

Brown's study, which was relative to four cognitive groups of adolescents, and their responses to counselor rating and ranking forms that consisted of five counseling approaches: Advice-giving, Reflection of feeling, Questioning, Information-giving, and Supporting, revealed that all of the groups tended to prefer the Advice-giving approach, and to reject the Reflection of feeling method. All males rejected the Questioning method, and all females except the "high demand-low success" group rejected the Information-giving method. Younger subjects manifested a tendency to rate both the Advice-giving approach and the Supporting method higher than older subjects did.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The goal of this study was to make inferences about certain designated categories of students within the population which was sampled. In line with this general end the subjects involved, the instrument utilized, the scoring and coding of the responses made to the instrument, and the way in which the data was collected must be described. These are the factors covered in this chapter.

I. DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS

The population sampling was intended to be representative of those students attending education classes (administration and supervision, and counseling and guidance) and psychology classes during the time of the study. No students outside of this population were included within the sampling and the categories of students used were taken from this group. Since there were students attending these classes who were not education or psychology majors, the scope of this study covers individuals majoring in other areas as well; the intent was to draw a cross section of all of those attending the classes, and not just those majoring in the areas designated.
The courses from which the sample was drawn were both undergraduate upper division courses (100 series) and graduate courses (200 series). Respondents were not solicited in lower division classes.

The sampling consisted of 237 students who were drawn from ten education courses and eight psychology courses. Classes selected were both required and elective for students majoring in each of the three areas of counseling and guidance, supervision and administration and psychology as well as for others.

Respondents involved in doing independent work in education and psychology, such as writing a thesis, were found elsewhere on campus. These students were requested to return the student opinion scales either to the author or to the School of Education office.

Of the students drawn, eighty were education majors specializing in counseling and guidance; twenty-six were education majors specializing in supervision and administration, and twenty-eight were psychology majors. The remainder of the students, 103, were working toward other objectives. The education majors in the two areas of specialization mentioned were graduate students, although not all students enrolled in these classes were of either area of concentration.

Within the total sample were graduate and undergraduate students, as well as an almost equal number of males
and females. The ages ranged from nineteen to sixty-four, and there were respondents included who were considered experienced in counseling and/or psychologically oriented work, as well as those who were not. In the "experienced" category were such persons as counselors, teacher-counselors, psychologists, psychometrists, social workers, occupational therapists, deans, and resident dormitory advisors. This category was limited to those who had been functioning in any of these positions for one or more years.

The sample also included a category of former education undergraduate majors, who were, at the time of the study, graduate education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration. Teaching credential aspirants in both levels of elementary and secondary education were subdivided into special education credential candidates, standard education credential candidates, those students working toward a degree, and those not working toward a degree.

II. DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUMENT

The general consideration involved in the construction of the student opinion scale or opinionnaire was that it must include a conceptual frame of reference applicable to people

1A copy of the student opinion scale is presented in Appendix A.
concerned with both counseling and therapy insofar as their present and future occupations were concerned as well as those not so concerned, but who may interpret the attitudinal scale from either of the two points of view. Based on this premise, it was assumed that there were certain basic psychologically oriented principles toward which both categories of students would have attitudes. The opinionnaire was concerned with their subjective opinions in relation to a particular frame of reference regarding the counselor-client relationship. The frame of reference is that of Carl R. Rogers. His approach is one which should be considered by all of those entering the psychological services and by those who will be assisting the client in various problem areas, such as adjustment, conflict, and so on.

The student opinion scale consisted of two parts. The first part was an attitudinal scale devised for the purpose of measuring student opinion regarding client-centered therapy. The second part was a data sheet which was used to classify the students.

The opinionnaire consisted of thirty-two statements. Fifteen of the statements represented attitudes which would be acceptable to a Rogerian client-centered therapist, and seventeen were the opposite.

The statements were drawn from a much larger pool of
statements. The original pool of statements were drawn from sources which had been written by three individuals. The first individual was Carl R. Rogers. All statements which represented an attitude favorable to his point of view came from his writings, as well as some of those representing an attitude disfavorable to his point of view. Those not favorable to his point of view were derived by turning some of his own statements around, giving them a meaning opposite to the one they previously expressed.

The second source of the statements used was the writings of Edmund Griffith Williamson. Williamson represents a point of view which is divergent from Rogers'.

Since Williamson's approach is considered quite different from Rogers', some points were drawn from his writings and used as statements which would not be favorable to the client-centered frame of reference. Since not all feelings expressed by Williamson are opposed to Rogers' main goals, each statement was carefully analyzed before it was included.

The third source used came from some of the writings of William Glasser. Glasser mentions his break with
traditional therapeutic and counseling orientations, and considers nondirective therapy as one of the types with which he is at odds. As with Williamson, those statements coming from the works of Glasser were carefully analyzed before being included as representing points of view divergent from Rogers.

All of the statements were carefully paraphrased and modified to fit the framework of the opinionnaire without changing their meaning.

