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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Although much research has been directed to the question of critical factors which influence therapeutic change in clients during the counseling relationship, the results of this research have been confusing. For example, the literature contains evidence that all schools of psychotherapy produce therapeutic change in some people (Berenson and Carkhuff, 1967). However, some therapists produce improvements while others create decrements in the level of client adjustment (Bergin, 1963, 1966; Truax, 1963; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963). Furthermore, Truax and Carkhuff (1967) have emphasized that such counselor qualities as congruency, empathy, acceptance, warmth, and sensitivity are important predictors of positive gain in therapy. However, it is apparent also that these counselor qualities are not necessary and sufficient conditions for therapeutic change in all people (Krumboltz, 1966). Bergin (1966) stated that therapeutic progress also varies as a function of such therapist qualities as adequacy of adjustment and experience in addition to warmth and empathy. Finally, to complicate matters further, Eysenck (1952) suggested that no very good evidence exists that psychotherapy works at all.

Some tentative conclusions can be drawn from the literature. The counseling relationship variables which influence positive
therapeutic outcome are at least numerous, difficult to isolate, and lacking in generalizability from one counseling situation to another. The past decade, however, has seen a positive trend emerge: an increasing number of investigators suggest, more or less explicitly, that psychologists and counselors should be asking how psychotherapy can best be made more effective, rather than asking whether "psychotherapy" works (Bandura, 1961; Hyman and Berger, 1965; Kiesler, 1966). Research seems best directed toward answering the question of which people, in what circumstances, responding to what therapeutic stimuli, result in the most positive therapeutic outcome (Sanford, 1953).

Common to most forms of psychotherapy is the presence of both a "therapist" and a "patient" or "client" in a dyadic relationship and it seems that some aspect of their relationship may be central to the changes which occur in the client during psychotherapeutic interventions of whatever form. Since, as Tyler (1961) stated, the initial interview provides the basis for the total relationship established in the client-counselor dyad, the logical point at which to begin examination of such a relationship is at the beginning, as the participants enter it.

Each participant enters the psychotherapy situation with complex sets of expectations about himself, his co-participant, the psychotherapy process, and the eventual outcome. These expectations significantly affect both the client's and the counselor's perception of the other dyad member (Grossack, 1953; Kelley, 1949, 1950; Newcomb, 1956; Warr and Knapper, 1966). According to Kumar and Pepinsky (1965), these client-counselor expectations may, in addition, have
determining effects upon therapeutic process and outcome. It is known, for example, that dyadic communication is a function of the "cognitive similarity" of its members (Triandis, 1960). Also, Heine and Trosman (1960) stated that the variable which appears to be significant for continuance of therapy is that of mutuality of expectations between patient and therapist. It seems important, therefore, that expectational discrepancies in the client-counselor dyad be minimized for greater therapeutic success. In fact, there is considerable theoretical support for the idea that reduction of expectational discrepancies is one of the prime functional requirements of interaction systems (Lennard and Bernstein, 1967). Further, Frank (1961), urged the psychotherapist to be mindful of the need to mobilize the patient's expectancies and suggested that adequate methods of diagnosis will eventually include estimates of the therapeutic approach most likely to capitalize upon this potential strength brought to therapy by the client. Clearly, the expectations of client and counselor involve, to some extent, attitudes about the potential counseling relationship to be established in the dyad.

It has long been assumed that the relationship between the participants in psychotherapy is important to the nature and outcome of the therapeutic process (Snyder, 1961). Research evidence, too, supports such a contention. One group of investigators (Kamin and Caughlin, 1963) found the most important variable influencing prognosis (on the basis of data from interviews one to two years after therapy termination) was client attitude toward the therapist, clearly relevant to the relationship between the two. These investigators
stated, in the summary of their research report: "The study high-
lights the crucial nature of a positive relationship between the
two partners in the psychotherapy process" (p.667).

Consistently, the elements of this relationship have been given
much attention in the literature and some agreements have emerged.
Fiedler (1950) found no significant differences among therapists of
differing schools in their opinions of what constitutes the ideal
therapeutic relationship. Gross characteristics seen as desirable
in therapists included warmth, empathy, acceptance and understanding.
Also, such qualities as empathy, acceptance, congruency, warmth and
sensitivity have been shown to be present to a greater degree in
counselors rated as effective than in counselors rated less effective
(Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). In addition, Barrett-Lennard (1962)
found that more therapeutic change occurred in those clients who
perceived greater empathy, congruency, unconditional positive regard,
and a high level of regard in their therapist than in those clients
who did not have such perceptions. These results give support to the
contention that client perceptions of the therapist influence the
counseling relationship and eventual therapeutic outcome.

It is interesting to note, however, that many psychologists have
recently begun to suggest that psychotherapy, and the therapeutic
relationship, are but one form of interpersonal interaction, and that
directions for psychotherapy research might be suggested quite profit-
ably by other disciplines which deal with such interactions (Goldstein,
1966; Goldstein, Heller and Sechrest, 1966). This view has been
succinctly stated by Matarazzo (1965):
Those psychotherapists who heretofore have seemed to make a fetish of such concepts as "the process" of psychotherapy, or who exalted "the transference" relationship to a position of almost religious pre-eminence will learn, to their surprise I believe, that such mystical phenomena are probably little more than what occurs in most, if not all, social interactions; and that the same general laws and principles which are relevant to the study of other behavior also apply to the study of psychotherapy (p.218).

One facet of the interpersonal interaction which has been dealt with in non-psychotherapeutic settings is the role of anticipations which the participants bring to the encounter. Perceptual theorists have long recognized the fact that people tend to see what they expect to see. Similarly, the role of "set" or "anticipation" or "expectation" has been demonstrated clearly in a large number of experimental studies. Goldstein (1962) has reviewed some of this relevant material in his book Therapist-Patient Expectancies in Psychotherapy. The question exists, then, as to what effect client and counselor expectations for relationship qualities have on the perceived developed counseling relationship and, hence, therapeutic outcome.

Of the many factors that influence how client or counselor perceives his dyad partner, the personality trait of dogmatism has been shown to be of some importance. If a person's degree of dogmatism can be shown to influence his expectations, perceptions, and behavior in interpersonal contexts, this knowledge would be of value in understanding client-counselor relationships.

Rokeach (1960) has proposed that a person's belief-disbelief system (degree of dogmatism) influences his perception of experience. The person who is less dogmatic tends to be more aware of his own
reactions to stimuli, has less need to distort meanings, and considers ideas mainly on their merits. Further he experiences less threat and anxiety, and is more permissive in his relationships with others. The dogmatic individual, however, is less aware of his reactions to stimuli, tends to distort meanings in relation to earlier beliefs, and is less permissive in his interpersonal relationships.

Psychological openness also refers to a relatively high degree of self-communication, that is, the extent to which one is aware of one's own feelings, desires, and impulses determines one's degree of openness or dogmatism. The open-minded, according to Kemp (1961), approach new experiences with a minimum of defensiveness, insecurity, and threat as contrasted with the closed-minded who are inclined to ignore, rationalize, project or narrow in their attempts to deal with new experiences.

Psychological openness refers to the extent one understands the thoughts and feelings of others (Allen, 1967) in addition to a knowledge and understanding of self. This view has direct implications for the development of the counseling relationship. For example, Allen regards the psychological openness of the counselor to be an essential factor in the establishment of an interpersonal atmosphere conducive to client exploration. A counselor's lack of insight or knowledge of himself may serve as a basis for distortion of perceptual processes which could result in a barrier to effective communication (Fenichel, 1945; Rogers, 1951; Tyler, 1961). However, counseling relationships occur within a dyadic framework, according to Jourard...
(1964), and are in part a function of the ability of both client and
counselor to risk self recognition or openness. This position recog­
nizes that the client and counselor each contribute to the establish­
ment of the relationship and emphasizes the importance of considering
both dyad partners when investigating the effect of dogmatism on
counseling effectiveness.

Several lines of converging theory regarding the counseling
process are then apparent. Clients and counselors hold certain
expectations for the counseling relationship, and positive client
perceptions of this are thought necessary for therapeutic gain.
When client and counselor enter the dyadic framework of counseling,
the potential exists for compatible or incompatible expectations.
The initial perceptions of the encounter by both dyad partners seem
to influence the establishment of the relationship and the eventual
outcome of counseling. If a discrepancy exists within the dyad
between expectations and initial perceptions of the counseling
relationship, the extent to which each participant is able to adjust
his expectations may influence the degree of counseling success.
This ability to adapt and adjust expectations is partly dependent
upon each participant's level of open-mindedness or dogmatism.

If it can be shown that expectations, perceptions of the
counseling relationship after the initial interview, and discrep­
cies between expectations and initial perceptions of the counseling
relationship within the dyad do vary as a function of dogmatism
levels, better decisions can be made regarding the assigning of
clients to counselors for maximum positive results. Also, this
information would add to our knowledge of the counseling relationship and process, in addition to providing data of value to counselor educators with regard to the ability of counselor trainees to establish relationships with their clients and effect positive therapeutic change.

The present study had as a goal the investigation of the relation between dogmatism and counseling relationship expectational and perceptual discrepancies in the client-counselor dyad. To accomplish the dyadic approach, the present study investigated the relation that client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism have with dyadic counseling relationship congruency. Dyadic counseling relationship congruency was conceptualized as the discrepancy between the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship, and the discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship following the initial interview and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship following the initial interview. Symbolically, the study investigated the relation that client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism have with:

\[
\left[ (E_{cl} - E_{co}) - (P_{cl} - P_{co}) \right]
\]

where \( E_{cl} \) represents the expectations of the client for the counseling relationship, \( E_{co} \) indicates the expectations of the counselor for the counseling relationship, \( P_{cl} \) denotes the counseling relationship perceptions of the client following the initial interview, and \( P_{co} \) symbolizes the counseling relationship perceptions of the counselor after the initial interview.
Several subproblems involving the relation between dogmatism and various other aspects of counseling relationship expectations and perceptions in the client-counselor dyad were also investigated.

Statement of the Problem

The present study investigated the relation that client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism have with dyadic counseling relationship congruency.

Also investigated was the relation between:

a. dogmatism and client expectations of the counseling relationship;

b. dogmatism and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship;

c. client-counselor dogmatism and client perceptions of the counseling relationship;

d. client-counselor dogmatism and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship;

e. client-counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship;

f. client-counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship;

g. client-counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship;
h. client-counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between
counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and
counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Statement of the Hypotheses

$H_1$: There is a relation between dyadic counseling relationship
congruency and client dogmatism.

$H_2$: Counselor dogmatism is related to dyadic counseling rela-
tionship congruency.

$H_3$: Dyadic counseling relationship congruency is related to the
interaction of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism.

$H_4$: Client expectations of the counseling relationship are
related to client dogmatism.

$H_5$: There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and
counselor expectations of the counseling relationship.

$H_6$: Client perceptions of the counseling relationship are
related to client dogmatism.

$H_7$: There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and
client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

$H_8$: Client perceptions of the counseling relationship are
related to the interaction of client dogmatism and
counselor dogmatism.

$H_9$: Client dogmatism is related to counselor perceptions
of the counseling relationship.

$H_{10}$: Counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship
are related to counselor dogmatism.
H\textsubscript{11}: There is a relation between the interaction of client
dogmatism and counselor dogmatism and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H\textsubscript{12}: The discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship is related to client dogmatism.

H\textsubscript{13}: There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship.

H\textsubscript{14}: The discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship is related to the interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism.

