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The purposes of this study were to determine the accuracy of counselor perception of client attributes after an initial interview, to determine the relationship that exists between counselors' perceptions of a client's attributes and the counselors' possession of the same attributes, to determine the accuracy of counselor self-perception and to determine whether there were significant differences between counselors who are accurate perceivers and counselors who are inaccurate perceivers of client attributes.

Forty-five master's level graduate students enrolled in a counseling practicum served as subjects. They were administered the *Sixteen Personality Factors Inventory*, the *Adjective Check List*, and the *Differential Emotions Scale II*. Following this they were asked to rate their possession of thirty-five attributes measured by the standardized instruments using a twenty-point non-standardized rating scale. For each subject there were Actual scores and Perceived scores.

The subjects were subsequently asked to view a series of four video-taped counseling sessions involving an interviewer
and four different clients in initial counseling sessions. The clients were administered the same instruments that the subjects had completed. Thus, for each client there were Actual scores and Perceived scores. After viewing each video-tape, the subjects were asked to rate the client using the twenty-point rating scale.

It was hypothesized that there would be significant positive correlations between the following sets of data: subjects' ratings of clients and client's Actual scores; subjects' ratings of clients and client's Perceived scores; subjects' ratings of clients and subjects' Actual scores; subjects' ratings of clients and subjects' Perceived scores; and subjects' Actual and Perceived scores.

The results were that subjects tended to be inaccurate in their perceptions of client attributes following an initial interview. Another general finding was that there was no overall tendency for subjects' perceptions of clients to be related to their own Actual or Perceived scores, although there were individual cases in which this was evident, and for a few individual attributes there were significant positive correlations ($P < .05$). Further, the subjects in this study tended to be accurate in their own self-perception.

The data were tested for differences between the Actual scores of "high-accuracy" subjects and the Actual scores of "low-accuracy" subjects. "High-accuracy" and "low-accuracy" groups were defined on the basis of discrepancy scores.
between subjects' ratings of clients and clients' Actual scores. A t-test for significant differences between means yielded a significant difference between the Actual scores of the two groups on only one attribute (p .05).

The findings pointed to the need for more training in the area of person perception in the master's level counseling program. This need is two-fold. First, counselors-in-training need to become more aware of their own personality, needs and emotions and how these might affect what they see in their clients. Second, counselors-in-training need to become more aware of personality attributes, needs, and emotions in their clients.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The counseling process involves the interaction of at least two persons—a counselor and a client. The counselor and the client, as they engage in the process, behave according to their own particular perceptions. This phenomenological point of view was espoused by Snygg and Combs (11) who stated that all behavior, without exception, is completely determined by and pertinent to the phenomenological field of the behaving organism. They further explicated the phenomenal field by saying that this field is the "entire universe, including himself, as it is experienced by the individual at the instant of action" (11, p. 5). Therefore, the behavior of both the counselor and the client in the process of counseling is dependent upon their individual perceptions.

That perception is an important aspect of the counseling process was made clear by Rogers (7). He stated that the counselor's function is to assume, in so far as he is able, the internal frame of reference of the client, to perceive the world as the client sees it, to perceive the client himself as he is seen by himself, to lay aside all perceptions from external frame of reference while doing so and to communicate something of this empathic understanding to the client. He
also elucidated the difficulty in doing this by pointing out,

... the therapist may find thoughts running through his mind which are of an evaluative nature, judging this material from his own frame of reference or of a self-concerned nature, in which attention has shifted from the client to himself (7, p. 45).

The behavior of the counselor and the client can be best understood in the context of their perceptions. The counselor's behavior is guided by his own self-perception as well as by his perception of the client. The client's behavior is a function of his own self-perception and his perception of the counselor. An interesting aspect of this process is the extent to which a counselor can really perceive the uniqueness of the client, after only a brief counseling interview. From time to time a counselor is called upon to make diagnostic-like decisions about the client. With counselors trained to work in educational institutions these decisions may take the form of a recommendation for a treatment program in the classroom or a decision about referral to outside sources for help. Often counselors must do this without the benefit of objective personality measures. Further, a counselor is engaged in a therapeutic process and must make decisions about the type of therapy needed for a particular student or client. Again, frequently the best measure available is a subjective one based on informal interviews and inference. What is known about the way counselors make these decisions? How do they perceive the client and his problems? Is there a projection-like process
not much is known about the accuracy of counselors' perception of the client and his problems. One wonders whether a counselor's perception of the client is in any way related to the counselor's perception of himself. Openness, or the ability to perceive accurately and without self-reference, is thought to be a desirable characteristic for counselors. "Open-mindedness" was studied by Russo, Kelz, and Hudson (9). They used Rokeach's (8) definition of the open-minded individual as being one who could receive stimulus information without internal irrelevant measures, such as unrelated habits, beliefs, power needs, the need for self-aggrandizement or ego motives getting in the way. Russo and others found that open-mindedness was an important counselor quality.

Browne (1) studied the relationship between "diagnostician" attributes and perception of a hospitalized "patient." Using diagnosticians' "Actual" and "Perceived" scores, Browne found that the subjects had a tendency to describe the patient very dissimilarly from their own scores on 25 variables, a phenomenon which he described as a "projection-like" process. The dichotomy between "Actual" and "Perceived" scores for the subjects of Browne's study was important to the results of the study. Browne recommended that future research in the area of clinical projection should continue to attend to the important dichotomy demonstrated in his study between an
individual's actual and perceived possession of personality attributes. Their respective contributions to the person perception process within clinical diagnostic tasks, can certainly vary with judge(s) and the person(s) perceived. The present study took this dichotomy into account and sought to investigate its effects with a different population of subjects and clients.

The task of this particular study was to investigate some of the basic perceptions that are important in counseling. To do this an attempt was made to ascertain whether counselors are able to perceive accurately certain client attributes and, further, whether they are able to perceive accurately these same attributes in themselves. A further attempt was made to understand the relationship that exists between a counselor's understanding of the client and what he understands or perceives about himself. Finally, counselors who are accurate perceivers may differ from counselors who are inaccurate perceivers. This particular phenomenon was also a phase of this study.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to determine the accuracy of counselors' (subjects) perceptions of selected client attributes following an initial interview and to determine the relationship of such perceptions to the counselors' possession of the same attributes.
Purposes

The specific purposes of this study were (1) to determine the accuracy of counselor perception of client attributes after an initial interview, (2) to determine the relationship that exists between counselors' perceptions of a client's attributes and the counselors' possession of the same attributes, (3) to determine the accuracy of the counselor self-perception, and (4) to determine whether there are significant differences between counselors who are accurate perceivers of client attributes and counselors who are inaccurate perceivers of client attributes.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were formulated.

1. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the client's Actual scores.

2. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the client's Perceived scores.

3. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the subjects' Actual scores.

4. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the subjects' Perceived scores.
5. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' Actual scores and the subjects' Perceived scores.

6. Significant differences will be found between "high-accuracy" subjects' Actual scores and "low-accuracy" subjects' Actual scores for each of the thirty-five attributes.

**Background and Significance**

The problems of accuracy of perception and the effect of one's own personality upon his perception of others have been topics of research in the field of social psychology. As early as 1937, Wolf and Murray (13) were interested in finding the effect of the personality of the judge upon his judgments of others. They postulated that there is a tendency for most people to "project" themselves onto others and there is a tendency to judge others as being similar to oneself. In their experiment they found that there was no strong tendency to judge others either by similarity or by contrast except on the trait of **orderliness**. Judges who were low in **orderliness** gave the highest marks for **orderliness** in the persons judged and, so, for this one trait, there was a tendency to mark by contrast. Others have studied the effect of the personality of the perceiver upon his perceptions. The findings generally indicate that the dimensions of perception are implicit in the personality of the perceiver (4, 5, 10, 12). Is this also true of counselors? Are counselors' perceptions impacted by what exists in the client or what exists within themselves?
Counseling is a sensitive and delicate process. Its potential impact on a client's life can be for better or for worse. Counseling can have immediate as well as long-range effects upon the client. Considering this, a counselor must be one who is sensitive to the client and perceptive of the client's personality, needs, and emotions. Personality traits, needs, and emotions are quite likely to be the subject matter of much of the counseling interview and a counselor's response to the client will be based upon his perception of these attributes in the client.

It seems extremely important, then, that counselors be accurate in their perceptions. A counselor who is haphazard or insensitive can respond incorrectly, thus reducing the possibility for the counseling relationship to have a positive effect upon the client. This inaccuracy may be extreme enough that it would render the counselor as a technician who may know the right things to say but not be perceptive enough to know when or why.

This kind of inaccuracy and seeming lack of perception is a major concern of those in charge of educating and training counselors. Counselors who go through a master's level program may have developed a cognitive level of skills pertinent to counseling but in the counseling practicum be inept at application of the skills because of a lack of accuracy in person perception.
Another question for consideration is whether or not a counselor's perception of the client is related to the way he sees himself. As pointed out by Rogers, the counselor may have a difficult time in keeping his own "self" from impinging upon his perception of the client. He may respond to the client out of his own needs or emotions. He may see in the client some of his own personality characteristics and be unable to be objective or open.

In counselor education, research findings indicate that a counselor's perception of the client is important to the establishment of an effective counseling relationship. Parloff (6), for example, found that the therapist who perceived the patient as closely approximating his "Ideal Patient" created the better counseling relationship. Other investigators (2) have shown that "good" counselors can be distinguished from "poor" counselors on the basis of their ways of perceiving "self, others, and the task of counseling."