A number of the statements positive to the client-centered point of view undoubtedly overlap with and are held true by other theorists, but such statements were included because they were felt to be a part of the theory involved in client-centered therapy. Nondirective therapy was not intended to be compared with other approaches; rather it was intended to compare different categories of people with respect to their relative acceptance of Rogers' theory. As such, the different aspects of his theory were felt to rate inclusion despite overlap with other theories. The word "never" was included in two of the statements on the attitude scale; this was felt to express more adequately the points of view which the statements were representing. Such an extreme word would cause an emotional reaction on the part

---

of the respondent; however, both statements represent opposing points of view, and therefore have a balancing effect on one another.

The statements were each rated on a scale ranging from complete acceptance to complete unacceptance. Since each statement represented a manner in which a counselor or therapist may act, or an attitude which he may hold when interacting with the client, each statement was to be read as following the introductory phrase--"the counselor or therapist should."

A nearly equal number of client-centered and nonclient-centered statements were made in order to keep the respondents vasiculating from the left side of the scale to the right side, so as to reduce the various types of errors involved when respondents mark predominantly on one side or the other.

III. SCORING AND CODING PROCEDURE

There were a total of thirty-two statements which were rated by each respondent. Fifteen of these statements represented attitudes favorable to client-centered therapy. A five-point rating scale was used, and was graded as follows: (a) completely acceptable (+2), (b) moderately acceptable (+1), (c) no opinion or insufficient evidence (0), (d) moderately unacceptable (-1), and (e) completely unacceptable (-2). Items one, three, six, eight, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, twenty, twenty-one, twenty-three, twenty-four, twenty-seven, twenty-eight, thirty, and thirty-two were scored in this manner. For those seventeen negative statements which were
defined as representing attitudes opposed to a client-centered frame of reference, the scale was reversed in the following manner: (a) completely acceptable (-2), (b) moderately acceptable (-1), (c) no opinion or insufficient evidence (0), (d) moderately unacceptable (+1), and (e) completely unacceptable (+2). Items two, four, five, seven, nine, ten, eleven, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty-two, twenty-five, twenty-six, twenty-nine, and thirty-one were marked in this way.

When the data had been collected, a mean score was arrived at for each respondent; this score was placed on the attached data sheet and coded with other pertinent data for key punching. Since there were some minus scores, a constant of +1 was added to every score before being key punched. ¹⁴

IV. DATA COLLECTION

The collection of the information to be used in the study was made by administering the student opinion scale to education and psychology classes.

The opinionnaire was distributed at the beginning of each period; a brief explanation was given in regard to the purpose of the study, and a need for the students' responses, since they were the source of the data.

The students were asked not to spend more than twenty

¹⁴See Appendix C for a complete list of the coded information and data for each respondent. A decoding sheet for this information is presented in Appendix B.
minutes on the scale so that they would not use up too much of their class time. It generally took from ten to fifteen minutes to complete the needed responses.

In order to make the sampling as representative as possible of the population, the opinionnaire was also distributed to students elsewhere on campus who were not enrolled in the classes involved, but who were registered for various other course work and research units. They too were requested not to spend more than twenty minutes in filling out the answers. On this basis, students majoring in the areas of education (counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration) and psychology were drawn from various aspects of their programs.

Furthermore, all the respondents were asked not to sign their names, and to "answer the scale as they feel it ought to be answered under ideal conditions with no restrictions, such as time, or number of clients involved."

V. STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

Hypotheses 1 through 9 were measured by means of two one-way analysis of variance tests in order to determine if there were any significant differences in attitudes between the groups involved. Since the results were found to be significant, a studentized range statistic was used for the purpose of determining where the differences were.

The tenth through the fourteenth hypotheses were
measured by the instrumentality of multiple t tests.

Two two-way analysis of variance tests were used in order to measure the final three hypotheses.

A minimal level of significance of .05 was set as the point for determining whether the hypotheses were to be accepted or rejected.

A number of tables appear in chapter four, and reveal in summary form the results of the various statistical procedures utilized.

All of the hypotheses stated in the analysis of the problem section of chapter one appear in chapter four for the convenience of the reader.

VI. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The subjects involved in this study were intended to be representative of those students attending education classes (counseling and guidance, and administration and supervision) and psychology classes, during the time the study was being conducted.

The students in the sample, which included 237 in toto, were categorized on the basis of different variables; the contrasting groups were then compared statistically in order to determine their probability levels. On the basis of this, inferences can be made about the population.

In order to collect the needed information, a student opinion scale was constructed and utilized. This instrument
consisted of two parts. The first part encompassed thirty-two attitudinal statements intended to conceptualize the client-centered frame of reference. The statements were both positive and negative to the orientation being measured. The second part of the instrument was a data sheet used for the purpose of dividing the students into the different groups for comparative analysis.

A mean value was obtained for each student opinion scale in the scoring process. This score was placed on the data sheet, and this value, along with other pertinent information, was coded onto a coding sheet for key punching.