H\textsubscript{15}: Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H\textsubscript{16}: The discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

H\textsubscript{17}: The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.
H_{18}: Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H_{19}: The discrepancy between client expectations and client perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

H_{20}: The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H_{21}: Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H_{22}: The discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

H_{23}: The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Definition of Terms

Several terms are used interchangeably: client, patient, and counselee; counselor and therapist; counseling, therapy, and psycho-
therapy. This is not to imply that "counseling" and "psychotherapy" are necessarily identical procedures, although a review of the literature suggests that an argument can be developed for this position. The present focal concern, however, is with client and counselor expectations and perceptions, and it is contended that client and counselor expectations and perceptions play equivalent roles in counseling and psychotherapy. Hence, the distinction between these two endeavors is not especially relevant to the present paper, and will not be made.

**Client expectations** A hypothetical construct to designate the extent to which a client feels certain qualities will be present in his relationship with a counselor, as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

**Client perceptions** A hypothetical construct to designate the extent to which a client feels certain qualities are present in his relationship with a counselor, as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

**Client-counselor dyad** Two units, client and counselor, regarded as one.

**Counseling relationship** A hypothetical construct to designate the inferred affective character of the observable interaction between a client and counselor restricted to perceptions, as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

**Counselor expectations** A hypothetical construct to designate the extent to which a counselor feels his client will see him with regard to certain relationship qualities, as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.
Counselor perceptions  A hypothetical construct to designate how a counselor feels his client saw him with regard to certain relationship qualities, as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

Dogmatism  A hypothetical construct designating the extent to which a person's belief system is open or closed, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. A detailed discussion of dogmatism can be found in The Open and Closed Mind (Rokeach, 1960).

Dyadic counseling relationship congruency  The discrepancy between the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship, and the discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Personal-social problems  Problems focused on issues involving individual actions that are determined by other persons or by socially modified objects. Included are reactions to culture patterns, customs and mores, social institutions, the adjustments to domestic life and social groups, and to community requirements (English and English, 1958).

Organization of the Study

In Chapter II a review of selected relevant research is presented. The methodology of the study is discussed in Chapter III, and an analysis of the data in Chapter IV; the summary conclusions, discussion, and interpretations and implications follow in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH

The basic question proposed by this study focuses on the extent to which different levels of client-counselor dogmatism influence the discrepancies between the expectations and perceptions that clients and counselors hold of the counseling relationship before and following the initial interview. A review of literature contingent upon each of the variables constituting the research question, as well as their relationship to one another, is examined in this chapter.

Related research primarily concerned with (1) the client-counselor dyad, (2) expectations and the counseling process, (3) the counseling relationship, (4) the initial interview and the counseling relationship, (5) dogmatism and the counseling process, (6) dogmatism and initial perception formation, and (7) dogmatism and resistance to change, is reviewed.

The Client-Counselor Dyad

Much research has been done on the subject of psychotherapeutic effectiveness with confusing and sometimes contradictory results (Berenson and Carkhuff, 1967; Bergin, 1963, 1966; Eysenck, 1952; Krumboltz, 1966; Truax, 1963; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963, 1967). Some of this research consists of studies which examine client variables related to the counseling relationship (Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958; Parloff, 1961; Snyder, 1961). Other studies are investigations
into counselor variables related to the counseling relationship (Ashby, Ford, Guerney and Guerney, 1957; Brams, 1961; Fiedler and Senior, 1952). However, according to Leary (1955), to completely understand the counseling relationship, both sides of the counseling interaction, client and counselor, must be studied together as a dyadic relationship. The counseling relationship, then, is neither client nor counselor alone, but both interacting together as one and affecting each other and the interaction between them during the counseling process. Following is a review of research pertaining to the client-counselor dyad.

While many studies have related client or therapist personality variables to specific outcomes (Arbuckle, 1956; Aronson, 1953; Heilbrun, 1961; Holt and Luborsky, 1958; Rubenstein and Lorr, 1957), a limited few have taken into account the personality structure of both members of the counseling or therapeutic relationship. Cook (1966) studied the influence of client-counselor value similarity on client and counselor change in meaning of certain selected concepts during brief counseling, defined as two to five sessions. The clients in this study were seventy university students consisting of thirty-six females and thirty-four males. A total of forty-two advanced counselor trainees served as counselors for these clients. Prior to counseling, both clients and counselors completed the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values Scale and were assigned to high, medium, or low value similarity categories. The clients responded to the Osgood Semantic Differential before and after counseling on each of the following concepts: "me," "the ideal student," "my future occupation,"
and "education." Results of the study indicated that a more positive client evaluation of "education" and "my future occupation" occurred in dyads with a medium degree of client-counselor value similarity. No significant difference at the desired level was found between client-counselor value similarity and "me" and "the ideal student." Other studies of the dyadic nature of the counseling relationship also emphasize the importance of, as Butler (1952) stated, viewing the client-counselor interaction as a two-way personal-social interaction.

Lesser (1961) investigated the relationship between counselor awareness of dyadic similarity in terms of self-concept similarity, as measured by Q-sort methodology, and psychotherapeutic progress. Lesser reported that counselor awareness of the extent of dyadic similarity was positively related to client progress in therapy; however, client-counselor self-concept similarity was negatively related to progress. Also, self-concept similarity between patient and therapist was not related to empathy scores. These results would seem to indicate that attempting to group clients and counselors with similar self-concepts to facilitate greater therapeutic progress is not effective. The results do not, however, obviate the possibility of identifying the dyadic-personality types which are most likely to produce the greatest therapeutic gain.

In another effort at specifying dyad personality types most likely to result in counseling effectiveness, Carson and Heine (1962) investigated patient-therapist personality similarity, as measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), as a factor in client improvement, determined by judges' ratings. The most
effective therapists in facilitating client gain were neither strongly similar nor dissimilar to their client's personality. Carson and Heine concluded that high patient-therapist similarity reduced therapist objectivity, and that high dissimilarity negatively influenced therapist empathy. Again, there appears to be evidence against the argument for similarity dyad grouping to promote therapist client gain.

Evidence from another quarter, however, raises the possibility that an important aspect of the counseling interaction is not being given proper consideration. The previously mentioned studies may be investigating variables incidental to counseling effectiveness and the counseling process as criteria for dyad grouping. Literature exists to suggest that the style preferences or expectations client and counselor hold for the counseling situation may exert more influence on counseling effectiveness than certain other personality variables present in the dyad (Carson and Heine, 1962; Vogel, 1961).

In an investigation of the relation between client-counselor similarity on a test assessing cognitive and perceptual style preferences to the length of stay in counseling, Mendlesohn and Geller (1963) administered the Meyer-Briggs Type Indicator (MB-TI) to seventy-two freshman client S's (forty-one females and thirty-one males) and ten counselors (six females and four males) at the University of California Counseling Center in Berkeley. A difference score, defined as the sum of the absolute differences between the scores of the client and his counselor on each of the four dimensions, Judgment-Perception, Thinking-Feeling, Sensation-Intuition, and
Extroversion-Introversion, was calculated for each client-counselor pair. Results of the study indicated that the greater the client-counselor difference score for each dimension, the fewer the number of counseling sessions. The greater the similarity in style preferences of client and counselor, as indicated by a smaller difference score, the greater the number of counseling sessions in a series. These findings tend to support the contention of Axelrod (1951), Heine and Trosman (1960), Snyder (1961), and Tuma and Gustad (1951) that high client-counselor similarity is related to a better counseling relationship. The critical point seems to be that high client-counselor similarity with regard to style preferences or expectations is related to longer duration in counseling and also, perhaps, to a better counseling relationship.

While it can be argued that a longer counseling duration for those clients interacting with counselors similar to themselves in style preferences does not mean a better counseling relationship has been established than in dissimilar dyads, it can also be argued that clients would not return if they were not satisfied with the counseling and optimistic about its results. Mendlesohn and Geller (1963) stated that a high difference score in their study can be thought of as an index of the inability of the client and counselor to communicate with each other. A low difference score indicates compatible style preferences in the dyad, a condition which seems to facilitate stay in counseling. Perhaps this kind of compatibility or dyad similarity also promotes the establishment of a productive counseling relationship and positive therapeutic gain.
Mendlesohn and Geller (1963) continued by stating that counselors who are different from their clients in regard to style preferences and the feeling about the ability to communicate will not be anxious to retain those clients in counseling and may terminate them early or, by their behavior, induce clients to terminate early. The implication is that some counselors who have style preferences different from their clients seem to have difficulty adjusting to those clients, providing a satisfying and productive counseling relationship, and maintaining an ongoing counseling experience for the client. A further implication is that some clients with style preferences different from their counselors seem to have difficulty adjusting to those counselors and facilitating the mutual client-counselor movement toward the establishment of a productive counseling relationship.

Vogel (1961), in a study with some meaning for the present investigation, studied authoritarianism in the psychotherapeutic relationship. The California F Scale and an instrument which described the ideal therapeutic relationship was administered to sixty-two patients and forty-nine therapists in two clinic populations. After the second session, the therapist rated the quality of the relationship and estimated patient satisfaction. In addition, ratings of segments of the interviews were made by judges with regard to the quality of the counseling relationship. Both the therapists and judges responded to the extent that they perceived two relationship criterion items to be present in the interview.

Vogel reported that similarity of patient-therapist authoritarianism did not seem to facilitate a positive counseling relationship.
Relationship ratings and the similarity between patient and therapist ratings of the extent to which the therapist should behave in an authoritarian manner were related significantly.

These findings seem to dispute the argument that, for example, high authoritarian dyads will exhibit less ability for adjustment to reduce expectational incongruity within the dyad and facilitate the establishment of a productive counseling relationship than low authoritarian dyads. It should be noted, however, that the study does report a significant relation between the expectations which patient and therapist have for the authoritarian behavior of the therapist and relationship ratings. Perhaps consideration should have been given to client-counselor expectations for other aspects of the counseling situation as well. For example, no consideration was given to expectations of the criterion relationship qualities client and counselor brought to the counseling situation. It is conceivable that client and counselor may expect little from the interaction in terms of the criterion relationship qualities, and hence rate the counseling relationship low, even though their perceptions of the quality of the relationship are higher than the initial expectations.

Also, although the study moves toward a dyadic consideration of the counseling situation, only the therapists and judges rated the quality of the relationship. The patients' perceptions of the extent to which the criterion measures were present were not considered. It is possible that even though the therapists and judges rated the relationship quality low, the clients, for whom counseling
is intended, may have perceived a more positive relationship present.

Another potential weakness of the study exists: High authoritarian dyads were classified as highly similar to low authoritarian dyads. A question exists as to whether this similarity classification is justified. One would reasonably expect that low authoritarian clients and counselors might more easily adjust to one another and facilitate the establishment of a positive counseling relationship than high authoritarian clients and counselors. Rokeach (1960) and Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levenson, and Sanford (1950), in fact, stated that it is unlikely high authoritarian dyads will establish the same quality relationship as dyads exhibiting low authoritarianism. Tosi (1968), in a study relating dogmatism and client relationship perceptions, provided some substantiation for this speculation by reporting that high authoritarian dyads do not necessarily result in the same relationship quality as low authoritarian dyads, based upon perceptions by the clients.

The study of Tosi (1968), however, neglected to investigate the effect of client and counselor expectations of relationship qualities on the final perceptions of those qualities by clients. It is possible that clients of varying dogmatism levels may differ with respect to their expectations for relationship qualities, and that their final perceptions are more a function of those expectations than what was experienced during the counseling interaction. The next section reviews literature associated with expectations in the counseling process.
Expectations and the Counseling Process

The research literature shows that the perceptions client and counselor have of the other dyad member are affected by the expectations each brings to the counseling situation (Grossack, 1953; Kelley, 1949, 1950; Newcomb, 1956, Warr and Knapper, 1966). It also seems apparent that communication in the dyad and continuance in therapy are a function of the extent to which patient and therapist expectations are congruous (Heine and Trosman, 1960; Triandis, 1960). Lennard and Bernstein (1967) stressed the importance of recognizing the association between client-counselor expectations and the counseling process. In this section, literature pertaining to the relation between expectations within the client-counselor dyad and the counseling process is examined.