There is a dearth of research relating person perception to the field of counselor education. A review of literature revealed that no study had been made in which the personality characteristics of the counselor had been related to his perception of the client. Browne's (1) study was an exception in which he related a full range of "diagnostician" characteristics to the diagnosticians' perception of a client. A study similar to Browne's was needed in the field of counselor education.
Definition of Terms

**Actual scores**—those scores the counselor and/or client received on the *Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire* (16PF), the *Differential Emotions Scale II* (DES II), and the *Adjective Check List* (ACL).

**Perceived scores**—the ratings the counselor and/or client assigned himself on the various attributes measured by the 16PF, DES II, and ACL.

**Subjects**—counselors enrolled in the master's level counseling practicum during the spring semester of 1976.

**Clients**—the students who volunteered to be interviewed in an initial counseling session.

**Interviewer**—the doctoral level counseling intern who interviewed the clients in an initial counseling session.

Limitations

This study was limited to five classes of students enrolled in the master's level counseling practicum at North Texas State University in the spring of 1976.

A weakness of the study was the lack of time available for viewing the video-taped counseling sessions. There were four tapes, each twenty minutes in length which had to be viewed and rated by each student in the practicum during a one hour and thirty minute period. This was a hurried presentation and was felt to be a limitation in the study.
The difficulty of researching accuracy of perception as pointed out by Cronbach (3) is recognized to be a limitation of this study.

Summary

This study was an attempt to describe the ability of counselors-in-training to assess attributes of clients in counseling. It was felt to be needed since research in this area is missing in counselor education. It was further an attempt to study the relationships of the counselors' perceptions of the clients to the counselors' own attributes. Open-mindedness has been shown to be important in counseling, while a projection-like process or letting one's own self interfere with his perceptions of another might be a hindrance in counseling.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Background research for topics of the kind in this paper comes from the field of social psychology. Person perception, social perception or interpersonal perception are the terms generally applied to this area of study. The related research for this study is presented under five headings: (1) Accuracy in Person Perception, (2) The Effects of the Personality of the Perceiver Upon His Perceptions, (3) Self-Perceptions of the Perceiver Upon His Perceptions, (3) Self-Perceptions of the Perceiver Related to His Judgments of Others, (4) Methods of Presentation of the Stimulus Person, and (5) Summary.

Accuracy of Person Perception

How accurately can one person perceive another? Hastorf, Schneider, and Polefka (13) pointed out that, historically, accuracy studies had mainly been done in two major areas: perception of emotions and perception of personality characteristics. Personality characteristics are those more enduring characteristics of a person which presumably determine a person's behavior. Emotions are the more fleeting characteristics which are typically inferred from how a person "looks"—his facial expression or general countenance. Hastorf and others pointed out that it was difficult to make any general
statements about the ability of an individual to judge the emotions of another since it depends on how finely the judge is to discriminate emotions. The stimuli employed and the emotions represented have considerable effect upon accuracy. "Our perceptions of the other person's feelings are heavily influenced by context, the labeling process, cultural rules for the expression of emotion, and a host of other variables," concluded Hastorf and others (13, p. 25).

On the issue of accuracy of identification of personality traits, research has traditionally been directed toward the identification of kinds of perceivers who are particularly sensitive to the characteristics of others. Hastorf and others (13) examined early research of this kind and concluded that there were serious problems with the methods used in these studies such as the artifact of "projection" or the misuse of the scale on which the perceiver rates the person perceived. Cronbach (7) pointed to the same kind of problems in studying accuracy in person perception. Because of the complexities involved in studying accuracy of perception, a limited number of studies have been done. Recent studies involving accuracy focus attention on the accuracy of the perceiver related to some criterion measure. Complementarity and similarity between judge and object were related to accuracy in interpersonal perception. Neither complementary or similarity were found to be important variables in accuracy (37).
Another area of research has been that of personally meaningful versus meaningless personality dimensions. In a study by Borman and Graham (4) accuracy was assessed by comparison with a standardized personality inventory, self-ratings and peer-ratings. When peer-ratings were the criteria of accuracy, the accuracy was higher regardless of the meaningfulness of dimensions. However, overall, the ratings on least meaningful personality dimensions were more accurate than were the meaningful dimensions.

The relationship between the training and experience of rehabilitation counselors and accuracy of client perception was studied by Anderson (1). The hypothesis that higher level training and accurate person perception are related was not supported by the data.

Accuracy in perception of emotions or affect has received some attention in recent studies. Zimmerman (39) studied counselor skill in perceiving affect. He found that skill in perceiving affect was not related to a client's perception of counselor empathy, although empathy and perception of affect are assumed by many to be the same thing. This investigator concluded that perception of affect may be a skill that is distinct from the ability known as "empathy."

Another study of perception of affect concentrated on the ability of counselors to assess immediately the non-verbalized feelings experienced by a client during a counseling interview. The hypothesis that a counselor's assessment
of the client's non-verbalized feelings will not differ significantly from the client's feelings as they were mechanically recorded during the interview was partially supported by the results. The observed accuracy was significantly different from 100 percent although it was also significantly different from chance (12). In another study, it was determined that accuracy in interpersonal perception could be improved. Following a direct teaching program designed to help the perceiver acquire knowledge of terms and concepts having to do with personality, the experimental group differed significantly from the control group with respect to scores on a perception measure (6).

In a similar study, McDowell (21) determined the extent to which accurate identification of non-verbalized feelings by counselors increases when they are given information on their errors and successes. It was found that they can improve accuracy when provided information on errors and successes.

Lesser (19) attempted to ascertain whether there was a significant relationship among a client's counseling progress, the counselor's ability to understand his client, and the similarity of client and counselor's self-concepts. It was found that counselor empathic understanding was unrelated to counseling progress. It was further found that similarity between client and counselor self-perceptions was negatively related to counseling progress but correct awareness on the
part of the counselor of similarity was positively related to progress. In other words, if a counselor correctly perceives counselor and client similarity he can overcome the negative effects of the similarity on the counseling process.

The question of how accurately one person can perceive another seems unanswerable in terms of the research to date. Problems in methodology of measuring accuracy have precluded much research along this line. However, research continues in which accuracy is a consideration. When attempts have been made to relate accuracy to other criteria such as complementarity or similarity of judge, or meaningfulness of dimensions being judged, the results have been inconclusive. Accuracy does not seem to be related to the training and experience of the perceiver.

The results of studies dealing with counselor perception of emotion have been inconclusive. Counselors can perceive client affect and they can improve in their perceptions; however, these results were not conclusive proof that counselors are accurate in their perceptions of emotion. Historically, research has been directed toward the problem of the personality traits of accurate perceivers but little attention has been paid to the description of how accurately counselors perceive their clients.
The Effects of Personality of the Perceiver Upon His Perceptions

The questions of the "perceiver" as a factor in his perception of another person was one of the first areas to receive attention in the literature related to this topic. As early as 1937, Wolf and Murray (38) were interested in the influence of the personality of the judge upon his judgments of others. They essentially found that there was no strong tendency for judges to rate persons as either similar to or different from themselves.

Some of the earliest work in impression formation was done by Asch (2). He had his subjects write their impressions of a person after being given verbal descriptions in the form of lists of stimulus traits which were said to characterize a person. He then had subjects select from pairs of opposing traits the one which they felt would best characterize the stimulus person. Asch concluded from his studies that in many impressions there are central "traits" that dominate the impression and other traits are organized around these.

Gollin (11) expanded upon Asch's work. It was suggested by his studies that the formation of an impression of the personality of another is not only a function of the characteristics of the person being observed but also a function of the underlying perceptual-cognitive organizing process of the observer.

As a way of explaining what happens when an observer forms an impression of an individual, Cronbach (8) formulated
the concept of "implicit personality theory." People build up an idea of the relative frequencies of joint occurrences of personality attributes and certain behaviors in other persons. This way of perceiving others is brought to any situation where an observer is asked to form a judgment of another.

The perceptual style of a perceiver is important. Readiness and receptivity to perceive the wishes and sentiments of another is thought to be an essential characteristic of the perceiver (14).

Norman (25), and Passini and Norman (28) related person perception and length of acquaintance. They studied groups of college students having varying length of acquaintance and varying intimacy of association. Using a peer nomination rating method, they had students who were unknown to one another make nominations on the same scales and under the same instructions as had previously been done in studies using students who were well acquainted. The results showed that the ratings of students who were very well acquainted were very similar to those of students who were less well acquainted.

Hastorf and others using these findings as a basis concluded that

If we believe that perceptions of other people are partially determined by perceiver variables, and that individual perceivers may have somewhat different theories about the way other people "really are," then we may be tempted to say that the perceivers' inferences about another reveal more about the perceiver than about the stimulus person (13, p. 44).
Shrauger and Altrocchi (32) reviewed the literature regarding the personality of the perceiver as a factor in person perception. Their review suggested that results of various studies relating global characteristics such as accuracy of perception and assumed similarity to person perception have generally been unsuccessful. However, when investigators have concentrated upon specified descriptive dimensions, such as favorability, hostility, and dominance, research has proved more fruitful. For example, they quoted several studies which showed that people with positive self descriptions tended to be positive in their descriptions of others. Likewise, studies have shown that hostility in the perceiver tended to influence his ratings of hostility in others.

Studies in which dominance in the perceiver has been related to his perception of dominance in others have shown mixed results. Early results were that dominant people described others as weaker than they were; however, these results cannot be generalized since later research has shown that differences in attribution of traits are a function of sex-related personality variables in interaction with the type of behavior judged and in consistency of behavior judged.