The data was collected by administering the instrument to students attending education classes (counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration) and psychology classes. It was also given to students who were not enrolled in such classes, but who were involved in various independent types of study, such as those writing theses.

The first nine hypotheses were measured by means of two one-way analysis of variance tests and studentized range statistics. The tenth through the fourteenth hypotheses were run on the basis of multiple t tests, and the final three hypotheses were tested by means of two two-way analysis of variance tests.

The probability level determining acceptance or rejection of all the hypotheses was set at the .05 level of confidence.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first section embodies the hypotheses which were tested with the view to answering the questions posed in the analysis section contained within the first chapter. The second subdivision presents the statistical analysis of the data and the results derived from each test. Tables are included for the purpose of showing the data in summary form.

I. HYPOTHESES TESTED

The hypotheses which were tested in relation to the statement of the problem section of the first chapter follow. With respect to their relative acceptance of client-centered therapy, there is no significant difference between:

1. Education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and those emphasizing supervision and administration;

2. Education majors specializing in counseling and guidance and psychology majors;

3. Education majors specializing in administration and supervision, and psychology majors;

4. Students falling in the age category under 30, and those in the age group 31-40;
5. Students falling in the age category under 30, and those in the age range 41-50;

6. Students comprising the under 30 subdivision, and those in the age division 51 and above;

7. Students in the age range 31-40, and those in the age category 41-50;

8. Students making up the age group 31-40, and those in the age class 51 and above;

9. Students in the age subdivision 41-50, and those in the age range 51 and above;

10. Males and females;

11. Graduate psychology majors and undergraduate psychology majors;

12. Those students who have had one or more years of working experience in areas related to counseling and/or therapy and who also were at the time of the study, so employed, as compared with those who were not of such status;

13. Former undergraduate education majors who were at the time of the study current graduate education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and those who, at the time of the study were specializing in supervision and administration;

14. Education majors emphasizing counseling and guidance and psychology majors, as opposed to all others;

15. Males and females majoring in education and
specializing in counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration as well as psychology;

16. All teaching credential candidates working on a degree, and those not working on a degree;

17. Standard teaching credential candidates, and special education teaching credential candidates.

A level of significance of .05 was chosen as the probability level for determining whether or not to accept or reject the above stated hypotheses in relation to the statistical methods utilized.

II. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND RESULTS

In order to determine whether or not there were any significant differences between the three categories of students included within the first three hypotheses, a one-way analysis of variance as described by Winer was utilized.\(^1\) This method was also applied to the four groups involved in Hypotheses 4 through 9.

The results of the two one-way analysis of variance tests are summarized in Tables I and II, on pages fifty and fifty-one. Inspection of Part (a) of Table I reveals an F value of 6.5392, which is significant beyond the established

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTS IN RELATION TO MAJOR AND AGE CATEGORIES OF STUDENTS AND THEIR RELATIVE ACCEPTANCE OF CLIENT-CENTERED THERAPY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.9679</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9839</td>
<td>6.5392</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Major groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>19.7122</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.1504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.6802</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.8532</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6177</td>
<td>4.0138</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>35.3980</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>.1539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.2512</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S = Significant at .05 level of confidence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major and Age Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Guidance</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.4130</td>
<td>1.7166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Supervision</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.2683</td>
<td>1.5335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.3867</td>
<td>1.4285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.3519</td>
<td>1.4567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.4233</td>
<td>1.6024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.4189</td>
<td>1.6492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.3494</td>
<td>1.6894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level of .05. Part (b) of the same table discloses an F statistic of 4.0138; this statistic is also significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

The one-way analysis of variance tests indicated that significant differences existed between the two sets of categories, major groups and age groups. Since such differences existed, another method was chosen to locate these discrepancies more specifically so that the questions relating to the hypotheses could be answered. The "studentized range" statistic set forth by Winer was chosen for this purpose. The results for Hypotheses 1 through 9 as measured by this technique, are presented in Table III on page fifty-three.

The first hypothesis is in relation to the disparity between education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and those emphasizing supervision and administration. The entry for Hypothesis 1 in Table III shows a q.99 calculation of 166.45. This statistic is significant beyond the .05 level. Therefore, the first null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between education majors specializing in counseling and guidance and those specializing in supervision and administration. As revealed in Table II,
### TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studentized Range Statistics of Major and Age Categories of Students in Relation to Relative Acceptance of Client-Centered Therapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(a)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(b)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p* = Significant at .05 level of confidence.
Part (a), the students emphasizing counseling and guidance showed a higher degree of acceptance of the client-centered orientation (mean=1.7166), than did those in supervision and administration (mean=1.5335).

The second hypothesis tested is relative to the divergence between education majors emphasizing counseling and guidance and psychology majors. The information given in Table III for Hypothesis 2 reveals a $q_{.99}$ figure of 261.91, which was found to be significant beyond the .05 level. On the basis of this, the second null hypothesis was rejected. The alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and psychology majors was accepted. Through examination of Table II, Part (a), it can be seen that the counseling and guidance group had a higher mean score in favor of the client-centered approach (mean=1.7166) than did the psychology group (mean=1.4285).