Frank, Gliedman, Imber, Nash, and Stone (1957), in a study of client continuance in therapy, hypothesized that discrepancies between what the patient expects therapy to be and what he actually finds it to be may contribute to client dropout rates. Comparisons were made between the dropout rates in group therapy, short-term or "minimal" therapy, and "regular" individual psychotherapy. The results of the study indicated that 44% of the patients assigned to group therapy dropped out of treatment, 27% of the patients in "minimal" therapy (each patient has only one-half as many sessions, each lasting only one-half as long as the "regular") terminated therapy prematurely, and 14% of the patients assigned to "regular" individual psychotherapy decided not to continue. The authors stated
that disconfirmed client expectations may be one factor contributing to this dropout rate.

In another study of client continuance in therapy, Overall and Aronson (1963) investigated the relationship between pre-initial interview expectations and post-initial interview perceptions of psychotherapy among forty lower-class patients. The authors reported that the patients who did not return for therapy tended to be those who showed the greatest discrepancies between expectation and perception.

The Frank et al. (1957) research and the Overall and Aronson (1963) study point to the importance of initial expectations in the counseling process. Heine and Trosman (1960) and Kumar and Pepinsky (1965) underlined this importance by stating that prior client-counselor attitudes may have determining effects upon therapeutic processes and outcome and, further, mutuality of expectation between patient and therapist is the variable which appears to be significant for continuance in therapy.

Certainly, client-counselor role or behavior expectations constitute a part of the prior attitudes present when client and counselor come together for counseling. Lennard and Bernstein (1960) analyzed the first fifty sessions of psychotherapy in eight cases and found that more communications of both patient and therapist were directed toward clarification of role in those cases when there existed greater discrepancy between the client and therapist in role expectations than in those dyads where such large discrepancies did not exist. This result tends to support the speculation of Videbeck and Bates (1959)
that the behavior of people in interaction will inevitably come to be organized by shared role expectations. It also suggests that, in counseling dyads where discrepancies exist between client and counselor expectations, part of the initial interaction must involve a kind of adjusting or reordering of expectations to facilitate a productive counseling relationship.

Friedman (1963) presented evidence that initial client expectations do seem to play a part in positive therapeutic gain. In this study, forty-three outpatients were tested immediately before and immediately after the initial interview to determine the relationship between the clients' initial expectations of improvement and the post-interview report of relief.

The author indicated that the client's post-interview report of relief is dependent to some extent upon the client's initial expectations of improvement, an effect particularly pronounced in patients suffering from anxiety and depressive states. In addition, the expectation of help seems to be activated at the first patient-therapist contact, and may be an important source of symptom reduction in neurotic outpatients. The results seem to imply that clients who interact with counselors who conform to their initial expectations perceive counseling as having been more effective than those who are paired with counselors who do not confirm such expectations. This is similar to a conclusion reached by Zerfas (1965) that subjects whose expectations are confirmed tend to like the therapy more than those whose expectations are disconfirmed.

The literature also contains arguments against the importance
of what Levitt (1966) calls the "expectation-reality discrepancy" or the degree of difference between the client's initial expectations and the actual perceived phenomena of the therapy session. Brady, Zeller, and Reznikoff (1959) stated that the patient's view of the psychotherapist bears little if any relation to the eventual outcome of the therapeutic process. Shaw (1955) wrote that the counselor must establish "mutuality" (rapport; relationship) with a client and then "up-end" the client's expectations to facilitate positive therapeutic gain. This process supposedly rids the client of undesirable or self-defeating expectations and, the author further states, the disconfirmation of some of the client's expectations by the counselor is a precondition to client change. Beisser (1965) also maintained that the therapist must behave in unexpected ways to create the opportunity for client improvement. These authors, however, offer no research evidence to support their positions, and hence their remarks can only be treated as speculation. The literature contains more supporting research for the position taken by Biddle (1958) that "non-conformity by the counselor to perceived norms of the client for the counselor leads to less progress in all phases of the initial interview than does conformity" (p.186).

Lennard and Bernstein (1966) further developed this position by suggesting that "therapy as a social system be conceived of as involving two subsystems, that of communication and that of expectations" (p.179). In an attempt at defining the dimensions of client expectations, Apfelbaum (1958) administered a Q-sort questionnaire designed to measure client expectations to 100 clients in a univer-
sity outpatient clinic before the clients had entered therapy. Through an inverse cluster analysis applied to the data, several emergent factors or dimensions of expectation were identified; "nurturant": a guiding, giving, positive therapist; "critic": a cold, hardboiled, rigid, critical therapist who gives advice but is not concerned whether it is taken or not; and the "model": a well-adjusted, tolerant, permissive, accepting psychotherapist.

In an attempt to relate patient and therapist ratings of patient improvement to certain perceived therapist behaviors, Lorr (1965) administered a sixty-five item inventory of therapist behaviors to 523 patients, all males who had been in treatment at least three months with the Veterans Administration. The results were factor analyzed and five dimensions of perceived therapist behaviors isolated: accepting, understanding, authoritarian, independence-encouraging, and hostile-critical. The author reported a significant correlation between ratings by both patient and therapist of patient improvement and therapist acceptance and understanding dimensions.

From the Apfelbaum (1958) research and the Lorr (1965) study, it seems that clients have definite expectations regarding their counselors' behavior. Also, the extent to which clients perceive their counselors to be accepting and understanding apparently varies with the client and counselor ratings of positive therapeutic gain. It is unfortunate that neither study examined the influence of client expectations for perceived counselor behavior on the final client perceptions and ratings of positive therapeutic gain.

Kumler (1968), in an attempt at integrating the literature on
expectations and perceptions in the counseling process, stated:

Patient expectations about the therapist, patient perceptions of the therapist, and the therapist's behavior (may be) all sampling items from the same general class. It may be that people in general have a relatively clear view of what good interpersonal relationships are like, and expect the therapy situation to conform in large details to this pattern, with a few differences from social settings (p.27).

Expectations, then, regarding some kind of interpersonal relationship quality or behavior seem to be important in client perceptions of the counselor and client gain in therapy.

Kumler's (1968) research was directed toward determining the relation between client expectations of therapist role and initial commitment to psychotherapy. Eight six-minute videotapes of scripted "psychotherapy sessions" were prepared to be shown. Each videotape represented one of eight unique combinations of three variables and two levels of each variable: age of the stimulus-therapist (old or young); directiveness of the stimulus-therapist (directive or non-directive); personal warmth of the stimulus-therapist (warm or cold). Eight independent groups of fifteen undergraduate psychology student S's viewed the videotapes. Each S completed the "expectation Q-sort" once prior to viewing the stimulus videotape and again following the videotape presentation. After the second Q-sorting, each S completed a rating scale of six seven-point items to describe his reaction to the stimulus-therapist which he had seen.

The author reported that the S's reactions to the stimulus-therapist were more favorable if the therapist conformed to the S's expectations of therapist age and therapist warmth. The "warm-cold"
variable was the major correlate of the S's reactions to the stimulus-therapist, among the variables examined, and exerted dramatic influence over the S's willingness to consult the stimulus-therapist professionally. Also, the S's tended to change their expectations in the direction of the characteristics of the stimulus-therapist if the stimulus-therapist was warm, but away from these characteristics if the therapist was cold.

It would appear, therefore, that the clients' initial expectations for the counseling relationship, specifically warmth of the therapist, may indeed influence the therapeutic process and outcome. This result seems especially true for clients who come to the counseling situation expecting to talk about personal problems and about themselves. Bordin (1955) stated that such clients will be likely to see the personal characteristics of the counselor as an important part of the process. Client expectations for personal qualities of the counseling relationship, and the confirmation or disconfirmation of such expectations, could, then, exert an influence on the counseling process and outcome.

The influence of client expectations for certain relationship qualities on the counseling process has been discussed in the literature. Bierman (1966) suggested that the perceptions of the therapist which a client forms, his interaction with the therapist, and his judgments about the therapist are all subject to influence by the client expectations of therapist warmth.

Grosz (1968) studied the effect of client expectations on the counseling relationship. Thirty male client S's from an introductory...
psychology class at the University of North Dakota were randomly assigned to three groups: a positive expectation group which heard a tape indicating the positive aspects of counseling plus an interview judged to be characteristic of effective counseling; a negative expectation group which heard a tape describing the negative aspects of counseling and an interview judged to be characteristic of ineffective counseling; and a control group which was given no formal treatment.

Immediately following the attitude modification sessions the two experimental groups completed the Semantic Differential to establish pre-treatment differences with respect to the subjects' expectations for counseling prior to treatment. Each of the six counselors in the study saw five clients from the positive, negative, and control groups for a thirty-minute initial counseling session. After the counseling session, the clients and counselors completed an appropriate form of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

Results of the study indicated a significant pre-treatment difference in expectations for counseling, with the control and positive groups having a more positive attitude toward counseling than the negative group. No significant differences were found between the positive, negative, and control group in the client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship established.

This study is an interesting attempt at investigating the effect of expectations on the counseling relationship; however, it may suffer from some shortcomings. If, as Kumler (1968) suggested, counseling relationships are an example of interpersonal relation-
ships in general, and if, as suggested by Bordin (1955) and Bierman (1966), expectations of personal qualities of the counseling relationship have an influence on the counseling process and outcome, then expectations about the relationship may be a more powerful variable to investigate than expectations about effective or ineffective counseling. Also, Kumler does not give full consideration to the dyadic nature of the counseling interaction. Although an attempt is made to determine client initial expectations, and client and counselor final perceptions, of the counseling relationship, counselor initial expectations are not considered. Although there are no significant differences among the three experimental groups with regard to the perceived relationship, there is no reason to believe that the final perceived relationship was not positive, and may indicate that all three groups were able to adjust their initial expectations to a level more nearly compatible with reality.

In this section, literature has been reviewed which suggests the influence of expectations on the counseling process, and more specifically the relation between expectations of personal relationship qualities and the counseling process and outcome. It seems clear that the expectations a client has for relationship qualities prior to entering the dyadic framework of counseling can either help or hinder the establishment of a helping or therapeutic relationship (Brammer and Shostrom, 1960; Rogers, 1961).

The following section will review literature pertaining to the counseling relationship and its influence on therapeutic outcome.
The Counseling Relationship

Although many authors, including Ford (1956), Forgy and Black (1954), and Snyder (1957), have stressed numerous techniques as being more or less beneficial for counseling success, an increased emphasis on the association between the counseling relationship and counseling success has developed (Patterson, 1959; Rogers, 1962; Wrenn, 1961). Literature pertaining to the counseling relationship and its relation to counseling outcome will be considered in this section.

In a now classic and often quoted study of the therapeutic relationship, Fiedler (1950) administered a Q-sort of 119 items representing descriptions of patient-therapist relationships to seven therapists of three different psychotherapeutic orientations. The author reported no significant differences in conceptions of the ideal therapeutic relationship. Characteristics seen as desirable in therapists included warmth, empathy, acceptance, and understanding. Therapist characteristics rated undesirable were coldness, hostility, rejection, and authoritarianism. It would seem, then, that one's psychotherapeutic orientation may have little influence on the kind of conditions one believes it important for therapists to have, and, presumably, to project to and be perceived by their clients.

In a similar study, Heine (1950) investigated the perceptions of counseling held by clients who had been counseled by therapists with Adlerian, client-centered, and psychotherapeutic orientations. All clients of the therapists studied reported similar attitude changes after therapy. Clients perceived the most helpful therapists as
being trusting, understanding, and permissive or capable of providing an atmosphere conducive to choice making. Therapists judged least helpful by their clients were perceived to be remote, over-sympathetic, and less interested in the client than therapists judged more helpful. There does seem to be a relation, then, between client perceptions of certain counseling relationship qualities and client opinions of therapist helpfulness. Seeman (1961) suggests that the patient's success in coping with life situations after psychotherapy is related to the mutual liking and respect between the counselor and client.