Researchers have continued to look for relationships between the personality of the perceiver and his perception of others. In a study of the perception of hostility in other persons, Olsson (26) concluded that overly-friendly people perceived less hostility than did moderately-friendly people.
Hjelle (15) studied personality characteristics associated with accuracy in interpersonal perception. In this study, good judges were found to be tolerant, have a higher sense of well-being and psychological-mindedness. He further concluded that sex differences in interpersonal perception are minimal. Counselor's anxiety has been related to the counselor's understanding of students' communication. Milliken and Kirchner (22) found that the more anxious counselors were less accurate in their ability to recall words spoken and feelings expressed in simulated interviews. The rationale, as they saw it, for these results was that when a client expressed strong feelings, the counselor became threatened and his own anxiety got in the way of recall.

Edwards and McWilliams (9) studied the effects of perceiver and expressor sex upon cognitive perception. They found basically no difference in accuracy of perception by different sex perceivers. Expressor sex differences were important to the outcome of the study. College-age males tended to be perceived more accurately on the activity dimension of a semantic differential, and college-age females were perceived more accurately on an evaluative dimension. In a related study, Edwards and McWilliams (10) studied the differences between personality variables for subjects who were considered either high or low in accuracy of perception. Using the California Psychological Inventory, it was found that when sex differences of expressor was considered as a variable,
the accurate perceivers differed on the variables of Dominance, Sociability, Achievement via Conformance, and Self-Control.

Researchers and theoreticians seem to agree that the way one person perceives another is a function not only of the characteristics of the stimulus person but is also a function of the characteristics of the perceiver. The results of research have been contradictory in indicating what characteristics of the perceiver might be important in his perception of another. Many attempts have been made to relate the personality of the perceiver to his perception of a stimulus person. The best results have been attained when specified dimensions of personality, such as hostility or dominance have been used.

Self-Perceptions of Perceivers Related To Their Perceptions of Others

The self-perception of the counselor is important in his perception of a client. Rogers' self-theory of personality made clear the idea that most of the behavior of an organism is consistent with the concept of self (31). Kelly (17) in his formulation of a theory of personal constructs explained the way a person perceives and anticipates events through a system of personal constructs. In discussion of the controlling effect an individual's personal constructs have upon him, Kelly said, "When a person begins to see himself as a datum in forming constructs . . . he finds that the constructs he forms operate as rigorous controls upon his behavior" (17,
Kelly saw social behavior as being particularly affected by personal constructs.

Lundy (20) tested Kelly's notion of incorporation-differentiation within the interpersonal situation. He found that when two people are talking with one another, the predictor's conceptualizations of the other's protocol were in the direction of the predictor's own protocol under the condition of focusing attention upon himself during the conversation. Lundy called this phenomenon assimilative projection. Under the condition of focusing attention upon the other person, the predictor's conceptualizations about the other person were more in the direction of the other's protocol. It was concluded that where constructs about the self exist and are the focus of attention, incorporation of the other person into already existing constructs about the self is facilitated.

In a study by Omwake (25), it was shown that attitudes toward self are related to the attitudes one holds toward others. This hypothesis was tested in a "normal" population. The subjects were 113 college students enrolled in the first course in psychology. The results showed that those who accepted themselves tended to be accepting of others and to perceive others as accepting of themselves. Those who tended to reject themselves had a low opinion of others and perceived others as self-rejectant.

Shrauger and Patterson (33) examined the relationships between high and low self-esteem subjects' satisfaction with
certain personality dimensions and the relevance they gave these in describing themselves. A further dimension of the study was the frequency with which the subjects used certain dimensions in describing self and others. Those dimensions seen as highly relevant were used more frequently than those which were seen as less relevant.

Relationships among self-concept, counselor-perceived client self-concept and/or client self-concepts have been studied. Bogard (3) had counselors complete the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale for themselves. At the end of two counseling interviews with two separate clients she had the counselors mark the same measuring instrument the way they thought the client would mark it. The client was also asked to mark the scale. The results generally showed an overall significant positive relationship between counselor-perceived client self-concept and client self-concept. When analyzed by sex of counselor and sex of client, the significant relationship occurred between both male and female counselor-perceived female client self-concept and female client self-concept. There was no significant relationship between counselor self-concept and client self-concept nor was there a significant relationship between counselor self-concept and counselor-perceived client self-concept.

Kreines and Bogart (18) asked subjects to rate themselves and others whom they had known for at least six months on the traits of stinginess, stubbornness, messiness, and bashfulness.
The examiners then determined whether the subjects had insight into their own personalities with regard to these four traits. Subjects were given feedback as to their "true" possession of these traits. Those who possessed a trait and realistically accepted it were said to have insight. For those without insight, the information regarding their "true" possession of a trait was dissonant. The subjects were asked to give a rating to all group members a second time. Those for whom the information about his possession of a trait was dissonant projected these traits onto other group members during the second rating. This was thought to reduce the dissonance.

While attention has been paid to the perceiver as a factor in his perceptions (see preceding section), very little attention has been paid to the perceiver's knowledge of his own possession of traits and the effect of this knowledge upon his perception. Holmes (16) categorized "projection" into two factors. The trait projected is either the same or different from the trait the projecting individual possesses and the projecting individual is either aware or not aware of the trait. In reviewing the literature, Holmes found no research support to indicate that a person will project a trait of which he is not aware. Holmes defined a projection-like process as taking place when a person ascribes to others' characteristics which are identical to his own and of which he is consciously aware.
Browne (5) studied projection in the diagnostic process. Specifically, Browne studied the relationship between diagnosticians' (subjects) attributes and their perceptions of a hospitalized patient. He had the diagnosticians complete several paper and pencil personality measures. These became the diagnosticians' "Actual" scores. Next, the diagnosticians rated themselves on the attributes measured by the various tests. This second set of data was the diagnosticians' "Perceived" scores. Browne, then, had his subjects view a videotaped interview. The interviewer was a clinical psychology intern; the person interviewed was a hospitalized patient. Browne obtained the same test data from the patient that he had from the diagnosticians. After viewing the video-tapes, the diagnosticians were asked to rate the patient on the attributes on which they had previously rated themselves.

Correlations were obtained among the sets of data. The distinction between the "Actual" and "Perceived" scores was important to the outcome. A projection-like process took place when diagnosticians were asked to rate a patient who was dissimilar from themselves. The projection was in the form of an exaggeration of the differences. The ratings that the diagnosticians gave the patient appeared to be influenced by both the "Actual" and "Perceived" scores of the diagnosticians. These ratings also seemed to be affected by the "Perceived" but not the "Actual" scores of the patient. Browne concluded that diagnosticians should be aware of the
influence of their own personalities on their perception of patients. He further cautioned about the influence a patient's self-perception might have on the diagnostic process when questions about how the patient "actually is" are raised. As a result of Browne's study he recommended that further exploration of this kind is needed with other mental health workers who engage in diagnostic work.

The literature shows that a person's self-concept or self-perception is related to the way he sees others. If he sees himself favorably, he tends to perceive others favorably. There is evidence that "projection" of one's own attributes to another does take place when one is perceiving another. The evidence for how it takes place is mixed. For example, some studies have shown that perceivers "project" characteristics that they have no knowledge that they themselves possess. Others have shown that projection takes place only when a person has knowledge that he himself possesses the trait. The function of projection in some studies is to exaggerate dissimilarity between oneself and another.

Methods of Presentation of Stimulus Person

In studies of person perception the method of presentation of the stimulus person has been an important variable. Shrauger and Altrocchi in their review of the literature pointed to this fact. Many methods of presentation have been used. Asch's (2) subjects formed impressions of personality after they were given verbal descriptions of the stimulus
person. Gollin's (11) subjects rated the stimulus person after viewing silent motion picture clips.

Other means of presenting the stimulus person are to ask subjects to rate persons with whom they interact. Norman (25) and Passini and Norman (28) asked raters to rate fellow students. Borman and others (4) had college sorority girls rate each other on ten personality dimensions defined by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Hjelle (15) had subjects answer a personality inventory for himself and for his roommate and used length of acquaintanceship as a variable. Bogard (3) asked her subjects who were graduate level counselor candidates to rate two clients after initial interviews with the clients.

Mishra (23) ascertained the role of verbal description in person perception and found that information about a stimulus person is affected by information conveyed about him in a verbal description. Ratings of subjects who both observed and were given a verbal description about the stimulus person differed significantly from those who observed only.

Video-tape has been a recent means of presenting stimulus persons for rating. Smith (34) studied counselor perception of anger by having subjects view video tapes which portrayed an actor-client expressing all combinations of two levels of anger. Verbal and non-verbal cues were analyzed. Non-verbal cues were more effective than verbal cues.
Edwards and McWilliams (9, 10) asked stimulus persons (expressors) to talk for three minutes about each of three topics, namely, grades, family, and money. The talks were video-taped and used subsequently to obtain perception scores.

Storms (35) video taped unstructured conversations between two actors while two observer subjects looked on. Later he manipulated the use of the video-tape to ascertain the factors utilized by the observers and actors in the attributional process. He found that the actors made judgments more from environment, situational factors while observers made judgments from internal, dispositional factors. When the actors were reoriented to see a replay of themselves on tapes and the observers saw only the other person with whom the actor was conversing the results were reversed. Storms' conclusions were that visual orientation will affect the attribution process.

The present study used a video-taped counseling session as a means of presenting the stimulus person to the subjects. This had the advantage of presenting both verbal and non-verbal cues simultaneously. A video-taped counseling session would denote a more realistic setting and would present information that would be the kind of information a counselor might have in forming judgments and making recommendations about a client.