The third hypothesis tested was associated with the differential between education majors emphasizing supervision and administration, and psychology majors. This also yielded a difference significant beyond the established level of confidence. In Table III, the data corresponding to Hypothesis 3 shows a $q_{.99}$ value of 95.45. The third null hypothesis was rejected accordingly, and the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between
education majors specializing in supervision and administration, and psychology majors was adopted. Table II, Section (a) shows that the higher positive score was made by the administration and supervision group (mean=1.5335), over the psychology group (mean=1.4285).

The fourth hypothesis concerned the contrast between the age categories of students under 30, and that of students 31-40. The information for Hypothesis 4 in Table III shows a q.99 number of 208.14. This is significant beyond the .05 level, leading to a rejection of the fourth null hypothesis, and an acceptance of the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between the age categories containing students under 30, and the one made up of students 31-40. Section (b) of Table II reveals the higher positive score was made by the group 31-40 (mean=1.6024), over the under 30 group (mean=1.4567).

The fifth hypothesis is germane to the difference between the category of ages under 30, and the age range from 41-50. The facts presented for Hypothesis 5 in Table III demonstrate a q.99 figure of 275.00; this is significant beyond the .05 level. Therefore, the fifth null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between the age subdivision of under 30, and that of 41-50 was accepted. As set forth in Part (b) of Table II, the students falling within the age
class 41-50 made a higher positive score towards the client-centered approach (mean=1.6492), than did those making up the age category under 30 (mean=1.4567).

The sixth hypothesis pertained to the differential between the age cluster of students under 30, and the one of students 51 and above. The figures reported in Table III for Hypothesis 6 reveal a q.99 statistic of 332.43. This statistic is significant beyond the established level which brought about a rejection of the sixth hypothesis. The alternative hypothesis was accepted. This states that there is a significant difference between the age class of students under 30, and that of students 51 and above. An examination of Section (b) of Table II shows that the higher positive score towards the client-centered approach was achieved by those students falling inside the age class of 51 and above (mean=1.6894), than the ones comprising the age group under 30 (mean=1.4567).

The students in the age range of 31-40 as compared with the students falling within the 41-50 class is the focal point of the seventh hypothesis. The details shown for Hypothesis 7 in Table III expose a q.99 value of 66.86 that is significant beyond the established level. The result was a rejection of the null hypothesis and an acceptance of the alternative hypothesis which states that there is a significant difference between the students falling
within the two age ranges of 31-40, and 41-50. The group in the age range 41-50 achieved the score denoting more of a client-centered predisposition (mean=1.6492) as opposed to the students making up the age category 31-40 (mean=1.6024).

The eighth hypothesis was concerned with the contrast between those students comprising the age subdivision 31-40, and those who are in the age class of 51 and above. The entry for Hypothesis 8 as set forth in Table III shows a q.99 score of 124.31. This quantity is significant beyond the .05 level, and resulted in a rejection of the null hypothesis and an acceptance of the alternative hypothesis stating that there is a significant difference between the students making up the age group of 31-40, and those in the age class of 51 and above. Those students comprising the age division of 51 and above made the higher positive score (mean=1.6894) than did those making up the 31-40 age group (mean=1.6024).

The final hypothesis relevant to age groupings concerned the divergence between the students falling within the age range of 41-50, and those in the age class of 51 and above. The data given for Hypothesis 9 in Table III reveals a q.99 number of 57.43 which is significant beyond the .05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between the students making up the age range 41-50, and those
involved in the age group 51 and above, was accepted. The students comprising the age category of 51 and above achieved the score more favorable to the client-centered orientation (mean=1.6894), than the students falling within the age class of 41-50 (mean=1.6492).

Multiple t tests as set forth by Winer were utilized for the purpose of ascertaining the answers to questions ten through fourteen. The results of each of these tests are presented in Table IV on page fifty-nine.

The differential between males and females was the subject of the tenth hypothesis. A perception of Table IV, Part (a) reveals a t score of -2.8365. This is significant beyond the .05 level. Accordingly, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between males and females was accepted. The direction of the difference was more positive for the females (mean=1.62), than for the males (mean=1.48).

The eleventh hypothesis referred to graduate psychology majors, as compared with undergraduate psychology majors.