Dittes (1957) conducted a study designed to investigate the relation between therapist relationship qualities and client behavior, by examining the effect of different levels of therapist relationship qualities on client anxiety or threat. The Galvanic Skin Response (GSR) was used to measure client anxiety or threat, and judges rated the degree of therapist permissiveness, warmth, and acceptance present during the counseling interaction with each client.

The author reported that when the therapists were variable in their attitudes to clients, the number of GSR deviations significantly increased over that observed when the therapists provided consistently high levels of relationship qualities. Also, when the therapists displayed a lack of acceptance and warmth, clients experienced more anxiety or threat than when the therapists exhibited high levels of those qualities. It would seem, therefore, that perceived therapist behavior does make a difference to the client in terms of experienced anxiety or threat.

In a study of client and therapist perceptions of relationship
qualities and client change, Barrett-Lennard (1962) related the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory responses of forty-two clients and twenty-one therapists to several objective measures of change. After the fifth interview and again following the final session, the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory was administered to both the client and counselor.

More therapeutic change occurred in those clients who perceived greater empathy, unconditional positive regard, congruency, and a high level of regard in their therapists early in the series of interviews than in those clients who did not have such perceptions in the initial stages. Barrett-Lennard (1962) concluded that if the client perceives the therapist as being congruent, empathic, and unconditional in his regard for the client, change is better predicted and facilitated. Also, the clients of more experienced therapists perceived more of these attitudinal conditions than those of the less experienced therapist group. Finally, clients who were better adjusted at the beginning of therapy perceived more of these therapeutic conditions in their therapists than those less well adjusted clients.

In regard to the final result, it may be that clients who are better adjusted, that is clients who exhibit more or less of a certain personality variable, may perceive high therapeutic conditions as a result of the expectations of therapeutic or relationship qualities they bring to the counseling situation. The better adjusted client may perceive more because he has developed certain expectations based upon his past, mostly favorable interactions with his environment.
In a study also concerned with client change under differing relationship quality conditions, Gross and DeRidder (1966) investigated the relation between client perceptions of relationship variables, as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (congruence, empathy, unconditional positive regard, and level of regard) and client movement in relatively short-term counseling. Client movement was measured by the Experiencing Scale given at different points in time to trained judges rating portions of the second and next-to-last interview. The authors reported a significant correlation between client perceptions of high relationship variable levels and client movement. Gross and DeRidder (1966) concluded that client movement in counseling is accompanied by client perceptions of high levels of therapist congruency, empathy, unconditional positive regard, and levels of regard in counseling of less extended duration.

Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, and Truax (1967), in an extensive study of the therapeutic relationship and counseling gain with schizophrenics, investigated largely unmotivated schizophrenics of lower socio-educational status, who were more or less chronic in their condition, interacting with therapists exhibiting varying levels of relationship qualities. The authors concluded that patients involved in a relationship high in growth-promoting qualities (congruence, unconditional positive regard, empathy) show the greatest degree of constructive personality change.

There is substantial support, then, for the argument that high levels of certain relationship qualities are a necessary, though
perhaps not sufficient, condition for positive therapeutic gain by
the client (Butcher, 1960; Cartwright and Lerner, 1963; Halkides,
1958; Hiler, 1958; Lesser, 1961; Parloff, 1956; Whitehorn and Betz,
1954). There is also reason to believe that the initial client
perceptions of the counseling relationship quality are determinative
of the final relationship established (Tyler, 1961). In the follow­
ing section, literature which stresses the importance of the initial
interview and the counseling relationship is presented.

The Initial Interview and the Counseling Relationship

The counseling relationship has been suggested to be an important
variable in predicting therapeutic outcome (Barrett-Lennard, 1962;
Rogers et al. 1967). In addition, the initial perceptions of the
counselor by the client during the first interview are important in
establishing the counseling relationship considered necessary for
therapeutic change (Grater, 1964; Gross and DeRidder, 1966). Liter­
ature pertaining to the initial interview and the counseling relation­­ship will be reviewed in this section.

The importance of the initial interviews for counseling outcome
is referred to by Truax and Carkhuff (1963) when they concluded, from
a review of the research, that the levels of patient self-exploration
during the initial stages of therapy (the second interview) are
significantly predictive of final therapeutic outcomes from six months
to three and one-half years later. Wagstaff, Rice, and Butler (1960)
reported similar findings when studying specifically client-centered
counseling.
In a study with implications for the present research, Grater (1964) investigated initial interview behavior as a function of client preferences for affective or cognitive counselor characteristics. An adjective check-list, the Cognitive-Affective Inventory, was administered to eighty-six clients. After the initial interview, the counselor completed a form and indicated whether the counseling was primarily personal-social or educational-vocational. A chi-square analysis was used to determine if the first-interview behavior of the Cognitive-Preference group differed from the Affective-Preference group, and a difference significant at the .01 level of probability was observed. The author concluded that clients preferring affective counselor characteristics focused more on personal-social discussions than those clients preferring cognitive counselor characteristics. However, a major characteristic of the counseling interaction is not given consideration. The study does not consider the contribution of client-counselor personality factors within the dyad on client focus upon educational-vocational or personal-social topics. It is reasonable to believe that counselors who prefer clients with problems which have affective characteristics, that is, are personal-social in nature, may be more likely to encourage personal-social topics than those who are educational-vocational in nature.

It is also true that clients who prefer personal-social topics tend to focus more on affective counselor characteristics. Bordin (1955) stated that "clients who come expecting to talk about personal problems and about themselves will be likely to see more personal characteristics of the counselor as an important part of the process" (p.20).
From this review, it seems that the literature presents a thread of continuity with regard to the counseling process. Firstly, the expectations which clients and counselors bring to the counseling relationship influence the perceptions each develops regarding the other partner and the counseling process; secondly, high levels of certain relationship qualities seem necessary for facilitating positive therapeutic gain; thirdly, perceptions formed during the initial interviews may be determinative of the total counseling relationship and final outcome; and fourthly, the expectations client and counselor bring to the dyadic framework of counseling influence the initial perceptions each develops.

Studies have been done which suggest the importance of compatible expectations in the client-counselor dyad for therapeutic progress (Frank et al., 1957; Friedman, 1963; Kumler, 1968; Overall and Aronson, 1963; Zerfas, 1965). It has also been stated that the reduction of expectational discrepancies should be one of the prime functional requirements of interaction systems (Lennard and Bernstein, 1967), and that psychotherapists should be prepared to modify their approaches to meet the expectations of different types of patients (Frank, 1959).

The research suggests that the personality trait factor of dogmatism or authoritarianism has some relation to this facility for reducing expectational discrepancies in the dyad. Literature which focuses upon dogmatism and the counseling process will be reviewed in the following section.
Dogmatism and the Counseling Process

In 1954 Rokeach defined dogmatism as "(a) a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, (b) organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, (c) provides a framework for patterns of intolerance toward others" (p.195). The review of literature regarding dogmatism will be centered about three topics: dogmatism and the counseling process, dogmatism and initial perception formation, and dogmatism and resistance to change.

Since Rokeach's (1960) publication, the concept of dogmatism has been investigated as a counselor personality variable with some influence on the counseling process. Russo, Kelz, and Hudson (1964) investigated the assertion of the Association of Counselor Education and Supervision that counselors should be open-minded to facilitate counseling effectiveness. Thirty counselors attending the 1960-1961 National Defense Education Act Guidance and Counseling Institute at the Pennsylvania State University participated in the study. Six trained judges observed closed-circuit television broadcasts of two interviews by each of the counselors, and rated the counseling effective or non-effective through the use of the Counselor Performance Rating Scale. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was administered to twenty-nine of the thirty counselors eighteen months later. When the counselors were grouped into effective and non-effective categories based on the judges' previous ratings, twelve of the forty items comprising the Dogmatism Scale were observed to be significant at the
.05 level of probability. Also, a rank order correlation coefficient of .64 was reported between scores on the twelve items and the judges' ratings. Results from the study were in the direction predicted: open-minded counselors received higher ratings from the judges than closed-minded counselors. The authors concluded that open-mindedness is an important counselor characteristic.

Since dogmatism is considered to be an important counselor characteristic in facilitating client therapeutic gain, the influence of dogmatism on the training of counselors is also of some importance. Kemp (1962) attempted to determine the relation between open- and closed-mindedness and counselor response style in hypothetical and actual counseling situations. Subjects for the study consisted of fifty graduate students who were randomly assigned to an experimental and a control group, twenty-five students in each. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and Porter's Test of Counselor Attitudes was administered to the experimental and control groups, during a classroom experience prior to the counseling practicum, before and after the close of an academic quarter.

Results of the study indicated that the experimental group subjects did not differ significantly from the control group subjects in their responses to a hypothetical counseling situation presented by the Porter test. Classroom experience was shown to be a variable influencing dogmatism, in that such exposure helped both groups become more supportive and permissive in their responses to hypothetical situations. However, the low dogmatic group did not change significantly in response style when in actual counseling.
interviews, while the high dogmatic group made significant changes toward more interpretive, evaluative, and probing or diagnostic responses. The middle dogmatic group was not considered in this research. Counselor training programs may, then, have an influence upon the counseling styles of the highly dogmatic counselor trainees, if not the low dogmatic counseling students.

Another study of the effectiveness of counselor trainees as a function of psychological openness was conducted by Allen (1967). Counselors who participated in the study were twenty-six graduate students enrolled in their first practicum experience. The level of counselor psychological openness was determined by scores on the Rorschach Index of Repressive Style and the Group Supervisor Report Scale. Effectiveness of counseling behavior was determined by supervisor ratings and two scales used to measure the responses trainees made to a motion picture of a counseling interview, the Client Affect Scale and the Responsiveness to Feeling Scale. A relationship was observed at beyond the .05 statistical level between the freedom with which subjects responded to the Rorschach and counseling competence as rated by supervisors. A positive correlation at beyond the .01 level of probability was also reported between the degree to which subjects acknowledged their own feelings and supervisors' ratings of competence. Allen concluded that counseling effectiveness is related to counselor openness to his own feelings.

The research of Allen (1967), Kemp (1962), and Russo et al. (1964) lends some weight to the assertion that counselor dogmatism is a variable to be investigated in counseling effectiveness.
Unfortunately, the dyadic nature of the counseling interaction is not given consideration in these studies. There is reason to believe that, just as counselor dogmatism may influence counseling effectiveness, client dogmatism may also have an effect upon therapeutic outcome. Also, a criterion of therapeutic outcome not considered in these studies is that of client perceptions. A considerable body of literature exists to substantiate the claim that client perceptions of counseling gain are valid and reliable indicators of therapeutic success (Kamin and Caughlin, 1963).

Dogmatism and Initial Perception Formation

Barrett-Lennard (1962), Truax and Carkhuff (1963) and Wagstaff et al. (1960) maintained that the first or second interview provides the basis for the total counseling interaction. Cahoon (1962), in a study of the association between counselor dogmatism and the counseling relationship quality as perceived by the client after five sessions, reported that counselor dogmatism does appear to influence the quality of the relationship. Low dogmatic counselors in this study were perceived by their clients to provide better counseling relationships than high dogmatic counselors. Although this study does consider client perceptions of counselor variables believed important for therapeutic change in the early stages of counseling, no consideration is given to the perceived relationship after the initial interview, nor to the influence of client dogmatism or the interaction of client-counselor dogmatism on the established relationship as perceived by the client.
Tosi (1968) conducted a study which was directed toward answering some of these criticisms. The author investigated the effects of different levels of client and counselor dogmatism on the perceptions which clients hold of the counseling relationship following an initial encounter. Twelve male counselors, enrolled in their first practicum at Kent State University, and sixty-nine male and female adult clients participated in the study. Each client and counselor was grouped into high, medium, or low dogmatism categories on the basis of Rokeach Dogmatism Scale scores, resulting in four highly dogmatic counselors, four medium dogmatics, and four low dogmatic counselors. Twenty-four clients were included in each category. Following the initial interview, clients were administered the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

Results from the study indicated that low dogmatic clients rated the relationship significantly higher than did high dogmatic clients (p < .05). The medium dogmatic clients also rated the relationship significantly higher than did high dogmatic clients; however, their ratings of the relationship were not significantly different from those of the low dogmatic clients. In addition, low dogmatic counselors were given significantly higher relationship ratings from clients than were high dogmatic counselors, while no significant differences were revealed in client relationship ratings with respect to medium and low dogmatic counselors and medium and high dogmatic counselors.