Browne (5) used a video-taped presentation of the stimulus person. In his study, the stimulus person was a hospitalized
patient who was interviewed on video-tape by a clinical psychology intern. The interview took the form of an initial contact for the purpose of obtaining information about the psychological status of the person.

While several modes of presentation of the stimulus person have been noted, it is noted also that the use of a videotaped counseling session for the purpose of ascertaining client attributes is rare. According to the studies reviewed in this section, methods of presentation of the stimulus persons do affect the outcome of the ratings.

Summary

The foregoing review of literature reveals that accuracy in person perception has been a subject of research for a number of years. Early research studied accuracy as a personality characteristic of the perceiver. More recently, studies have related accuracy to a specific characteristic of the perceiver. In both these areas of research results have been inconclusive and have drawn criticism as to methodology used. Studies describing accuracy of counselors in describing clients' characteristics is missing from the literature, although there are studies which relate counselors' accuracy to such things as training and experience. Other studies have attempted to improve accuracy through immediate feedback procedures or direct teaching methods.

Theoreticians and researchers alike have related characteristics of the perceiver to his perceptions. The most
fruitful line of research has come from relating specified characteristics of a perceiver to his perceptions. Hostility and dominance have been shown to be related to a perceiver's perception of these characteristics in others, although there are contradictory results when one studies the sex of the perceiver, sex of the stimulus person, and the interaction of specific characteristics.

Self-perception has also been related to perception of others. The literature reveals that how a person perceives himself will affect how he sees others. There is also evidence that what a person knows about himself and his own personality characteristics will affect his perception of these characteristics in others. "Projection" has been used to describe this process and has been found to occur when psychologists or diagnosticians are asked to rate another person or client on characteristics which they have also been asked to rate themselves on.

The review of literature has also shown the importance of method of presentation of the stimulus person. Various methods have been used but little has been done using actual video-taped counseling sessions. It was felt that this mode of presentation would better represent the client than other modes of presentation.

What is missing from the literature are studies describing the accuracy of counselors in perceiving clients. Studies dealing with a full-range of counselor personality variables
which might influence the counselor's perception of the client are few. Browne (5) recently found a significant negative relationship between counselors' own scores and the scores they assigned to a client on the same attributes. This phenomenon he described as "projection." Research describing the ability of counselors to describe a client with only limited information is needed along with research which focuses on the effect of one's own personality on the perceptions he has of others.
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CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The general design of the study was correlational. Correlations among the five sets of data were examined. A further study was made of the differences between the "high accuracy" group and the "low accuracy" group.

Subjects

The subjects of the study were students enrolled in the master's level counseling practicum during the spring semester of 1976. There were twenty-four female subjects and twenty-one males. The ages of the subjects ranged from twenty-two years to forty-five years.

Description of Counseling Practicum, University Setting, Background, and Experience of Students

The subjects in this study were in the final phase of the master's degree program in counseling at North Texas State University. The counseling practicum is the next to last course the students take before graduation and is designed to give the student an opportunity to practice counseling skills under the supervision of a graduate faculty member and doctoral level counseling student. Most of the students in the master's level program have no
experience in counseling although a few do hold counseling related jobs while finishing their degree.

The master's level counseling program at North Texas State University is a part of the College of Education. All students take a core of general courses in testing, guidance in the public schools, methods of counseling, and group counseling. Those who wish to specialize in counseling in the elementary school take courses in play media and learning disabilities while those in the secondary area take courses in career and vocational counseling. With this kind of emphasis on counseling in the schools, the subjects of this study had a somewhat different background than the subjects in Browne's study who were "forty male graduate students (ages 22 to 34) enrolled in the clinical psychology program at the University of Kansas" (1, p. 12). The subjects of the present study were labeled as "counselors" while the subjects of Browne's study were called "diagnosticians."

Instruments

The three standardized instruments used in the study were the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16 PF), the Adjective Check List (ACL) and the Differential Emotions Scale II (DES II). These three instruments were selected because they measure personality factors, needs, and emotions which were assumed to be the most important perceptions needed for making assessments and decisions concerning a client.
The 16 PF was devised by Cattell (2) using a factor analytic procedure. The selection of an instrument for measuring personality factors was based upon an assumption that in assessing a client a counselor needs to be familiar with those ongoing traits which determine a person's characteristic behavioral responses. This questionnaire attempts to measure what a person really is as opposed to what he may think he is. Forms A and B of the questionnaire are alternate forms and Form A was chosen for this study. Reliability of the instrument was reported in a series of coefficients showing the agreement of each of the 16 scales with itself. Reliability coefficients on short-term retest (2 to 7 days) range from a low of .54 to a high of .89 over the traits. Equivalence coefficients of test forms A and B are reported to range from .34 to .71 over the traits (2, pp. 10-11).

Validity was reported as "Concept" or construct validity. The test questions were chosen "as being good measures of personality factors" (2, p. 11). They were chosen from thousands of items originally tried and were only those that had significant validity after ten successive factor analyses. Concept validity was measured by correlating the scale score with the pure factors it was designed to measure. For Forms A and B, taken separately, the direct concept validities were reported to range from .35 to .92 over the traits (2, p. 12).
The ACL, the second instrument in the study, was chosen because of the "needs" scales as well as some general scales, namely Self-Control, Personal Adjustment, and Counseling Readiness. The decision to study needs was based upon the assumption that counselors frequently respond to clients from their own needs rather than accurately perceiving the client's needs and responding to these. The "needs" scales chosen were Achievement, Dominance, Aggression, Autonomy, Succorance, Nurturance, Affiliation, and Deference. The ACL "needs" scales were based on Murray's (6) definitions. The needs chosen for this study were from Murray's list of "manifest" needs. These needs can be readily ascertained from overt behavior of the type one would observe in counseling. The ACL Manual (3) reported a test-retest reliability on the list of words. Test-retest reliability coefficients ranged from .01 to .86 with a mean of .54 and standard deviation of .19. Validity of the ACL was reported by relating the fifteen "needs" scales to their counterparts on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The coefficients ranged from .01 to .48 for the fifteen scales reported. Ten of the fifteen coefficients were significant beyond the .01 level. Other studies related the ACL to comparable scales on the MMPI, the California Psychology Inventory, and various measures of intellectual ability and functioning. The latter were low enough to say that the ACL was not strongly related to intellectual measures (3).
The third instrument for this study was the DES II (5). Since emotions and feelings are very often the focus of attention in the counseling interview, it was assumed that a scale for measuring emotions was appropriate for this study. Again, counselors need to be perceptive of emotion and what a client is feeling. This instrument purported to measure the characteristic ways a person experiences particular emotions in his day-to-day life. It yielded scores for ten emotions as described by Izard (4), eight of which were used in this study. Content validity was determined through a factor analysis procedure. The items chosen for the final inventory had factor loadings ranging from a low of .45 to a high of .97 (5, p. 39). Construct validity was reported in intercorrelations among the factors making up the inventory. Only one of the intercorrelations exceeded .50, most of them being sufficiently low to support their relative independence.

Both internal consistency and test-retest reliability have been studied for the DES II. The average coefficient alpha for all emotion scales of the DES II is .84. On another index of internal consistency, the item-whole correlations range from a low of .73 for one item to a high of .90 for one item. Most of the correlations range in the high 80's. On test-retest reliability, the average reliability coefficient was .77 when the test was administered to a group
of college students with a one-week interval between administrations (5, p. 32).

A fourth, nonstandardized, instrument was also used for the study. This was a twenty-point rating scale (see Appendix A) which was used to measure the subjects' and clients' self-perception on the same factors assessed by the three standardized instruments. This rating scale was also used to assess the subjects' perception of each client. This procedure was similar to the procedure used by Browne (1) in which he administered several instruments to his subjects to ascertain their "Actual" scores. He then had them rate themselves on a rating scale which corresponded to the factors assessed by the instruments. Their self-ratings were their "Perceived" scores. Both sets of data were important to the results of his study.

In the present study there were four instruments and five sets of data. The four instruments were as follows: (1) the 16 PF, (2) the ACL, (3) the DES, and (4) the twenty-point rating scale. The five sets of data were the following:

(1) the subjects' "actual" scores,
(2) the subjects' "perceived" scores,
(3) the clients' "actual" scores,
(4) the clients' "perceived" scores, and
(5) the subjects' estimates of the clients' scores.
Thirty-five attributes were assessed by the instruments. From the 16 PF were the following:

1. Reserved--Outgoing
2. Less Intelligent--More Intelligent
3. Affected by Feelings--Emotionally Stable
4. Humble--Assertive
5. Sober--Happy-go-lucky
6. Expedient--Conscientious
7. Shy--Venturesome
8. Tough-minded--Tender-minded
9. Trusting--Suspicious
10. Practical--Imaginative
11. Forthright--Shrewd
12. Placid--Apprehensive
13. Conservative--Experimenting
14. Group-dependent--Self-sufficient
15. Undisciplined--Controlled
16. Relaxed--Tense

The following attributes were assessed by the ACL:

17. Self-control
18. Personal Adjustment
19. Counseling Readiness
20. Achievement
21. Affiliation
22. Autonomy
23. Aggression
(24) Dominance

(25) Nurturance

(26) Succorance

(27) Deference

The remaining attributes were assessed by the DES II and are as follows.