As shown in Table IV, Section (b), the t value is .6358 which is not significant at the minimal level of .05. In accordance with this, the null hypothesis was accepted.

\[3\] Ibid., pp. 14-32.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-2.8365</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(b)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychology majors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychology majors</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.6358</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(c)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in field</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently in field</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.4965</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(d)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former undergraduate education majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Guidance (current graduate major)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and administration (current graduate major)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.9313</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(e)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and counseling and guidance majors</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other majors</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.1294</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Significant at .05 level of confidence.
NS = Not significant at .05 level of confidence.
The twelfth hypothesis was concerned with those students who have had one or more years of working experience in areas related to counseling and/or therapy and who also were, at the time of the study, so employed, as compared with those who were not of such status. A focus upon Table IV, Part (c) brings out a t value of 4.4965 which is significant beyond the established level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. The latter states that there is a significant difference between those students who have had one or more years of working experience in areas related to counseling and/or therapy and who also were, at the time of the study, so employed, as compared with those who were not of such status. As set forth in Table IV, the higher positive score was achieved by those classed as having one or more years of experience and currently in the field (mean=1.87) as opposed to those not so categorized (mean=1.51).

The focus of the thirteenth hypothesis was on the disparity between former undergraduate education majors who were, at the time of the study, graduate education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and the ones who, current with the study, were specializing in supervision and administration. A scan of Table IV, Section (d) brings out a t number of .9313 which is not significant at the .05 level of probability. Thus, the null hypothesis was retained. The
fourteenth hypothesis was in conjunction with education majors emphasizing counseling and guidance, and psychology majors, as compared with all others who responded to the opinionnaire. Part (e) of Table IV sets forth a t value of 3.1294 which is significant beyond the established level. The null hypothesis was then rejected, and the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant difference between education majors specializing in counseling and guidance and psychology majors, as opposed to all others, was accepted. The counseling and psychology group attained a score more favorable to the client-centered orientation (mean=1.64), than did all other groups (mean=1.47).

Two two-way analysis of variance tests were computed on the data linked with the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth hypotheses. The procedure used was that described by Winer for utilizing the "least squares solution for unequal, unproportional N's."4

Table V, page sixty-two, presents the summary of the analysis pertaining to the fifteenth hypothesis and a replication of the data in Table I. The numbers and means corresponding to the data in Table V are in Table VI, page sixty-three. Table VII, page sixty-four, covers the analysis for the sixteenth and seventeenth hypotheses, and the

### TABLE V
SUMMARY OF TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE—SEX BY EDUCATION MAJORS (COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE, AND SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION), AND PSYCHOLOGY MAJORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males and females within major groups</td>
<td>.4621</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4621</td>
<td>3.0907</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major groups</td>
<td>1.7631</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8815</td>
<td>5.8955</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ab)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.0348</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0174</td>
<td>.1164</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>18.9910</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.1495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.2511</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S = Significant at .05 level of confidence.
NS - Not significant at .05 level of confidence.*
TABLE VI

SUMMARY DATA FOR THE NUMBERS AND MEANS FOR SEX BY EDUCATION MAJORS (COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE, AND SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION), AND PSYCHOLOGY MAJORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Males</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Education majors (counseling and guidance)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education majors (supervision and administration)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology majors</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Males education majors (counseling and guidance)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females education majors (counseling and guidance)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Males education majors (supervision and administration)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females education majors (supervision and administration)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Males psychology majors</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Females psychology majors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- NON-DEGREE AND DEGREE ASPIRANTS BY STANDARD AND SPECIAL EDUCATION CREDENTIAL PROSPECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p*a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Credential Aspirants seeking advanced degree and those not seeking advanced degree</td>
<td>.6079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6079</td>
<td>4.4595</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Standard teaching credential aspirants compared with those specializing in special education</td>
<td>.1359</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1359</td>
<td>.9970</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ab) Interaction</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7.2250</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.1363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.9689</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Significant at .05 level of confidence.
NS = Not significant at .05 level of confidence.
corresponding sample sizes and mean values are reported in Table VIII, page sixty-six.

The fifteenth hypothesis was linked with the discrepancy between males and females who were majoring in education, emphasizing counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration, as well as psychology majors. Table V, Part (a) exposes an F statistic of 3.0907 which is not significant at the .05 level. In accordance with this, the null hypothesis was accepted.

A scrutiny of Table V, Part (b) reveals an $F$ value of 5.8955 which is significant beyond the .05 level. This tends to confirm and replicate the information presented for the three groups of education majors specializing in counseling and guidance, supervision and administration, and psychology majors, as set forth in Table I.

Further examination of Table V brings out an interaction between (a) and (b) which is not significant at the established level. As shown, the F value is .1164.

The sixteenth hypothesis was allied with the contrast between all teaching credential candidates working on a degree, as opposed to those not working on a degree. As brought forth in Table VII, Part (a), this comparison yielded an F statistic of 4.4595 which is significant beyond the established level of confidence. In line with this, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis,
TABLE VIII
SUMMARY DATA FOR THE NUMBERS AND MEANS FOR STANDARD TEACHING CREDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND SPECIAL EDUCATION CREDENTIAL CANDIDATES BY THOSE NOT SEEKING A DEGREE, AND THOSE SEEKING A DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Credential aspirants not seeking an advanced degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Credential aspirants seeking an advanced degree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Standard education credential aspirants</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Special education credential aspirants</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Standard education credential aspirants not working towards an advanced degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Standard education credential aspirants working towards an advanced degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Special education credential aspirants not working towards an advanced degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Special education credential aspirants working towards an advanced degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which states there is a significant difference between all teaching credential candidates working on a degree and those not working on a degree, was accepted. Parts (f) and (h) of Table VIII both show higher positive scores for standard education credential candidates and special education credential candidates who are also working towards degrees (means = 1.45 and 1.55), as compared with those not working towards degrees shown in parts (e) and (g) of the same table (means = 1.24 and 1.35).