Tosi concluded, in part, that the best counseling relationships were perceived when low dogmatic counselors were paired with low and
medium dogmatic clients. The poorest relationships resulted when high dogmatic counselors were paired with high and medium dogmatic clients, and when medium dogmatic counselors interacted with high dogmatic clients.

This research further points to the influence of dogmatism on the counseling process. In so doing, the study recognizes the importance of the perceived relationship by the client after the initial interview, and approaches a dyadic consideration by investigating the relation of both client and counselor dogmatism to the client's relationship perception. The present research, however, gives complete consideration to the dyad by investigating the influence of both client and counselor dogmatism on the discrepancies between the expectations for the counseling relationship and the perceptions of the relationship by client and counselor before and after the initial interview.

The importance for therapeutic gain of compatibility between client and counselor in terms of the expectations each holds for counseling has been discussed earlier (Heine and Trosman, 1960; Kumar and Pepinsky, 1965). Also, mention has been made of the importance for counseling progress associated with the reduction of expectational discrepancies in the client-counselor dyad (Lennard and Bernstein, 1967). Whiteley (1967) stated that counselors should be flexible and able to adjust to the client in order to establish the relationship considered necessary for therapeutic change, and Frank (1959) encouraged psychotherapists to be prepared to modify their approaches to meet the expectations of different types of
patients. However, there is reason to believe that the dogmatism personality variable may have some influence on this ability to modify or change one's expectations.

Dogmatism and Resistance to Change

A central proposition of Rokeach's (1960) theory of the organization of belief-disbelief systems is that the cognitive system of closed-minded (dogmatic) persons is highly resistant to change and that such persons are less able to learn new beliefs and change old beliefs than open-minded (low dogmatic) persons (Ehrlich and Lee, 1969).

Ehrlich (1955, 1961a, 1961b) attempted the first direct test of the learning-change proposition. In a study done with students enrolled in an introductory sociology course, Ehrlich concluded that "subjects low in dogmatism entered the sociology classroom with a higher level of learning, learned more as a result of classroom exposure, and retained this information to a significantly greater degree than the more dogmatic subjects" (1961a, p.149). This result, along with others reported by Costin (1968), Ehrlich (1961b), Rokeach and Norrell (1966) and White and Alter (1967), provides additional support for the learning-change proposition.

In a study related more directly to the field of psychotherapy, Ehrlich and Bauer (1966) attempted to assess the effect of dogmatism in psychiatric hospitalization by administering the Dogmatism Scale to 254 patients on entry and exit. The authors reported that high dogmatic subjects were retained for periods greater than seven weeks.
twice as often as low scorers were retained for this length of time. The researchers interpreted the longer hospitalization of closed-minded patients to be a consequence of their greater resistance to change.

As a means of understanding this resistance to change by closed-minded persons, Rokeach has suggested that the dogmatic individual will be threatened by, and avoid exposure to, or reject, stimuli which are at variance with his expectations and beliefs. Rosenman (1967) reported that high dogmatics are less accepting of a film which flaunts traditional beliefs of society than low dogmatic individuals. White and Alter (1965) reported that highly dogmatic individuals are more resistant to change with changing stimuli conditions than low dogmatics. Pyron (1966), in a factor analysis of various attitudinal scales, reported that dogmatism emerges in a factor involving rejection of stimuli potentially threatening to an individual's perceptual and attitude organization. Also, Tosi, Fagan, and Frumkin (1968a, 1968b) stated that high dogmatic subjects differed significantly from low dogmatics with respect to the extent to which they perceived a group personality-testing situation as threatening.

Rokeach also proposed that the highly dogmatic individual would exhibit less tolerance, and more anxiety, for stimuli discrepant with his expectations and beliefs. Foulkes and Foulkes (1965) investigated the hypothesis that self-descriptions for a particular trait would be systematically related to reactions to inconsistency in the presentation of material about that trait dimension. The relationship between dogmatism and the tolerance of such inconsistency was of
particular interest. The authors reported a negative relationship between dogmatism and tolerance of trait inconsistency in impression-formation problems. High dogmatic subjects, when faced with discrepant information, tended to avoid compromise solutions by either changing greatly or adhering very closely to their original impression.

Studies by Crockett and Meidinger (1966), Scodel and Freedman (1956), and Scodel and Mussen (1953) also focus on the association between dogmatism and perception. The effect of authoritarian dyads on the perception one member has of the other's authoritarianism was investigated. Subjects were placed in two-person groups for approximately a twenty-minute period and instructed to talk about various topics of television, radio, and the movies. The interaction dyads were varied on the basis of high and low authoritarian traits; for example, low-low, high-high, and high-low. After the interaction, both dyad members responded to the California F Scale as they thought the other member would respond.

The results of these studies indicated that the perceiver usually assumes the other dyad partner to be a peer, not having any especially significant characteristics that might set him apart from others. The high authoritarian perceiver tended to assume that the other person has values like his own, and rates him high on most authoritarian traits. The low-authoritarian person tended to rate others as average on authoritarian traits.

The concepts of authority and authority figures also hold particular significance for a consideration of dogmatism. According to Ehrlich and Lee (1969), the greater the closed-mindedness, the
greater should be the dependence on authority considerations and the more difficult it should be for closed-minded persons to distinguish between the source of stimuli and the quality of the stimuli received. Conversely, open-minded persons should be more able to distinguish the source of stimuli from the quality of the stimuli. In terms of the present research, high dogmatic individuals may have more difficulty realistically evaluating their other dyad partner in the counseling relationship than low dogmatic persons.

Kemp (1963), in a study which bears on this point, investigated the perceptions of authority figures as a function of dogmatism. He reported that high dogmatic subjects tended to idealize an authority figure and give him qualities which fit the expectation of a particular situation. The low dogmatics perceived those in authority more realistically.

The studies reviewed in this section lend support to the point of view that dogmatism in the client-counselor dyad does have an influence on the counseling process. There seems to be an association between dogmatism in the dyad and the individual's perceptions of each other, and, also, one's resistance to change appears to vary with dogmatism.

Summary

The review of the literature has resulted in some major findings pertinent to the present research:

1. The counseling interaction can profitably be viewed within a dyadic framework.
2. The expectations which both client and counselor have for counseling may influence the therapeutic process.

3. The reduction of dyadic expectational discrepancies can facilitate the counseling process.

4. A positive relationship between client and counselor as a necessary condition for therapeutic gain is supported.

5. Successful therapeutic outcomes are better facilitated and predicted when the client perceives the counselor as warm, acceptant, and congruent in the early interview sessions. In addition, the behaviors of the client and counselor during the initial interview are somewhat influenced by their expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship.

6. Dogmatism appears to be a factor which influences interpersonal perceptions and behavior, as early as the initial encounter. Dogmatism also seems to influence one's resistance to change.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter will describe the research methodology and statistical procedures used in the study. Sections will be presented which detail the instrumentation, the sample, procedures for collecting the data, research design, and the statistical procedures.

Instrumentation

The study involved the use of five measurement instruments; the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory with individualized instructions designed to measure client and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship following the initial interview.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

The levels of client-counselor dogmatism (high, medium, low) were determined by an administration of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The scale consists of forty items thought to be representative of open- and closed-belief systems. The forty items of the scale are responded to on a six-point continuum ranging from strong agreement (+3) to strong disagreement (-3). According to Rokeach (1960), a high score on this test represents a relatively closed-belief system, while a low score represents an open-belief system (see Appendix A).
Although many investigations into the dogmatism construct employ Rokeach's *Dogmatism Scale* to discriminate among subject groups and thus deal with the scale's predictive or concurrent validity, other studies have been concerned with aspects of the scale's construct validity. For example, Vacchiano, Schiffman, and Strauss (1967) performed a factor analysis on the items of the *Dogmatism Scale* and reported that although the instrument was internally complex, factors tended to group around Rokeach's conceptualizations.

From a review of the literature on dogmatism, Vacchiano, Strauss, and Hochman (1969) reported that reliability measures for the *Dogmatism Scale* have been generally high for adult and high school populations. Ehrlich (1961b) reported a test-retest correlation separated by five years of .55. Rokeach (1960) reported split-half reliability coefficients ranging from .68 to .85 for Form E of the *Dogmatism Scale*, a sixty item instrument with twenty filler items. A corrected split-half reliability coefficient of .86 for the *Dogmatism Scale* was later reported by Hough (1965). Tosi (1968), using the Spearman-Brown formula for determining reliability coefficients, obtained a value of .81 for an N of sixty-nine clients. A Spearman rank order test-retest reliability coefficient of .98 for the *Dogmatism Scale* was reported in the same study for a group of twelve counselors.

There does not appear to be any great disparity in test-retest reliability for those scoring high or low on the *Dogmatism Scale* (Zagona and Zurcher, 1965) nor when the number of items of the *Dogmatism Scale* is reduced (Schulze, 1962; Troldahl and Powell, 1965). In the present study, a Spearman rank order correlation test-retest
reliability coefficient of .93 was obtained for the group of twelve counselors on the Dogmatism Scale.

**Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory**

Client and counselor expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship preceding and following the initial interview were measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (see Appendix B). The Inventory was developed by G. T. Barrett-Lennard (1962) as an objective measure of certain relationship qualities believed by Carl R. Rogers and others to be important conditions for counseling. The Inventory consists of statements which pertain to and comprise four relationship variables or sub-scales; empathy, congruence, unconditional positive regard, and level of regard. The Inventory also yields a total score.

The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory consists of sixty-four items that can each be responded to on a six-point scale ranging from strong agreement (+3) to strong disagreement (-3). The four subscales each contain sixteen items which are meant to reflect the appropriate construct. Items representing each construct (empathy, unconditional positive regard, level of regard, and congruence) are dispersed throughout the Inventory to allow for maximum independence of responses.

According to Barrett-Lennard (1962), content validity for the Relationship Inventory items was established by having five client-centered counselor judges classify each item as either a positive (+) or negative (-) indicator of the variable in question, and a neutral
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rating to any item that they regarded as irrelevant or ambiguous. The judges agreed on all but four items in regard to classification as positive or negative. Three of these items were eliminated, with one retained because it had received a neutral rating by one judge. An item analysis revealed that all of the items contributed in a direction consistent with the respective variable represented.

Validity for the individual scales was established by investigating meaningful relationships with other variables that are theoretically relevant to those included in the Relationship Inventory. Therapist ratings of client adjustment and change, a Q-sort adjustment scale developed by Dymond (1954), and scores on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Depression Scale were the variables chosen. It was reported that therapeutic personality change occurs in proportion to the degree that the client experiences the relationship qualities measured by the scales of the Relationship Inventory.

Several investigators have reported split-half and test-retest reliability coefficients of the Relationship Inventory. Barrett-Lennard (1962) reported test-retest reliability coefficients ranging from .86 to .92 for the four scales during an interval of two to six weeks with a sample of forty college students. Hollenbeck (1965) obtained split-half correlation coefficients ranging from .61 to .81 for the four scales over a six-month interval. Rogers et al. (1967) reported test-retest reliability coefficients of .76 to .94 on the Relationship Inventory over a five-year period. Hough (1965) reported split-half reliabilities ranging from .82 to .91 for the four
scales of the Relationship Inventory, and Tosi (1968) obtained a split-half reliability coefficient of .82.

In the present study, the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, with individualized instructions, was used as a measure of client and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship, and client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship following the initial interview (see Appendices C, D, E and F). A test-retest reliability coefficient of .76 was observed for counselor expectations of the counseling relationship over a six-week period.