(28) Interest—Excitement

(29) Enjoyment—Joy

(30) Surprise—Startle

(31) Distress—Anguish

(32) Disgust—Revulsion

(33) Anger—Rage

(34) Fear—Terror

(35) Contempt—Scorn

Video-taped Counseling Sessions

For the second phase of the study, it was necessary to video tape four counseling sessions. The clients in the tapes were volunteers who were chosen after being interviewed by the examiner. The criteria for choosing the clients were as follows:

1. They must be authentic clients with a presenting problem that they were willing to talk about with a counselor in an initial session.

2. They must not know the interviewer prior to the counseling session.
3. There must be a discernible difference in the overall impression made by each client.

Two males and two females were chosen from among the volunteers. They were all students at North Texas State University. Three were undergraduates, and one was a graduate student. They were told that the video-taped session was to be used for a doctoral dissertation and the tapes would be shown to master's level counselors. Their names were not used in the tapes.

The clients were interviewed in an initial counseling session by a doctoral level male counseling student. This student was also employed as a counselor by the University Counseling Center and was in his last semester of counseling internship. The video tape was made so that the camera focused only on the client. The interviewer was not seen. This was done so that the subjects' attention as they viewed the video tapes would be focused mainly on the client. The first twenty minutes of the interviews were taped. At the end of twenty minutes, the interviewer told each client that he had the option of coming to the campus Counseling Center to continue in counseling with him, another intern, or a member of the staff if he desired to do so.

Rating the Tapes

After the four tapes were completed, they were judged by the examiner and two members of the Graduate Faculty in
Counselor Education at North Texas State University. Each tape was viewed in its entirety and the questionnaire (Appendix B) was answered for each tape. The criterion for retaining a tape for use in the study was an agreement by the judges on seven of the ten questions. During the first judging period, one tape was rejected on the basis of its poor quality with regard to audio clarity. A fifth tape was then made which met the criteria of the first three.

On one tape there was one sentence of information which was judged to be very personal in nature, which could have been detrimental to the client had there been a question of confidentiality. This one sentence was erased from the audio portion of the tape. No other adjustments in any of the tapes were made. They were judged to be authentic and characteristic of typical clients.

Collection of the Data

Soon after the beginning of the spring semester, the students enrolled in the master's level counseling practicum at North Texas State University were asked to participate in a doctoral dissertation study. As an incentive to taking part in the study, it was included as a part of their regularly scheduled class time and the students were told that the results might have some implications for the effectiveness of their future counseling roles. A further incentive to the students' participation in the study was that the procedures
would be a learning experience for them. It had been ascertained from conversation with several of the graduate faculty members and from the supervision experience of the examiner that the counseling practicum students lacked a good background of training which helped them perceive what a counseling relationship should be and how it might be developed in the initial interview. Therefore, a modeling procedure such as was possible with this study could be a valuable asset to the learning experience of students in the practicum.

The subjects were administered the series of inventories (16 PF, ACL, and DES II) during class periods. After completing these instruments, they were asked to rate themselves on each attribute being assessed, using the twenty-point rating scale. The instructions for the rating scales were as follows:

How do you see yourself?

Use the following scales to rate yourself on the various attributes listed. Consider the entire scale (1-20) and use as much of it as you feel is appropriate for you.

After a period of approximately two weeks, the subjects were shown a series of four video-taped counseling sessions. Again, this took place during regularly scheduled class time. The subjects were told that they would be viewing video-taped counseling sessions. It was pointed out that these were real clients with real problems and confidentiality should be
maintained. They were asked to pay special attention to the client as they would be rating the client on the scale of attributes which they had used previously for rating themselves. The subjects were given the rating scales before viewing each video tape. The instructions for using the rating scales were as follows:

How do you see the client?

Using the following scales, rate the client as you perceive him to be. Consider the entire scale (1-20) and use as much of it as you feel is appropriate for this client. If some attribute(s) was not clear from the counseling session, please make the best estimate you can.

They were asked to rate the client at the end of each tape. These ratings were collected before viewing the next tape. The subjects saw all four video tapes during one class period. It was also ascertained at the beginning of each tape whether the subjects knew the clients. None of the subjects knew any of the clients; therefore, the subjects who had previously agreed to participate in the study and who were present during the presentation of the video tapes became a part of the study.

Each of the four clients was administered the 16 PF, the ACL, and the DES II directly following his/her taping session with the interviewer. After answering the inventories, they were each asked to rate themselves on the twenty-point
rating scale. The instructions for the inventories and rating scale were the same as those given the subjects. The data were collected from each client individually.

Scoring Procedures

The **16 PF**, **ACL**, and **DES II** were scored by the hand-scoring method. The scores obtained through this procedure became the subjects' "Actual" scores. The ratings which the subjects gave themselves on the twenty-point scale were the subjects' "Perceived" scores.

The data collected from each client were also scored by hand. The scores that the clients received on the **16 PF**, **ACL**, and **DES II** became the clients' "Actual" scores. The ratings they gave themselves on the twenty-point rating scale became the clients' "Perceived" scores.

Treatment of Data

Since there were thirty-five attributes assessed and forty-five subjects, the data were treated so that the first two hypotheses would be descriptive of the relationships that existed between the subjects' ratings of each client and each client's Actual scores. Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients were obtained between the way each subject rated each client and each client's Actual scores. A set of forty-five correlations were thus obtained for each client.
This same procedure was followed in testing the relationships that existed between the subjects' ratings of each client and each client's Perceived scores.

Another procedure was used in determining the relationship between the subjects' ratings of the client and the subjects' own Actual and Perceived scores. Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients were obtained between the subjects' ratings of each client and the subjects' own Actual scores for each attribute being measured. This allowed for examination of a "projection-like" process which might be taking place for any one attribute. This procedure yielded thirty-five correlations for each client. The same procedure was done a second time using this time the subjects' Perceived scores. Additionally, subjects' ratings of clients were averaged across the four clients and Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients were obtained between this average rating and subjects' Actual and Perceived scores. Finally, Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients were obtained between the subjects' Actual and Perceived scores.

The data were also treated to find the differences between the subjects who were accurate perceivers and those who were less accurate. This was done in the following manner.

Discrepancies between the subject's ratings of the clients and the client's Actual scores were found and summed over the four clients. The total discrepancy score for each
subject was ranked from low to high. The subjects were then divided into thirds according to the discrepancy score, the lowest third being the "high-accuracy" group, the highest third being the "low-accuracy" group. The middle third was disregarded. The means of the subjects' Actual scores on each of the thirty-five attributes were tested for significant difference between the "high-accuracy" group and the "low-accuracy" group by using a t-test. All hypotheses were tested for significance at the .05 level of significance.

Summary

Subjects for this study were forty-five master's level counseling students at North Texas State University. They were enrolled in the counseling practicum course. Three objective instruments were used to obtain subjects' Actual scores on selected attributes; a rating scale was used to obtain subjects' Perceived scores on these same attributes. The subjects viewed four twenty-minute video-taped initial counseling sessions. The clients in the tapes had completed for themselves the same instruments that the subjects had completed. After viewing the tapes, the subjects were asked to rate the client on the same rating scale they had used to rate themselves. There were thirty-five attributes measured. These attributes were derived from the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire, the Adjective Check List, and the Differential Emotions Scale II.
The data were treated to find relationships between subjects' ratings of the clients and each client's Actual and Perceived scores. Relationships between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the subjects' own scores were ascertained. Further, relationships between the subjects' Actual scores and Perceived scores were assessed. Finally, differences between those subjects who were accurate in their perception of clients and those who were less accurate were tested.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the statistical analysis of the data pertinent to each hypothesis are presented.

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I as stated in Chapter I was as follows:
There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the client's Actual scores.

Pearson Product-moment Coefficients of Correlation were obtained between the sets of data referred to in the hypothesis. Raw scores were used to obtain the coefficients. Coefficients were obtained across the thirty-five attributes measured. Since forty-five subjects rated each client, forty-five correlations were obtained for each client. Table I contains the range and median correlations between the subjects' ratings of each client and the client's Actual scores.

For Client 1, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings and the client's Actual scores across the thirty-five attributes was from .55 to -.23 with a median correlation of .18 (p > .05). For Client 2, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings and the client's Actual scores across
TABLE I
PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION
FOR SUBJECTS' RATINGS OF CLIENTS AND
CLIENT'S ACTUAL SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Range of r's</th>
<th>Median r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55 to -.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.68 to .06</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49 to -.08</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.45 to -.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05

the thirty-five attributes measured was from .68 to .06 with a median of .31 (p ≤ .05). For Client 3, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings and the client's Actual scores across the thirty-five attributes measured was from .49 to -.08 with a median of .21 (p > .05). For Client 4, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings and the client's Actual scores across the thirty-five attributes measured was from .45 to -.02 with a median of .22 (p > .05).

These correlations indicated that the relationship between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the clients' Actual scores tended to be low with the median for Client 2 being the only significant positive correlation. Precisely, there was little relationship between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the clients' Actual scores on the 16 PF,
the ACL, and the DES II. Therefore, Hypothesis I was rejected.

Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II stated: There will be a significant positive correlation between subjects' ratings of the client and the client's Perceived scores.

Pearson Product-moment Coefficients of Correlation were obtained between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the clients' Perceived scores. Raw scores were used to obtain the coefficients. Coefficients were obtained across the thirty-five attributes measured. Again, since there were forty-five subjects, there were forty-five correlations for each client. Table II contains the range and the median correlation for each client between the subjects' ratings of the client and the client's Perceived scores.