The seventeenth and final hypothesis was connected with the divergence between standard teaching credential candidates and special education teaching credential candidates. A look at Table VII, Part (b) brings out an F number of .9970 which is not significant at the .05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

The interaction for the variables connected with the sixteenth and seventeenth hypotheses as set forth in Section (ab) in Table VII is not significant. The F value shown in this respect is .0005.

III. SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Four different types of statistical tests were utilized for measuring the hypotheses in this study. One-way analysis of variance tests, and studentized range statistics were the procedures used for the first through the
ninth hypotheses. The tenth through the fourteenth hypotheses were measured by means of multiple t tests. Two-way analysis of variance tests were used in order to test the fifteenth through the seventeenth hypotheses.

The level of significance for all the hypotheses tested was set at .05.

The two one-way analysis of variance tests for the seven categories included within the first nine hypotheses both showed significant differences. The studentized range was then applied in order to test the combinations of comparisons involved in each of these hypotheses. All were found to be significant. The higher positive mean scores toward the nondirective point of view were made by: education majors emphasizing counseling and guidance over those specializing in supervision and administration; education majors specializing in counseling and guidance over psychology majors; education majors emphasizing administration and supervision over psychology majors; students comprising the age range of 31-40 over those in the age category of under 30; students in the age group 41-50 over those in the age division of under 30; students in the age group of 51 and above over those in the age category of under 30; students making up the age range of 41-50 over those in the age class of 31-40; those students who are 51 and above over the ones
31-40; and the students who were 51 and above over the ones in the age category of 41-50.

The tenth through the fourteenth hypotheses were run by means of t tests. The t test on the disparity between males and females found a significant difference, with the higher mean score attained by the females. Between graduate and undergraduate psychology majors no significant difference was found. A significant difference was found between those with working experience in counseling and/or psychologically oriented work for a year or more and also in such work at the time of the study, and those not of such status. The higher positive mean score was obtained by the group currently in the field. The difference between the two graduate major groups in counseling and guidance and supervision and administration, both of which were undergraduate education majors, was found not to be significant. The differential between the category including both psychology majors and education majors specializing in counseling and guidance and all others, was significant; the higher positive score towards the client-centered orientation was achieved by the former.

The last three hypotheses were tested by means of two two-way analysis of variance tests. For the fifteenth hypothesis there was found to be no significant difference between males and females who were either education majors
specializing in counseling and guidance, or those emphasizing supervision and administration, or psychology majors. The analysis did find a significant difference between these three major groups, when both males and females were included, which tended to back up the results shown in Table I. The F statistic for the interaction between the two combinations tested did not reach the significance level.

The sixteenth hypothesis concerning the divergence between credential aspirants seeking an advanced degree and those not seeking such a degree was found to be significant. Those working towards the degree maintained the higher positive score. The contrast between standard teaching credential aspirants and those specializing in special education was found not to be significant. The interaction value for the combination involved in this analysis did not achieve a significance level.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

I. SUMMARY

This study was conducted for the purpose of ascertaining the relative acceptance of the client-centered orientation between various categories of students attending education and psychology classes at Fresno State College during the summer session, 1968.

In order to accomplish this goal, seventeen hypotheses were formulated, and tested by statistical procedures. The results were analyzed and reported.

Literature on Rogers' theory. Literature was reviewed in order to give a view of client-centered therapy as seen by Rogers, and also for the purpose of presenting synopses of any studies which statistically measured the preference of the nondirective approach or its various parts by different groupings of people.

Rogers' client-centered therapy is based upon a conceptual framework which places faith in the individual to be able to handle the sundry problems which occur in his life. Each person is involved in an orderly process; this course takes a forward path towards self-actualization,
and realization of the person's potentialities.

The individual must be involved in a warm and accepting relationship which is "helping" in nature if he is to be able to realize his powers. Inside this relationship the counselor must be accepting of himself and of the counselee. Within the context of a nonjudgmental atmosphere, the counselor must experience a deep empathic feeling for the counselee's expressed attitudes, and must reflect these feelings back to the client. In this way the therapist takes on the role of an "alter ego" who has removed his own personality and who is now merely attempting to completely understand the client's expressed feelings. The counselor's attitudes are considered more important than his techniques.

The client is to perceive the therapeutic process as moving through the following steps: he discovers he is responsible for himself in the relationship; he experiences as exploration of his attitudes, he notes inconsistencies; he re-examines them; he alters himself; and he progresses to the consummation of therapy. Therapy ends with the client more able to cope with himself and his situation, for he has experienced "significant learning."