Sample

The present study involved the use of twelve male counselors selected from the Winter (1970) term classes of Counseling and Personnel 684, Supervised Practicum and Professional Experience, at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Male counselors were used to control for an effect reported by Mendoza (1968) that personality variables were found to be significant for women but not for men in predicting counseling effectiveness as rated by supervisors.

The course Counseling and Personnel 684 is the final class requirement in the Master's degree professional sequence of counseling courses. Counselor trainees enrolled in this class have had one other formal exposure to counseling theory, practice, and supervision, Counseling and Personnel 683, Theory and Laboratory Practice in Counseling, and thus can be categorized as relatively experienced counselors, a variable which Bergin (1966) stated has an influence
on therapeutic progress. In addition to the experience in Counseling and Personnel 683, the counselors had completed prerequisite courses in The Personnel Worker and His Role, Organization and Administration of Pupil Personnel Services, and Research in Guidance and Personnel Services. In Table 1 is a description of the counselors by age, length of time in the Master's degree Counseling and Personnel program at Western Michigan University, and years of counseling experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23-39 years</td>
<td>28.4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Training</td>
<td>.5-3.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Experience</td>
<td>.25-6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clients used in the study were seventy-two male and female adults willing to experience a personal-social counseling interview. These adults were students who were enrolled during the Winter (1970) term in Counseling and Personnel Services department courses, but had not yet taken practicum counseling training and may not yet have been formally accepted into the Master's degree Counseling and Personnel program. Clients willing to discuss personal-social areas of concern with a counselor were chosen because there is some reason to believe that the counseling relationship established with clients experiencing
educational-vocational problems may be different from that established to facilitate therapeutic change in clients with personal-social problems (Bordin, 1955). Table 2 includes a description of the clients in terms of level of study, age, time in training, and counseling experience.

**TABLE 2**

Description of the Clients by Educational Level, Age, Time in Training, and Counseling Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Study</th>
<th>Number of Clients</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Mean Age (Years)</th>
<th>Time in Training Mean (Years)</th>
<th>Mean Counseling Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22-44</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22-51</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21-27</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19-51</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Procedures

During the first week of the Winter (1970) semester, eighty-eight students who agreed to be potential clients for the study were administered the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the client expectation Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. A total of thirty-one counselors who volunteered to participate in the investigations were also
tested, utilizing the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the counselor expectation Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

Twelve counselors were selected from those available for the study; four each representative of high, medium, and low dogmatism categories. A decision based upon a review of the literature on dogmatism was made prior to data collection regarding the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale score values appropriate for each dogmatism classification. The values selected for categorizing counselors were also employed when classifying clients into dogmatism levels. Dogmatism category score values selected were:

- High: 140 - above
- Medium: 118 - 139
- Low: 117 - below

The ranges of dogmatism scores for each counselor dogmatism category were:

- High: 143 - 175
- Medium: 122 - 130
- Low: 78 - 108

Seventy-two clients were selected from those willing to participate in the study. Of the clients chosen, twenty-four were each representative of high, medium, and low dogmatism levels. The ranges of dogmatism scores for each client dogmatism category were:

- High: 141 - 203
- Medium: 119 - 138
- Low: 89 - 117
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Each counselor was scheduled to conduct an initial personal-social counseling interview with six clients, two each representative of high, medium, and low dogmatism categories over a period of six weeks and during a supervised practicum class hour. Following the initial counseling interview, both client and counselor completed the appropriate perception Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (see Appendix G).

Research Design

A 3 x 3 factorial analysis of variance design was employed to study the influence of client and counselor dogmatism on dyadic counseling relationship congruency. Client and counselor dogmatism were reduced to three levels of classification (high, medium, low) by scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, thus resulting in nine combinations of the experimental variables. Twelve counselors were used in the study; four each representative of three levels of dogmatism, high, medium, and low. Each counselor conducted an initial interview with six clients, two each representative of three levels of dogmatism, high, medium, and low, making a total of seventy-two clients. Prior to the initial interview, client and counselor completed an appropriate expectation Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. Following the initial interview, client and counselor completed an appropriate perception Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

Cell entries for the main analysis of dyadic counseling relationship congruency as a function of dogmatism were indices of dyadic counseling relationship congruity operationally defined as the means
of three counseling relationship congruency achieved ratings for each counseling dyad. The ratings were made by three trained counselor educators, all having the doctorate degree. These judges were asked to examine sets of numbers describing each counseling dyad and consisting of:

1. $|E_{cl} - E_{co}|$, or the absolute value of the discrepancy between the initial expectations for the counseling relationship of both client and counselor, where $E_{cl}$ represents the initial expectations of the client for the counseling relationship and $E_{co}$ indicates the initial expectations of the counselor for the counseling relationship;

2. $|P_{cl} - P_{co}|$, or the absolute value of the discrepancy between the client and counselor final perceptions of the counseling relationship after the initial interview, where $P_{cl}$ indicates the final perception of the client of the counseling relationship after the initial interview, and $P_{co}$ represents the final perception of the counselor of the counseling relationship after the initial interview;

and

3. $[l(E_{cl} - E_{co}) - (P_{cl} - P_{co})]$, or the amount and direction of movement in the dyad toward counseling relationship congruency.

After examining these three numbers, the judges rated each of the seventy-two counseling dyads on a seven-point scale from (1) low counseling relationship congruency achieved to (7) high counseling relationship congruency achieved (see Appendix H). An inter-rater
reliability coefficient of .92 was obtained for the judges' ratings of counseling relationship congruency achieved. Indices of dyadic counseling relationship congruity consisting of means of the judges' ratings for each counseling dyad were then calculated. The research design of the present investigation is shown in Table 3.

Three major hypotheses were tested. They are as follows:

$H_1$: There is a relation between dyadic counseling relationship congruency and client dogmatism.
H₂: Counselor dogmatism is related to dyadic counseling relationship congruency.

H₃: Dyadic counseling relationship congruency is related to the interaction of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism.

Also tested were the hypotheses:

H₄: Client expectations of the counseling relationship are related to client dogmatism.

H₅: There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship.

H₆: Client perceptions of the counseling relationship are related to client dogmatism.

H₇: There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H₈: Client perceptions of the counseling relationship are related to the interaction of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism.

H₉: Client dogmatism is related to counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H₁₀: Counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship are related to counselor dogmatism.

H₁₁: There is a relation between the interaction of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H₁₂: The discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship is related to client
There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship.

The discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship is related to the interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism.

Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

The discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship.
H_{19}^*: The discrepancy between client expectations and client perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

H_{20}^*: The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H_{21}^*: Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H_{22}^*: The discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

H_{23}^*: The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Statistical Procedures

F tests for the main effects of client and counselor dogmatism on the index of dyadic counseling relationship congruity, and for interaction, were computed.
Several sub-analyses were also conducted. **F tests were computed** for the relation of dogmatism to client expectations of the counseling relationship, and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship.

**F ratios were also determined for the main effects of client and counselor dogmatism, and for interaction, on:**

a. client perceptions of the counseling relationship;
b. counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship;
c. the absolute value of the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship;
d. the absolute value of the discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship;
e. the absolute value of the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship; and
f. the absolute value of the discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

In addition, **t tests were conducted by dogmatism dyad grouping to determine the significance of the differences, and the direction of the differences of:**

a. the discrepancy between client and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship;
b. the discrepancy between client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship;

c. the discrepancy between client expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship; and

d. the discrepancy between counselor expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Summary

This study was conducted with counselor trainees and clients at the Western Michigan University Counseling Laboratory. Client and counselor levels of dogmatism were determined by an application of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The criterion for the main analysis was the index of dyadic counseling relationship congruity determined by judges' ratings of the counseling relationship congruency achieved in each counseling dyad.

Twelve male counselors, four each representative of high, medium, and low dogmatism categories, were all assigned two high, two medium and two low dogmatic clients for a personal-social initial counseling interview. A 3 x 3 factorial analysis of variance model was employed to investigate the main analysis. Several sub-analyses were also investigated.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The hypotheses for the main analysis of this investigation were tested simultaneously by a 3 x 3 factorial analysis of variance design. The experimental variables were client and counselor dogmatism as defined by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The criterion measure was the index of dyadic counseling relationship congruency defined by the mean of judges' ratings of dyadic counseling relationship congruency achieved in each client-counselor dyad. The experimental variables were divided into high, medium, and low levels of dogmatism, resulting in nine dyad types. F ratios were computed for each main effect and for interaction. Several sub-analyses were also conducted. In this chapter the hypotheses which relate to each analysis under investigation are presented, followed by the results of the investigation. The results of the investigation are described by probability levels which depict the probability of observing the obtained results if there is no relation between the variables being studied. This method of presentation is consistent with a trend in the behavioral sciences to conduct studies, analyze the results, and report the observed levels of probability, rather than adopting some arbitrary probability level as denoting statistical significance (Winer, 1962).

Hypotheses and related results

$H_1$: There is a relation between dyadic counseling relationship congruency and client dogmatism.
H$_2$: Counselor dogmatism is related to dyadic counseling relationship congruency.

H$_3$: Dyadic counseling relationship congruency is related to the interaction of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism.

The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4 with the observed levels of probability.

TABLE 4
The Relation of Client-Counselor Dogmatism to the Index of Dyadic Counseling Relationship Congruency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.79065</td>
<td>.26828</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.26195</td>
<td>.08888</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.54525</td>
<td>1.88163</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.94704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4, there was little statistical relation between client and counselor dogmatism alone and dyadic counseling relationship congruency. This result is not unexpected, given the dyadic nature of the counseling relationship. That is, when client and counselor interact as one, each having an impact upon the other, the relation of either dyad partner's dogmatism to a dyadic criterion measure, such as counseling relationship congruency, could be predicted to be slight. However, the interaction of client and counselor dogmatism did appear to be related to dyadic counseling relationship congruency. This relation is such that only fourteen times in each
one-hundred observations would the results reported have been observed if there is no relation between the interaction of client and counselor dogmatism and dyadic counseling relationship congruency. Means of indices of dyadic counseling relationship congruency for each dyad type are shown in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

Means of Indices of Dyadic Counseling Relationship Congruency by Dogmatism Dyad Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 5, the interaction effect of client and counselor dogmatism seems most evidenced in counseling dyads with high dogmatic clients and medium dogmatic counselors, low dogmatic clients and medium dogmatic counselors, and those consisting of high dogmatic clients with low dogmatic counselors. The high dogmatic client - medium dogmatic counselor dyads achieved the most dyadic counseling relationship congruency, while the low dogmatic client - medium dogmatic counselor and high dogmatic client - low dogmatic counselor dyad groupings resulted in the least dyadic counseling relationship congruency. These results are difficult to explain theoretically, and suggest that the interaction of client and counselor dogmatism
was not systematically related to dyadic counseling relationship congruency. It can be observed, however, that the high dogmatic client - high dogmatic counselor dyad grouping resulted in the same dyadic counseling relationship congruency as the low dogmatic client - low dogmatic counselor dyads. This result is unexpected since, based upon the dogmatism literature, a prediction could be made that high-high dogmatism dyads would result in the least dyadic counseling relationship congruency, and low-low dogmatism dyads would result in the most dyadic counseling relationship congruency.

Several sub-analyses bearing on the main analysis were also conducted. The first of these was an investigation of the relation between client expectations of the counseling relationship and dogmatism.

H₄: Client expectations of the counseling relationship are related to client dogmatism.

The F ratio for the main effect of client dogmatism is shown in Table 6.