### Table II

**PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBJECTS' RATINGS OF CLIENTS AND CLIENT'S PERCEIVED SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Range of r's</th>
<th>Median r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.82 to -.25</td>
<td>.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.67 to -.35</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49 to -.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.52 to -.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05
For Client 1, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings and the client's Perceived scores across the thirty-five attributes was from .82 to -.25 with a median of .61 which was significant at the .05 level of significance. For Client 2, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings and the client's Perceived scores across the thirty-five attributes was from .67 to -.35 with a median of .11 (p > .05). For Client 3, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings and the client's Perceived scores across the thirty-five attributes was from .49 to -.21 with a median of .29 (p > .05). For Client 4, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings and the client's Perceived scores across the thirty-five attributes was from .52 to -.32 with a median of .02 (p > .05).

Again, these correlations indicate that the relationship between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the clients' Perceived scores tended to be positive but weak. The subjects' ratings of the clients' attributes and the clients' own perceptions of their attributes did not correlate highly. Thus, Hypothesis II was rejected.

**Hypothesis III**

Hypothesis III stated there will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the subjects' Actual scores.
To test this hypothesis, Pearson Product-moment Coefficients of Correlation were obtained between the two sets of data for each attribute measured. A set of thirty-five correlations were thus obtained for each client. Subjects' ratings of client attributes were averaged across the four clients and the correlation between this average and the subjects' Actual scores was also ascertained for each attribute.

Table III contains data showing the range of the correlations and the median correlation between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the subjects' Actual scores.

### TABLE III

**PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBJECTS' RATINGS OF CLIENTS AND SUBJECTS' ACTUAL SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Range of r's</th>
<th>Median r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30 to -.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.28 to -.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.38 to -.23</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41 to -.32</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.35 to -.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Client 1, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings of the client and subjects' Actual scores was from .30 to -.19 with a median correlation of .10 (p > .05). For
Client 2, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings of clients and subjects' Actual scores was from .28 to -.28 with a median correlation of .00 (p > .05). For Client 3, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings of the client and subjects' Actual scores was from .38 to -.23 with a median correlation of .03 (p > .05). For Client 4, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings of the client and subjects' Actual scores was .41 to -.32 with a median correlation of .00 (p > .05). When the average estimate of client's scores and subjects' Actual scores was correlated, the range of correlations was from .35 to -.29 with a median correlation of .04 (p > .05). The median correlations for Hypothesis III were at or near zero, with none significantly different from zero. There appeared to be little relationship between the way subjects rated the clients and the subjects' Actual scores on the 16 PF, the ACL, and the DES II.

It was possible also to examine the correlations between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the subjects' Actual scores for each attribute measured. Table IV contains the correlations between the subjects' average ratings of the clients and the subjects' Actual scores for each attribute.

Two of these correlations met the criterion for significance (p < .05). These correlations were between subjects' average ratings of the clients on attributes 25 and 28 and the subjects' Actual scores on these same attributes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .05$
Attribute 25 was a measure of Nurturance as measured by the ACL. The correlations of subjects' ratings of the clients on that attribute with the subjects' Actual scores ranged from .38 to -.01. When the ratings were averaged and correlated with subjects' Actual scores, the correlation was .35 (p < .05). There was a low-positive correlation between the way the subjects perceived clients' possession of Nurturance as an attribute and subjects' own possession of Nurturance as measured by the ACL.

Attribute 28 was Interest--Excitement as measured by the DES II. The correlations of subjects' ratings of the clients on that attribute with the subjects' Actual scores ranged from .41 to -.01. When the estimates were averaged across subjects and correlated with the subjects' Actual scores, the correlation was .30 (p < .05). There was a low positive correlation between the way subjects perceived clients' possession of Interest--Excitement and subjects' Actual scores on Interest--Excitement as measured by the DES II.

After examining the data for significant positive correlations between subjects' ratings of the clients and subjects' Actual scores, it was found that there was no relationship between subjects' ratings of clients and subjects' Actual scores. When correlations between the sets of data were examined for each attribute measured, significant positive correlations were found for only two of the attributes.
These positive correlations were for Nurturance (.35) and Interest--Excitement (.30). Although significant at the .05 level of significance, the correlations were still low. On the basis of these findings, Hypothesis III was rejected.

Hypothesis IV

Hypothesis IV stated there will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the subjects' Perceived scores.

Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients were obtained between the subjects' ratings of client and the subjects' Perceived scores for each of the thirty-five attributes measured. A set of thirty-five correlations was thus obtained for each client. Subjects' ratings of client attributes were averaged across the four clients and the correlation between this average and the subjects' Perceived scores was also ascertained for each attribute.

Table V contains data showing the range of the correlations and the median correlation of the subjects' ratings of the client and the subjects' Perceived scores.

For Client 1, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings of the client and subjects' Perceived scores was from .47 to -.12 with a median correlation of .13 (p > .05). For Client 2, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings of the client and subjects' Perceived scores was from .37 to -.32 with a median correlation of .03 (p > .05). For
TABLE V

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
FOR SUBJECTS' RATINGS OF THE CLIENT AND
SUBJECTS' PERCEIVED SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Range of r's</th>
<th>Median r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47 to -.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.37 to -.32</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.60 to -.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.28 to -.42</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.49 to -.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Client 3, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings of the client and subjects' Perceived scores was from .60 to -.14 with a median correlation of .07 (p > .05). For Client 4, the range of correlations of subjects' ratings of the client and subjects' Perceived scores was from .28 to -.42 with a median correlation of -.01. When the average rating of the client was correlated with the subjects' Perceived scores, the range of correlations was from .49 to -.26 with a median of .10.

The median correlations for Hypothesis IV were not significantly different from zero. There appeared to be little relationship between the way subjects perceived the clients and the way they perceived themselves.

The data were examined for significant positive correlations between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the
subjects' Perceived scores for each attribute. Table VI contains correlations between the subjects' average ratings of the clients and the subjects' Perceived scores for each attribute.

**TABLE VI**

**PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR SUBJECTS' AVERAGE RATINGS OF CLIENTS AND SUBJECTS' PERCEIVED SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the coefficients were significant positive correlations. These were the correlations between subjects'
average ratings of the clients on attributes 10, 23, and 32 and the subjects' Perceived scores on these same attributes.

Attribute 10 was Practical—Imaginative as measured by the 16 PF. The correlations of subjects' ratings of the clients and subjects' Perceived scores on that attribute ranged from .60 to .09. When the ratings were averaged across clients and correlated with subjects' Perceived scores, the correlation was .49 (p < .05). There was a significant positive correlation between the way subjects perceived clients' possession of this attribute and the way they perceived this attribute in themselves.

Attribute 23 was Aggression as measured by the ACL. The correlations of subjects' ratings of the client and subjects' Perceived scores ranged from .48 to .05. When the estimates of the clients' scores were averaged and this average was correlated with the subjects' Perceived scores, the correlation was .34 (p < .05). There was a significant positive correlation between the way subjects perceived clients' possession of the attribute of Aggression and their perception of Aggression in themselves.

Attribute 32 was Disgust—Revulsion as measured by the DES II. The correlations of subjects' ratings of the clients and subjects' Perceived scores ranged from .47 to .03. When the ratings of the clients were averaged across clients and this average correlated with the subjects' Perceived scores, the correlation was .38 (p < .05). There was a significant
positive correlation between the way subjects perceived clients' possession of *Disgust--Revulsion* and the perception of this attribute in themselves.

After examining the data for significant positive correlations between subjects' ratings of the clients and subjects' Perceived scores, it was found that there was a relationship between subjects' ratings of clients' scores and subjects' Perceived scores. When the correlations between the sets of data were examined for each attribute measured, significant positive correlations were found for three of the attributes measured. Significant positive correlations existed between subjects' ratings of the clients and subjects' Perceived scores on *Practical--Imaginative*, *Aggression*, and *Disgust--Revulsion*. Since there were few significant positive correlations and they were low, Hypothesis IV was rejected.

**Hypothesis V**

Hypothesis V stated that there will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' Actual scores and the subjects' Perceived scores.

To test this hypothesis, Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients of the subjects' Actual and Perceived scores across the thirty-five attributes were obtained. Raw scores were used in obtaining the correlations. The forty-five correlations that resulted are shown in Table VII.
TABLE VII

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBJECTS' ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

A total of thirty out of a possible forty-five significant positive correlations were obtained when the subjects'
Actual and Perceived scores were used. The range of correlations of subjects' Actual scores with subjects' Perceived scores was from .70 to -.05 with a median of .38 which was significant at the .05 level. There was a relationship between the subjects' Actual scores obtained from the 16 PF, the ACL, and the DES II and the subjects' Perceived scores obtained from the ratings they gave themselves on the twenty-point rating scale designed to measure subjects' perceptions of the thirty-five attributes being measured in themselves. On the basis of the significant positive median correlation, Hypothesis V was retained.

Hypothesis VI

As stated in Chapter One, Hypothesis VI was as follows: Significant differences will be found between the "high-accuracy" subjects' Actual scores and the "low-accuracy" subjects' Actual scores on each of the thirty-five attributes.

To test this hypothesis, it was stated in the null form. No significant differences will be found between the "high-accuracy" subjects' Actual scores and "low-accuracy" subjects' Actual scores on any of the thirty-five attributes.