Literature on relevant research findings. The studies which were reviewed showed perceptions and attitudes of various groupings of people towards nondirective counseling and/or its various aspects.
The results of Lipkin's study indicated that at the end of counseling each client involved was experiencing satisfying results from being given the major responsibility for his own treatment. Furthermore, of the thirty-seven subjects, twelve mentioned that they were pleased by finding out that they could think their own problems through and plan their own courses of action. Three of the subjects indicated a preference for more concrete advice. The remaining twenty-two did not mention this point.

Phillip's and Agnew's study concerning responses of clinically trained and untrained people to hypothetical counseling situations was related to Rogers' Reflection technique. Untrained people were found to respond to hypothetical counseling situations primarily in terms of Non-reflective choices. Furthermore, responses to hypothetical counseling situations by untrained people were basically made in the same manner, whether they simulated the counselor's or the counselee's role. The last finding was that responses Reflective in nature were chosen by trained clinicians at a significantly greater than chance level.

Grady's thesis, which was related to perceptions of client-centered counseling by the Catholic Church, brought out the fact that Catholic writers question the nondirective approach as related to moral issues. These writers indicated that the counselor becomes judgmental in the use of the
Rogerian approach. They felt that when moral problems are involved, the counselor cannot avoid being judgmental. They also felt that the permissiveness situation demands strict professional control by the counselor.

Jones' study brought out diverse reactions by people from various occupational groupings in relation to helping relationship responses. Scores from the "Helping Relationship Inventory" with five subscores—Understanding, Probing, Interpretive, Supportive, and Evaluative—were utilized. Persons employed in the helping professions showed similar helping relationship response tendencies; individuals in other occupations tended to be more similar to each other than to those of the helping professions. Lawyers were different from all others. School counselors and counselor candidates turned out to be quite similar. A preference for Understanding and Probing responses was shown by counselors. The other groups tended to prefer Evaluative and Probing statements.

Reiter's dissertation which was based on responses of students toward a Therapist Behavior Scale focusing on therapist activity versus client activity as well as the MMPI, showed a preference by females for the nondirective therapist. This was particularly true for the younger ones of seventeen years; the converse was true for males. As age went up, this differential decreased. High self-ideal discrepancy males
preferred the noncontrolling therapist significantly more than did low self-ideal discrepancy males; the opposite was true for females. A noncontrolling therapist was preferred by females with high ego strength; for the lows it was the opposite. Males did not differ in this respect. Non-defensive males preferred a noncontrolling therapist, while the opposite held true for the defensive ones; females did not differ in this respect. Females with high social desirability preferred nondirectionality; a curvilinear relationship was found for males. In general, the females' preferences concerning the therapist's degree of directiveness were related to overall amount of adjustment while for males, the relationship was to defensiveness.

Holden's dissertation which was written on the bases of data collected from interviews, reveals significant differences within and between the four groups of counselors, principals, superintendents, and school board members with respect to their perceptions of ideal pupil-personnel strategies as related to directive and nondirective responses. It was also found that there were no significant differences between actual and ideal pupil-personnel strategies within the following three groups: school superintendents, secondary school counselors, and secondary school principals. Assuming ideal conditions, all said they would be more directive than nondirective in counseling. Actual strategies used by
counselors, principals, and superintendents tended to be more directive than nondirective. Concerning both the ideal and the actual, counselors were significantly more nondirective than the other groups.

Brown's study in conjunction with the four adolescent, cognitive groups and their responses to counselor rating and ranking forms which consisted of five counseling approaches: Advice-giving, Reflection of feeling, Questioning, Information giving, and Supporting, revealed that all of these groups preferred the Advice-giving approach, and rejected the Reflection of feeling method. All males rejected the Questioning technique, and all females except the "high demand-low success" group rejected the Information giving method. Younger subjects tended to rate both the Advice-giving approach and the Supporting method higher than older subjects did.

Description of subjects. The subjects involved in this study were intended to be representative of those students attending education classes (counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration) and psychology classes, during the time the study was being carried out.

The total number of students in the sample, which included 237 in all, was classified on the basis of different variables; the contrasting groups were then compared statistically in order to gather their probability
levels. On this basis, inferences can be made about the population.

**Description of instrument.** A student opinion scale was constructed and utilized for the purpose of collecting the needed information. This instrument consisted of two parts. The first section was made up of thirty-two attitudinal statements intended to conceptualize attitudes favorable to the client-centered point of view, as well as those not favorable to Rogers' theory. The statements were therefore both positive and negative to the orientation being measured. The second part of the instrument was a data sheet used to divide the students into the divergent groups for comparative analysis.

**Scoring and coding procedure.** A mean value was obtained for each student opinion scale in the scoring process. This score was placed on the data sheet, and this value along with other pertinent information was coded onto a coding sheet for key punching.