### TABLE 6

The Relation of Dogmatism to Client Counseling Relationship Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4081.2500</td>
<td>3.0814</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1324.4768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 6, it can be seen that a relation did exist between client dogmatism and client counseling relationship expectations. That is, the expectations a client had for the counseling relationship were related to the client's level of dogmatism. The relation is such that low dogmatic clients held the most favorable expectations, and high dogmatic clients expressed the least favorable expectations, as shown by Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

Client Counseling Relationship Expectation Means by Dogmatism Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counseling Relationship Expectation Mean</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>162.08</td>
<td>164.63</td>
<td>185.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 6 and 7 demonstrate that the low dogmatic clients had statistically significantly more favorable expectations for the counseling relationship than the medium or high dogmatic clients. The relation between dogmatism and counselor expectations was also investigated.

**H₅:** There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship.

The results of this investigation are presented in Table 8.
TABLE 8
The Relation of Dogmatism to Counselor Counseling Relationship Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5544.3350</td>
<td>2.59877</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2133.4444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 8, counselor dogmatism does seem to be related to counselor expectations, although the relation does not reach traditionally acceptable statistical levels. However, the trend, as indicated by the counselor counseling relationship expectation means presented in Table 9, is clearly that the low dogmatic counselors held the most favorable expectations, and the high dogmatic counselors expressed the least favorable expectations.

TABLE 9
Counselor Counseling Relationship Expectation Means by Dogmatism Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counseling Relationship Expectation</th>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>164.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An investigation of the relation between dogmatism and client counseling relationship perceptions was also conducted.
H₆: Client perceptions of the counseling relationship are related to client dogmatism.

H₇: There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H₈: Client perceptions of the counseling relationship are related to the interaction of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.0500</td>
<td>.04238</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4444.3500</td>
<td>3.08589</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1162.3000</td>
<td>.80703</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1440.2126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated in Table 10, there was a statistically significant relation between counselor dogmatism and client perceptions. That is, some counselor dogmatism types were perceived by their clients to provide more favorable counseling relationships than those perceived by the clients of other counselors. The client counseling relationship perception means by dogmatism dyad grouping are shown in Table 11.
As observed from Tables 10 and 11, the high dogmatic counselors were perceived by their clients to provide more favorable counseling relationships than those reported by the clients of medium and low dogmatic counselors. This result is in direct contradiction of research results cited earlier which indicated that low dogmatic counselors are perceived by their clients to provide the most favorable counseling relationships, and that clients perceive the high dogmatic counselors as providing the least favorable counseling relationships.

The relation between counselor dogmatism and counselor counseling relationship perceptions was investigated by the $F$ test for main effects and the interaction.

$H_0$: Client dogmatism is related to counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

$H_{10}$: Counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship are related to counselor dogmatism.
There is a relation between the interaction of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship. Table 12 contains the results of this analysis.

**TABLE 12**

The Relation of Client-Counselor Dogmatism to Counselor Counseling Relationship Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.90000</td>
<td>.07590</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13925.70000</td>
<td>112.75021</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>619.40000</td>
<td>.56711</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1092.19360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 12, a highly statistically significant relation existed between counselor dogmatism and counselor perceptions. That is, certain counselor dogmatism types perceived the counseling relationship which they provided significantly differently from counselors of other dogmatism levels. In Table 13 are presented the counselor counseling relationship perception means by dogmatism dyad grouping, and from this table it can be seen that the low dogmatic counselors consistently perceived themselves offering more favorable counseling relationships than did the medium or high dogmatic counselors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>185.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>185.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>239.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highly statistically significant finding that the low dogmatic counselors perceived themselves as offering more favorable counseling relationships than did either the medium or high dogmatic counselors is in contrast to the result reported earlier that the clients of the high dogmatic counselors perceived more favorable established counseling relationships than the clients paired with medium or low dogmatic counselors. It would appear, then, that the low dogmatic counselors thought they were being perceived most favorably while, in fact, the clients assigned to the high dogmatic counselors were most satisfied with the established counseling relationships.

An investigation of the relation between client and counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship was conducted based on the following hypotheses.

$H_{12}$: The discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of
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the counseling relationship is related to client dogmatism.

$H_{13}$: There is a relation between counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship.

$H_{14}$: The discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship is related to the interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 14.

**TABLE 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2121.34500</td>
<td>1.63291</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8262.39000</td>
<td>6.36002</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1236.76000</td>
<td>.95200</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1299.11340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 14, counselor dogmatism was related to the dyadic discrepancy in expectations at a highly statistically significant level. This result suggests that dyads with certain counselor dogmatism types experienced greater expectational discrepancies than dyads consisting of counselors with other dogmatism levels. In Table 15 are presented means of the discrepancy in counseling relationship expectations by dogmatism dyad grouping.
The results shown in Table 15, combined with those presented in Table 14, suggest that counseling dyads composed of low dogmatic counselors evidenced the greatest expectational discrepancies. To better understand the significance of the differences between client and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship, as well as the direction of the differences, *t* tests comparing means of client and counselor expectations for each dyad type were conducted. The probability levels for these *t* ratio results are shown in Table 16. A negative result indicates counselor expectations which are more favorable than client expectations.

**TABLE 15**

Means of the Discrepancy in Counseling Relationship Expectations by Dogmatism Dyad Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>66.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>36.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>91.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 16**

*p*-Values for the Differences in Counseling Relationship Expectations by Dogmatism Dyad Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would appear, then, that low dogmatic counselor dyads resulted in the greatest expectational discrepancies, and that the low dogmatic counselors consistently, and at highly statistically significant levels, expected to provide more favorable counseling relationships than their clients expected to experience. Incompatible expectations did exist in low dogmatic counselor dyads and, based upon the finding reported earlier that the high dogmatic counselors were perceived more favorably by their clients than were the low dogmatic counselors, this incompatibility seemed partly due to an overestimation by the low dogmatic counselors regarding how they would be perceived.

The relation of the discrepancy between client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship to client and counselor dogmatism was also investigated.

$H_{15}$: Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

$H_{16}$: The discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

$H_{17}$: The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Table 17 contains the results of this analysis.
Table 17

The Relation of Dogmatism to The Discrepancy in Counseling Relationship Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>152.54000</td>
<td>.15645</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>537.54000</td>
<td>.55131</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1467.83500</td>
<td>1.50546</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>975.00603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 17 indicate little systematic relation between client-counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy between client perceptions of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship. Means of the discrepancies between client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship are shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Means of the Discrepancy in Counseling Relationship Perceptions by Dogmatism Dyad Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>41.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as seen in Table 18, knowing the dogmatism of client or counselor seemed to contribute little to a prediction of the discrep-
nancy between client and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship. The *t* test ratio probability levels used to compare client and counselor perceptions for each dyad type are presented in Table 19. A negative result indicates counselor perceptions more favorable than client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

**TABLE 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although no systematic relation was observed between dogmatism and dyadic perceptual discrepancies, the results shown in Table 19 suggest that the low dogmatic counselors tended to perceive more favorable established counseling relationships than their clients. This finding seems consistent with those reported earlier. That is, the low dogmatic counselors expected to be perceived most favorably, and, even though the high dogmatic counselors were perceived most favorably, the low dogmatic counselors believed they had provided the best counseling relationships. These perceptions of the low dogmatic counselors are more optimistic than those held by their clients, as seen in this analysis.
The relation of the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship to client and counselor dogmatism was another investigation conducted by the present study.

H₁₈: Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

H₁₉: The discrepancy between client expectations and client perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

H₂₀: The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between client expectations of the counseling relationship and client perceptions of the counseling relationship.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20

The Relation of Dogmatism to the Discrepancy between Client Expectations and Perceptions of the Counseling Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1376.76400</td>
<td>2.42678</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111.26400</td>
<td>.19612</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>605.45150</td>
<td>1.06721</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>567.31949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 20 it can be seen that client dogmatism was related
to the discrepancy between client expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship. Some dyads with particular client dogmatism types, then, exhibit greater discrepancies between client expectations and perceptions than others. In Table 21 are presented the means of the discrepancies between client expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship for each dogmatism dyad type.

### TABLE 21

Means of the Discrepancy between Client Expectations and Perceptions of the Counseling Relationship by Dogmatism Dyad Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>20.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>24.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>34.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The larger discrepancies between client expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship occurred in dyads with high and medium dogmatic clients, as shown in Table 21. The low dogmatic counselors, as reported earlier, expected to perceive more favorable counseling relationships than the medium and high dogmatic clients. After the initial counseling interview, the perceptions of the low dogmatic counselors were not significantly different from their expectations. The medium and high dogmatic clients, however, who expressed more pessimistic expectations for the counseling relationship, exhibited a statistically significant readjustment to higher.
perceptual levels after counseling. The probability levels of t test ratios comparing the significance of the differences between client expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship for each dyad type are shown in Table 22. A negative result indicates client perceptions more favorable than client expectations of the counseling relationship.

### TABLE 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 22 it can be seen that the clients consistently reported more favorable counseling relationship perceptions than expectations. Also, the relation of high and medium client dogmatism to the difference between client expectations and perceptions was observed to be at generally high statistically significant levels. It would appear, then, that the clients tended to perceive better counseling relationships than they expected, and that the high and medium dogmatic clients perceived significantly more favorable counseling relationships than expected.

The final investigation was the relation of dogmatism in the dyad to the discrepancy between counselor expectations and perceptions of
the counseling relationship.

$H_{21}$: Client dogmatism is related to the discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

$H_{22}$: The discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship is related to counselor dogmatism.

$H_{23}$: The interactive effects of client dogmatism and counselor dogmatism are related to the discrepancy between counselor expectations of the counseling relationship and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 23.

### TABLE 23

The Relation of Dogmatism to the Discrepancy between Counselor Expectations and Perceptions of the Counseling Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>230.37400</td>
<td>.35873</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Dogmatism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3568.49900</td>
<td>5.55674</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1214.50100</td>
<td>1.89117</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>642.19253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Table 23 indicate a highly statistically significant relation between counselor dogmatism and the discrepancy...
between counselor expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship. In other words, dyads with counselors of a particular dogmatism type resulted in the greatest discrepancies between counselor expectations and perceptions. Also, as can be seen in Table 23, the interactive effects of client and counselor dogmatism were related to the counselor expectation-perception discrepancy. It appears, therefore, that the difference between the way a counselor expected to be perceived in the counseling relationship, and how he believed he was perceived by his client, is related to counselor dogmatism and to the interaction of client and counselor dogmatism. In Table 24 are presented the means of the discrepancy between counselor expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship by dogmatism dyad grouping.

TABLE 24

Means of the Discrepancy between Counselor Expectations and Perceptions of the Counseling Relationship by Dogmatism Dyad Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>54.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 24 demonstrate that the greatest discrepancies between counselor expectations and perceptions occurred in dyads with high dogmatic counselors. The exception seemed to be
in the low client - medium dogmatic counselor dyad where, perhaps, the interactive effects of client and counselor dogmatism may have been related to a larger than expected counselor expectational-perceptual discrepancy. The highly statistically significant relation between high counselor dogmatism and the counselor expectational-perceptual discrepancy suggests much readjustment from expectational to perceptual levels for this type counselor. The p-values for the differences between counselor expectations and perceptions by dogmatism dyad grouping are shown in Table 25.

**TABLE 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Dogmatism</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 25, the high dogmatic counselors perceived more favorable counseling relationships than they expected to provide. The results of this analysis imply, then, that the high dogmatic counselors, who expected to be perceived less favorably than did the medium or low dogmatic counselors and yet were, as reported earlier, perceived more favorably, exhibited the greatest readjustment from expectations to more favorable perceptions of the counseling relationship.
Summary

In this chapter were presented the analyses of the data collected by this research. Following are the results of the investigations.

1. The interaction of client and counselor dogmatism was related to dyadic counseling relationship congruency.

2. Low dogmatic clients expressed more favorable counseling relationship expectations than medium or high dogmatic clients. High dogmatic clients held the least favorable counseling relationship expectations.

3. Low dogmatic counselors tended to express the most favorable counseling relationship expectations, and high dogmatic counselors reported the least favorable counseling relationship expectations.