To treat the data for this hypothesis, it was necessary first to standardize the clients' Actual scores and the subjects' ratings of the clients. This was done by the computer so that each set of scores had a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.
In order to determine which subjects would comprise the "high-accuracy" and "low-accuracy" groups, discrepancy scores were obtained for each subject. This was done by obtaining the absolute differences between the subjects' ratings of the clients and clients' Actual scores, using the standardized scores. These discrepancy scores were summed over the four clients and thirty-five attributes, thus attaining one discrepancy score for each subject. These discrepancy scores were then ranked in order from high to low. The lowest third (fifteen subjects) became the "high-accuracy" group while the highest third (fifteen subjects) became the "low-accuracy" group. The differences between the means of the Actual scores for the two groups were tested. Table VIII contains the mean, standard deviations, and $t$-values for each attribute.

In order to reach the .05 level of significance with 28 degrees of freedom, a $t$ value of 2.048 was required. As indicated in Table VIII, only one of the $t$-values reached this level. For attribute 1, there was a $t$-value of 2.099 ($p = .05$). These results indicated that with the exception of one attribute no significant differences existed between the "high-accuracy" subjects and the "low-accuracy" subjects on the attributes measured. Therefore the null hypothesis was retained. This necessitated rejecting the working hypothesis that there would be significant differences between the "high-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Accuracy</td>
<td>Low Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td>15.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>13.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-11.00</td>
<td>-14.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>23.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>21.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accuracy" group and the "low-accuracy" group on each attribute measured.

Summary

This chapter has presented the results of the statistical treatment of the data obtained in this study. The data were analyzed using the Pearson Product-moment Coefficients of Correlation and the t-test for differences between means.

Results of the procedure utilized to test Hypotheses I through IV yielded few significant positive correlations. Such findings indicate that there was little relationship between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the clients' scores. There, likewise, tended to be little relationship between the subjects' ratings of the clients and the subject's own scores. The correlations for Hypothesis V were significant, signifying that there was a relationship between the way subjects scored on the series of paper and pencil inventories and the way they perceived themselves on the rating scales. When differences between the means of the "high-accuracy" subjects' and "low-accuracy" subjects' Actual scores for each attribute were tested, only one significant difference was found.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RESULTS, NONSTATISTICAL OBSERVATIONS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was designed to investigate the ability of counselors to perceive accurately certain personality factors, needs, and emotions in clients following an initial interview. Further, it was designed to determine whether the ratings counselors gave to clients on these attributes were related to the counselors' own possession of the attributes. The study sought to determine the accuracy of the counselors' self-perceptions. Finally, it was designed to test differences between counselors who were accurate in perception of client attributes and those who were less accurate.

Forty-five counselors-in-training who were enrolled in the master's level counseling practicum at North Texas State University during the spring semester of 1976 served as subjects for the study. The Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire, the Adjective Check List, and the Differential Emotions Scale II were administered to the subjects. Following this, they were asked to rate their possession of thirty-five attributes measured by the standardized instruments using a twenty-point nonstandardized rating scale.
Approximately two weeks later, the subjects viewed a series of four video-taped counseling sessions. The video tapes had been made especially for this study. They were twenty-minute initial counseling sessions. The interviewer was a doctoral level counseling intern from North Texas State University. The clients were four university students who volunteered for the project. They were screened ahead of time to determine whether they had a presenting problem appropriate for counseling in this setting and whether they were willing to talk fully about themselves. The clients also completed the 16 PF, the ACL, the DES II, and the twenty-point self-rating scale. The tapes were judged by members of the graduate faculty in counseling at North Texas for authenticity and quality before use in the study.

Following the viewing of each tape, the subjects were asked to rate the client using the twenty-point rating scale which they had previously used to rate themselves. The four taped counseling sessions were viewed and each client was rated by each counselor during one class period.

The design of the study yielded five sets of data. They are as follows:

1. Subjects' Actual scores
2. Subjects' Perceived scores
3. Clients' Actual scores
4. Clients' Perceived scores
5. Subjects' ratings of the clients.
Results

To carry out the purposes of the study, six hypotheses were generated. Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficients were obtained to test Hypotheses I through V. The data for Hypothesis VI were tested using a t-test for significant differences between means. The results were tested for significance at the .05 level. The hypotheses and the results of each are as follows.

I. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the client's Actual scores.

This hypothesis was rejected because correlations between the subjects' ratings and the Client's Actual scores for only one client out of four reached the level of significance required.

II. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the client's Perceived scores.

This hypothesis was rejected because correlations between the subjects' ratings and the client's Perceived scores for only one client out of four reached the level of significance required.

III. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the subjects' Actual scores.
This hypothesis was rejected because very few of the correlations obtained reached the required level of significance. However, this was viewed as a positive result since it is desirable that counselors not project their own attributes onto the client.

IV. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' ratings of the client and the subjects' Perceived scores.

This hypothesis was rejected because very few of the correlations obtained reached the required level of significance.

V. There will be a significant positive correlation between the subjects' Actual scores and the subjects' Perceived scores.

This hypothesis was accepted because thirty of a possible forty-five correlations obtained reached the .05 level of significance.

VI. Significant differences will be found between the "high accuracy" subjects' Actual scores and the "low accuracy" subjects' Actual scores for each of the thirty-five attributes.

The findings were that only one significant difference existed between the means of the Actual scores for those subjects who were in the "high accuracy" group or "low accuracy" group. Therefore, Hypothesis VI was rejected.
Nonstatistical Observations

While not a part of the design of this study, there were some nonstatistical observations of interest. One such observation was the significant negative correlation obtained in the data for Hypothesis III. This negative correlation was obtained between the subjects' estimates of the client's scores and the subjects' Actual scores. The correlation was -.29 (p < .05) on the Sober--Happy-go-lucky attribute as measured by the 16 PF. The hypothesis had predicted a significant positive correlation. The presence of this significant negative correlation shows a tendency for subjects to see the clients very differently from themselves on this particular attribute.

Another observation of interest was the comparison of subjects' self-ratings with their ratings of the clients. Significant positive correlations were obtained between subjects' Actual and Perceived scores. A comparison of this data with the data for Hypothesis I showed that none of the subjects who were judged statistically to be accurate in self-perception judged all four clients accurately. The subject who had the highest correlation (.70) between his own Actual and Perceived scores was able to attain only one statistically significant correlation between his ratings of the client and the client's Actual scores. Only one subject obtained three significant positive correlations between his ratings of the client and the client's Actual scores.
Eight of the thirty accurate self-perceivers obtained no significant positive correlations in rating clients.

When the data were examined to determine whether those who were accurate self-perceivers were more accurate in client perception, it was apparent that as a group they were more accurate. For instance, none of the fifteen inaccurate self-perceivers judged more than one client accurately. Six of the fifteen judged none of the clients accurately. These particular observations, although they have no direct bearing upon this study, might be significant observations in designing another study.

Discussion

This study was designed to evaluate the ability of counselors, especially counselors-in-training, to perceive client attributes following an initial interview. Although Hypotheses I and II were rejected on the basis of few significant findings, a further examination of the data revealed one median coefficient of correlation that was significant at the .05 level. The subjects' ratings of Client 2 revealed a range of correlations from .68 to .06 with a median correlation of .31. Although this median correlation coefficient is low, the fact that it is significant showed that, based on Actual scores for Client 2, subjects were more accurate in their perceptions than for the other three clients.
Client 2 was a male undergraduate student, twenty-five years of age. He had been in the military service prior to returning to school as a full-time student. He was a quiet, soft-spoken person who talked with the interviewer about his reasons for returning to school. When the subjects' ratings of Client 2 were compared with his Perceived scores, the median correlation was .11. An implication of these results was that Client 2 was a transparent, real person in the interview, but did not communicate his own self-perception in the interview. Because the correlations are so low, definitive statements are not possible.

Examination of the data for Hypothesis II showed that the subjects' ratings of Client 1 ranged from .82 to -.25 with a median correlation of .61 which was significant at the .05 level of significance. For this client, subjects were more accurate based upon the client's Perceived scores. Client 1 was an undergraduate student was was very effervescent during her counseling interview. She described herself as "outgoing and friendly." This kind of description may have influenced the subjects in their descriptions of the client. Further, since they saw her as friendly and outgoing, and she evidently saw herself in the same way, the subjects' "implicit personality theory" as described by Cronbach and others (2, 3) may have operated to put together those traits which seemed congruent with a person who is described in this way. None of the other clients had such
vivid or well-defined self-perceptions which they shared during the interview. This seems to be the type of information for which counselors look in counseling sessions and the fact that the perceptions of the subjects matched the perception of the client is understandable. However, the fact that the subjects' perceptions did not match Client 1's Actual scores may also indicate that counselors are influenced by how a client sees himself rather than how he actually is. This is congruent with Browne's subjects who were also influenced by the client's Perceived scores (1).

The lack of significant positive correlations for Hypotheses I and II could be attributable to the fact that these particular counselors-in-training were not sensitive to the four clients whom they rated. It could also be that lack of time influenced their accuracy. The subjects viewed tapes which were only twenty-minutes in length. This small amount of time in which to ascertain thirty-five client attributes was a limiting factor. Time was also a factor in that subjects viewed all four tapes in one class period. Generally, this was done the last half of the three-hour period. Four of the classes were in the evening and it could be the subjects were tired and disinterested by the time the project began.

There is a strong possibility that the restricted ranges of the score distribution may have resulted in depressed correlation coefficients. Perhaps with greater ranges, the
coefficients would have been higher and a greater number of
significant findings could have been reported. Further, the
lack of significant correlations may stem from the compli-
cated nature of the process of person perception. While
ability to perceive another person is vital to counseling,
the measurement of the perception is complex and difficult.
This study may be a reflection of the complexity of this
measurement.