**Data collection.** The data was gathered by administering the instrument to students attending education classes (counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration) and psychology classes. It was also given to students who were not enrolled in such classes but who were involved in
various types of independent study, such as those writing theses.

Statistical procedures, analysis of data, and results. The hypotheses of this study were measured by means of four different statistical tests. One-way analysis of variance tests as well as studentized range statistics functioned as measures of the first nine hypotheses. The tenth through the fourteenth hypotheses were run on the basis of multiple t tests, and the final three hypotheses were tested by means of two-way analysis of variance tests.

The probability level determining whether any of the hypotheses were accepted or rejected was set at the .05 level of significance.

Significant differences beyond the established level resulted from both of the one-way analysis of variance tests for the seven categories included within the first nine hypotheses. The studentized range was then applied in order to test the combinations of comparisons involved in each of these hypotheses. All were found to be significant. The higher positive mean scores toward the client-centered frame of reference were made by: (1) education majors emphasizing counseling and guidance over those specializing in supervision and administration; (2) education majors specializing in counseling and guidance over psychology majors; (3) education
majors emphasizing supervision and administration over psychology majors; (4) students comprising the age range of 31-40 over those in the age category of under 30; (5) students in the age group of 41-50 over those in the age category of under 30; students in the age category 51 and above over those who were under 30; students in the age range of 41-50 over those comprising the age group of 31-40; those students who were 51 and above over the ones who were 31-40; and those 51 and above over the ones in the age category of 41-50.

The tenth through the fourteenth hypotheses were measured by means of t tests. The t test on the divergence between males and females located a significant difference, with the higher mean score obtained by the females. No significant difference was found between graduate and undergraduate psychology majors. A significant difference was found between those with working experience in counseling and/or psychologically oriented work for a year or more and also in such work at the time of the study, and those not of such status. The group currently in the field obtained the highest positive mean score. The difference between the two graduate major subdivisions in counseling and guidance and supervision and administration, both of which were undergraduate education majors, was not found to be significant. The differential between the group including both education
majors specializing in counseling and guidance, and psychology majors, as compared with all others, was significant; the higher positive score towards the nondirective frame of reference was achieved by the counseling and psychology category.

Two-way analysis of variance tests were utilized in order to measure the last three hypotheses. In relation to the fifteenth hypothesis, no significant difference was found between males and females who were education majors emphasizing counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration, and psychology majors. Furthermore, analysis yielded a significant difference among these three major groups when no discrimination between males and females was made, tending to confirm the results reported in Table I, Part (a).

The sixteenth hypothesis related to the disparity between credential aspirants seeking an advanced degree and those not working on such a degree was found to be significant. The higher positive score was made by those seeking the degree. The contrast between standard teaching credential aspirants, and those emphasizing special education was found not to be significant. The interaction value for the combination involved in this analysis did not achieve a significant level.
II. RELEVANT FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Education majors (counseling and guidance, and supervision and administration) came out more acceptant of the client-centered frame of reference than did psychology majors. Of the two categories of education majors, the counseling and guidance group had the higher amount of relative acceptance.

Relative acceptance of the client-centered orientation tended to rise with age. The older the group, the more Rogerian it became. Those in the 51 and above age bracket scored highest toward the nondirective approach; the students comprising the 41-50 group came next; the 31-40 group were third highest; and the under 30 category were the lowest.

In general, females came out more acceptant of Rogers' approach than did males. The difference between psychology graduate students and psychology undergraduate students was not above the chance level. The experienced group, consisting of counselors, teacher-counselors, psychologists, psychometrists, social workers, occupational therapists, deans, and resident dormitory advisers made responses significantly more in favor of the client-centered point of view than did the others. The disparity between former education majors who were graduate education majors specializing in counseling and guidance and those
specializing in administration and supervision was inconsequential. The psychology majors and education majors (counseling and guidance) together, turned out responses significantly more in favor of the nondirective approach than did all others.

The difference between males and females who were in the counseling and guidance group, the administration and supervision group, and the psychology group did not reach the significant level.

Teaching credential candidates working on a degree yielded responses indicating more relative acceptance of the client-centered point of view than did teaching credential candidates not working on a degree.

The disparity between all standard teaching credential candidates and all those emphasizing special education did not reach a significant probability level.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following are recommendations for further research. Such studies should be related to the client-centered orientation focused upon in this study, and to other methodological theories:

1. Similar studies should be done at other colleges and universities.

2. Studies should be made at Fresno State College and
other schools covering students enrolled in courses not covered in this study. Likely subject matter areas would include social science, social welfare, personnel services, and sociology.

3. Research should be carried out in relation to persons who are not students but who are out in various related occupation areas.

4. Studies should be made to determine what types of counseling and/or therapy are actually used, as compared with what is claimed to be used or favored by people working in counseling and/or psychologically oriented occupations.

5. Finally, research should also be carried out to determine the relative acceptance and perceptions of the various counseling and/or therapeutic theories and procedures by individuals who have received various types of counseling and/or therapy.
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