An inspection of the data for Hypotheses III and IV re-
vealed that, for each client, very few correlations of the
subjects' ratings of the client with the subjects' Actual
and Perceived scores reached the level required for signifi-
cance. Since Hypotheses III and IV were intended to describe
the effects of "projection," it can be assumed from these
data that there was little tendency for the subjects to pro-
ject their attributes onto the clients. This was a positive
finding in the study. Browne's subjects exaggerated the
differences between themselves and the client they were rat-
ing. Browne (1) called this process "projection." For the
purposes of this study, it was assumed that since the clients
were typical clients in a normal counseling setting, the sub-
jects would exaggerate similarities rather than differences,
a process which could also be labeled "projection." This
process was present for a few individual subjects but was
not apparent as an overall finding in this study.
In examining individual attributes and the possibility of projection of any one attribute, there were only two for which there were significant positive correlations based upon subjects' Actual scores. These were Nurturance and Interest—Excitement. Correlations, although significant, were low and therefore it cannot be assumed that subjects were exaggerating similarities between themselves and the clients on these attributes. Based upon subjects' Perceived scores, there were three significant positive correlations between subjects' ratings of the clients and the subjects' scores. These were Practical—Imaginative, Aggression, and Disgust—Revulsion. The positive correlations, again, were significant at the .05 level but were low enough not to be definitive. With the exception of the attributes mentioned above, there was little evidence of projection of individual attributes taking place based on either subjects' Actual or Perceived scores.

Hypothesis V was intended to show the relationship between the subjects' Actual scores, how they really are, and the Perceived scores, how they see themselves. The overall result was that these particular subjects were accurate in self-description. When the data were examined, it was interesting to note that for only one subject was the correlation higher than .50. A correlation of .70 was obtained when Subject 40's Actual scores were correlated with the Perceived scores. These results might be interpreted different ways.
Since two-thirds of the subjects had significant positive correlations between the Actual and Perceived scores, it might be stated that these particular subjects were very accurate in self-perception. On the other hand, since none of the significant correlations were very high, it might be stated that these subjects had attained some degree of accurate self-perception but not impressively so.

Limitations and weaknesses of the study notwithstanding, some pertinent information was gathered. From the data at hand, it seemed that these particular subjects, counselors-in-training, were not able to perceive a wide variety of client attributes, including personality factors, needs, and emotions. This made credible a point often lamented among practicum supervisors that their students know the correct counseling responses but do not know when or why to use them. Perhaps the counseling practicum is completed too late in the master's level program to find out that the student is only a technician. Attempts should be made earlier to teach more accuracy in person perception.

Self-perception is an important aspect of counseling. Rogers, Kelly, and others (6, 4, 7) have noted the effect of the self of the counselor as a datum in the counseling interview. McMahan and Wicas found public school counselors were "doers" rather than "thinkers." They described counselors as repressed individuals, not given to introspection or self-analysis. The investigators concluded that this type of
counselor, confronted by an emotional client would find communication between himself and the client closed, become threatened by the client's behavior and bring to fore his own defense mechanisms, or become irrationally identified with the client. They were firm in the stand that these behaviors are impassable barriers and without self-analysis on the part of the counselor cannot be crossed. They further stated, "This raises a very serious issue in counselor selection and education. Is there any effort made to develop within the counselor-trainees an awareness and alertness to the dynamics of their own behavior which might allow for insight into human behavior and its vagaries?" (5, p. 81).

The present study found that these counselors-in-training were somewhat self-perceptive but were not accurate in their perceptions of the clients. It appeared that the master's level counseling program did not offer real opportunity for counselors-in-training to become highly introspective or open about themselves or to become fully aware of personality attributes, needs, and emotions of clients.

Conclusions

From this study it can be concluded that these particular counselors-in-training were somewhat inaccurate in their perceptions of clients' personality attributes, needs, and emotions. Because a fairly large number—forty-five—subjects were used, and since the counseling program at this University
is representative of other counseling programs, the findings could be generalized to say that the master's level counselors-in-training may not possess the ability to perceive accurately client personality traits, needs, or emotions following an initial interview.

The general findings indicated that the counselors-in-training were not "projecting" their own attributes onto the clients. However, closer inspection of the data indicated that some significant correlations existed for individual attributes. There were a few positive correlations between the ratings the subjects gave clients and the subjects' Actual and Perceived scores. Based on these data and previous findings by Browne (1), it can be concluded that it is important to warn counselors-in-training of the possibility that their own personality, needs, and emotions may affect what they see in their clients.

The findings pointed to the need for more training and teaching in the area of person perception while the student is in the master's level counseling program. This need is two-fold. There is need for counselors-in-training to become more aware of their own personality, needs, and emotions, along with becoming more aware of these attributes in their clients. Accuracy in person perception can be improved, and so it is concluded here that some consideration of this should be given in planning for a master's level counseling program.
Further, it can be concluded that more research in person perception is needed in the field of counselor education. Research designed to assess accuracy and the projection-process and the relationship between self-perception and client-perception are needed.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study, it is recommended

1. that a similar study be conducted using doctoral level counseling students as subjects and/or counselors in the field;

2. that a study be designed which would utilize more clients to allow for a better statistical design;

3. that a study be conducted in which time for viewing the video-taped counseling sessions was not a limiting factor;

4. that a new study be designed in which the subjects rate persons they observe as well as persons with whom they interact in counseling;

5. that a similar study be done in which comparisons are made between a counselor's perceptions of a client after one interview and subsequent interviews;

6. that in future studies, instruments should be used that would provide a wider range of scores than some of the instruments in the present study in order to improve the
change for finding significant correlations between variables;

7. that a study be made to determine whether or not accuracy in person perception is related to counseling effectiveness;

8. that, as a part of their course of study, master's level counselors be given direct help in forming perceptions of client, either by a direct teaching method, or by feedback techniques in courses earlier in the program than the counseling practicum.
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RATING SCALE

Traits Based on the 16PF

Reserved
(detached, cool)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Outgoing
(warmhearted, participating)

Less Intelligent
(concrete-thinking)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
More Intelligent
(abstract-thinking, bright)

Affected by Feelings
(emotionally less stable, easily upset)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Emotionally Stable
(faces reality, calm, mature)

Humble
(mild, accommodating, conforming)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Assertive
(independent, aggressive)

Sober
(prudent, serious, taciturn)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Happy-go-lucky
(impulsively lively, enthusiastic)

Expedient
(evades rules, feels few obligations)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Conscientious
(persevering, rule-bound)

Shy
(restrained, diffident, timid)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Venturesome
(socially-bold, uninhibited, spontaneous)

Tough-Minded
(self-reliant, realistic, no-nonsense)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Tender-Minded
(dependent, overprotected, sensitive)

Trusting
(adaptable, free of jealousy, easy to get along with)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Suspicious
(self-opinionated, hard to fool)

Practical
(careful, conventional, proper)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Imaginative
(wrapped up in inner urgencies, careless of practical matters)

APPENDIX A
RATING SCALE, cont'd.

**Forthright**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(natural, artless, sentimental)  

**Shrewd**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(calculating, worldly, penetrating)  

**Placid**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(self-assured, confident, serene)  

**Apprehensive**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(worrying, depressive, troubled)  

**Conservative**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(respecting established ideas)  

**Experimenting**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(critical, liberal, analytical, free thinking)  

**Group-dependent**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
"joiner", and sound follower)  

**Self-sufficient**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(prefers own decisions, resourceful)  

**Undisciplined**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(Self-Conflict)  
(careless of protocol, follows own urges)  

**Controlled**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(socially precise, exacting will power)  

**Relaxed**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(tranquil, unfrustrated, composed)  

**Tense**  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20  
(frustrated, driven, overwrought)
### RATING SCALE

Traits based on the ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Almost totally lacks this trait</th>
<th>About average</th>
<th>Has this trait to a strong degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-control</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious, responsive to obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude toward life, optimism, cheerfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Counseling Readiness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready for help, will likely profit from help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Achievement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strives to be outstanding in pursuits of socially recognized significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affiliation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to sustain numerous personal friendships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autonomy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts independently of others or of social values and expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aggression</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in behaviors which attack or hurt others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dominance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks and sustains leadership roles in groups - seeks to be influential and controlling in individual relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nurturance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in behaviors which extend material or emotional benefits to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Succorance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicits sympathy, affection or emotional support from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Deference</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks and sustains subordinate roles in relationship to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RATING SCALE
Traits based on the DES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Almost totally lacks this trait</th>
<th>About Average</th>
<th>Has this trait to a strong degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest-Excitement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrating, attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment-Joy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glad, merry, joyful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise-Startle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden reaction to something unexpected, astonished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress-Anxious</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad, unhappy, miserable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust-Revulsion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversion, distaste, feels sickened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-Rage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile, furious, enraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear-Terror</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared, afraid, terrified, panicked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt-Scorn</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneering, derisive, haughty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUDGING VIDEO TAPES

1. Do you feel this counseling session to be an average, above average, or below average initial session?

2. Could you form a statement about this client's personality and needs on the basis of this interview?

3. Could you form an opinion of the nature of the client's problem or problems?

4. Could you make recommendations regarding further counseling, referral, or other plans for treatment based on this interview?

5. Could you form a statement concerning the general affect being expressed by this client?

6. Is the nature of topics covered similar to those a counselor might experience in an educational or counseling center setting?

7. Would you consider this a typical client?

8. Does the counselor elicit pertinent information without probing?

9. Is the video tape clear and understandable?

10. Does the counselor distract your attention from the client?
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