4. Clients interacting with high dogmatic counselors perceived more favorable established counseling relationships than clients paired with medium or low dogmatic counselors.

5. Low dogmatic counselors perceived more favorable established counseling relationships than medium or high dogmatic counselors.

6. The largest discrepancies between client and counselor counseling relationship expectations occurred in dyads with low dogmatic counselors.

7. Low dogmatic counselors expressed more favorable counseling relationship expectations than their clients.

8. There was little relation between dogmatism and dyadic
counseling relationship perceptual discrepancies.

9. Client dogmatism was related to the discrepancy between client expectations and perceptions of the counseling relationship. Larger client expectational-perceptual discrepancies occurred in dyads containing high dogmatic clients, and smaller client expectational-perceptual discrepancies were found in dyads with low dogmatic clients.

10. Client perceptions of the established counseling relationship were consistently more favorable than client expectations of the counseling relationship.

11. High dogmatic counselors reported the greatest discrepancies between counseling relationship expectations and perceptions. Low dogmatic counselors reported the smallest discrepancies between counseling relationship expectations and perceptions.

12. High dogmatic counselors tended to express more favorable counseling relationship perceptions than expectations.

In the next chapter is presented a summary of the present study, along with related conclusions, discussion, interpretations, and implications.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND INTERPRETATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The present study investigated the relation between dyadic counseling relationship congruency and dogmatism. The investigation was based on several lines of converging theory. The literature provides reason to believe that the relationship between client and counselor during counseling is related to therapeutic change of the client. This counseling relationship is apparently established early in the series of interviews and seems partly a function of initial impression formation. The counseling relationship, as perceived by client and counselor, may also be partly a result of one's expectations for such a relationship. If the counseling relationship expectations of client and counselor do play a part in the perceptions each develops of the established relationship, then the potential exists for incompatible expectations and perceptions, and possibly reduced therapeutic gain for the client. The literature also suggests that the prime function of an interaction system, such as counseling, should be to reduce such expectational discrepancies. However, this expectational discrepancy reduction requires, in part, a willingness and ability of client and counselor to adjust cognitively to the counseling relationship as it exists. Such cognitive flexibility is dependent to some extent upon one's resistance to change or degree of dogmatism.
The sample for the present study was composed of seventy-two male and female clients selected from Counseling and Personnel department courses at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Only students who had not yet completed formal practicum experiences in counseling were selected as clients. Twelve male counselor trainees in their final practicum of the Master's degree program in Counseling and Personnel were selected as counselors for these clients.

Clients and counselors were categorized high, medium, or low dogmatic by an application of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. Prior to the initial interview, clients and counselors completed an appropriate expectation Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. Following the initial interview, clients and counselors completed an appropriate perception Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

Counselors in the study, four each representative of high, medium, and low dogmatism categories, conducted an initial personal-social counseling interview with six clients, two each representative of high, medium, and low levels of dogmatism. The basic design of the study was a 3 x 3 factorial analysis of variance model, resulting in nine combinations of client-counselor dogmatism or dyad types. The independent variables were client and counselor dogmatism, and the dependent variable was the index of dyadic counseling relationship congruity. To clarify the relation of dogmatism to expectational and perceptual discrepancies in the client-counselor dyad, several sub-analyses were also conducted.
Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the present study.

1. The dogmatism of client or counselor alone is not related to dyadic counseling relationship congruency.

2. The interaction of client and counselor dogmatism is related to dyadic counseling relationship congruency.

3. High dogmatic counselors underestimate their abilities to establish favorable counseling relationships.

4. Low dogmatic counselors overestimate how their clients will perceive their abilities to establish favorable counseling relationships.

5. High dogmatic counselors are more successful at establishing favorable counseling relationships than medium or low dogmatic counselors.

6. High dogmatic clients are more flexible in adjusting from low expectations to favorable counseling relationship perceptions than low dogmatic clients.

7. High dogmatic counselors are more flexible in adjusting from low expectations to favorable counseling relationship perceptions than low dogmatic counselors.

Discussion

This study was designed to investigate the relation between dogmatism and dyadic counseling relationship congruency. Although other studies (Cahoon, 1962; Tosi, 1968) have reported that client
or counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship vary as a function of dogmatism, the dyadic approach adopted for this investigation resulted in the finding that all counseling dogmatism dyad types achieved generally the same dyadic counseling relationship congruency. That is, there was essentially no relation between client and counselor dogmatism and dyadic counseling relationship congruency. The interaction of client and counselor dogmatism did, however, relate to the criterion measure. This finding, though, may have been more a result of certain relations which existed within the dyadic counseling relationship congruency concept than the strict interaction of client-counselor dogmatism, as will be discussed more fully later. As an interesting example, high dogmatism client-counselor dyads resulted in the same dyadic counseling relationship congruency as dyads consisting of low dogmatic clients paired with low dogmatic counselors.

The scope of the dyadic counseling relationship congruency concept is such that a discussion of various components of the concept is warranted for complete understanding. Prior to client and counselor entering the dyadic framework of counseling for the initial interview, both hold certain expectations for the counseling relationship they will experience. The low dogmatic clients studied expected to perceive the most favorable counseling relationships, while the high dogmatic clients expected the least favorable counseling relationships. Also, the low dogmatic counselors expected to be perceived by their clients as providing the most favorable counseling relationships, while the high dogmatic counselors believed their clients would perceive them as offering relatively less favorable counseling relationships.
When client and counselor enter the dyadic framework of counseling for the initial interview, the potential exists for compatible or incompatible counseling relationship expectations. Incompatible counseling relationship expectations could be detrimental to the counseling process and might result in a necessity to spend time in the dyad interaction system reducing this expectational discrepancy (Lennard and Bernstein, 1967). The low dogmatic counselors under observation consistently held more favorable counseling relationship expectations than their clients. That is, the greatest discrepancies between client and counselor expectations of the counseling relationship occurred in dyads consisting of low dogmatic counselors. This optimism could have been the result of the low dogmatic counselors having a better understanding of the counseling relationship and how it would develop with their clients, or an overestimation based upon assumptions regarding how their evidenced personality traits and ways of behaving are perceived by others. At any rate, the reduction of counseling relationship expectational discrepancies seemed most necessary in low dogmatic counselor counseling dyads, and, according to Rokeach's (1960) theories about dogmatism and resistance to change, it could be predicted that this expectational reduction would be accomplished in such counseling dyads.

Following the initial interview, clients and counselors have developed perceptions of the counseling relationship as a result of their encounter. Although the low dogmatic counselors expected to provide more favorable counseling relationships than did the high dogmatic counselors, the clients of high dogmatic counselors reported
perceiving the most favorable established counseling relationships. In addition, the low dogmatic counselors, who expected to provide the most favorable counseling relationships, indeed perceived that they had provided the most favorable counseling relationships.

These results do present a contradiction. The way a counselor expects to be seen, in terms of providing a favorable counseling relationship, the way he is seen by his clients, and the way he sees himself are apparently all related to the counselor's dogmatism. The high dogmatic counselors seem to have underestimated their abilities to provide favorable counseling relationships, as perceived by their clients, whereas the low dogmatic counselors were overly optimistic in their expectations and final perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Further, dogmatism, as a main effect, has little statistical relation to the difference between the counseling relationship perceptions of client and counselor. The trend was, however, that the larger discrepancies between client and counselor counseling relationship perceptions occurred in dyads with low dogmatic counselors, and in those dyads the counselors perceived more favorable counseling relationships than their clients. However, considering the expectational and perceptual levels of clients and counselors, it would appear that movement within the dyad from expectations to perceptions did occur.

The movement within the dyad was such that the high dogmatic counselors, who expected to provide the least favorable counseling relationships, changed the most from initial expectations to final perceptions of the counseling relationship. However, the low dogma-
tic counselors expected the most favorable counseling relationships and perceived themselves offering essentially the same high levels expected, even though their clients did not perceive the counseling relationship in that way.

These results are in opposition to Rokeach's conceptualizations that the high dogmatic individual is resistant to change and less able to adopt new beliefs than the low dogmatic individual (Ehrlich and Lee, 1969). The low dogmatic counselors tended to overestimate the counseling relationships they would provide, as judged by client perceptions of the established counseling relationships, and perceived the relationship approximately as they had expected. However, the high dogmatic counselors apparently underestimated the counseling relationships they would provide, and experienced the greatest adjustment from expectations to perceptions of the counseling relationship.

It would seem, therefore, that although client and counselor dogmatism alone had little relation to dyadic counseling relationship congruency, dogmatism was related to several components of the dyadic counseling relationship congruency concept. In brief, the high dogmatic clients and counselors tended to underestimate, and the low dogmatic clients and counselors overestimate, the quality of the counseling relationships they would experience and provide. After the initial counseling interview, the high dogmatic counselors were perceived most favorably by their clients, while the low dogmatic counselors perceived themselves the best even though their clients gave them relatively low ratings. The clients and counselors did not differ significantly in their perceptions of the counseling relationship,
and the high dogmatic subjects seemed to most facilitate dyadic counseling relationship congruency. That is, the high dogmatic counselors changed the most from expectations to perceptions more nearly in accord with those of their clients. The high dogmatic clients also exhibited the most flexibility for adjusting from low expectations to more favorable perceptions of the counseling relationship.

Interpretations and Implications

Interpretations and implications for theory and practice

The present research suggests that when the counseling process after an initial interview is viewed within a dyadic framework, a relation may not exist between dyadic counseling relationship congruency and client and counselor dogmatism alone, but may be related to the interaction of client-counselor dogmatism. It may also be that dogmatism as a personality factor is completely unrelated to the counseling process, and that other variables, such as evidenced behaviors, play a more important part in therapeutic change. At any rate, the present research suggests that the dyadic approach, including the consideration of what both client and counselor bring to the counseling situation, the impact they have on each other during the counseling interaction, and how each is different as a result of the encounter, is a productive research design for understanding the counseling process. Future research into the counseling process might best be conducted by researching both client and counselor together rather than, for example, the perceptions of the client or the counselor independently.
In addition, the present research implies, for the conditions surrounding this investigation, that client and counselor dogmatism is related to counseling relationship expectational discrepancies and the reduction of such discrepancies in the dyad. This result may have been partly due to the client and counselor populations employed. High dogmatic clients drawn from courses in Counseling and Personnel may be more pessimistic in their expectations of what counseling will be like with peers than medium or low dogmatic subjects because of self-doubts regarding their abilities to be successful as counselors if the roles were reversed. The high dogmatic clients might, then, express relatively low expectations of the counseling relationship based upon a concern for the counselors they will see and how those counselors' performances might be evaluated. Given these relatively low expectational levels, perceptions by the high dogmatic clients of favorable counseling relationships would result in large discrepancies between expectations and perceptions.

The low dogmatic clients, on the other hand, expected a great deal from the counseling relationship, perhaps unrealistically so. They may have been expressing the expectation that the counselors would be open, flexible, and successful at establishing interpersonal relationships, based upon their own perceptions of themselves. The counselors with whom the low dogmatic clients interacted might have felt comfortable with them because of the clients' openness, and, hence, may have been subtly seduced into behaving as the clients expected they would. Thus, little movement would have occurred from expectations to perceptions when considering the low dogmatic clients.
The high dogmatic counselors may have expected to be perceived by their clients as providing relatively poor quality counseling relationships because of self-doubts about their own abilities to function successfully with peers. Such doubts might be the result of past disappointing interpersonal relationships with peers in which the dogmatism factor had a negative effect, or in which the high dogmatic counselors believed they were being perceived negatively because of inflexible and authoritarian behaviors. It might also be possible that the high dogmatic counselors expected to be perceived less favorably than the low dogmatic counselors because textbooks and counselor training programs reinforce the belief that to be high dogmatic is bad and to be low dogmatic is good.

The high dogmatic counselors were, however, perceived by their clients to provide the most favorable counseling relationships. This success experienced by the high dogmatic counselors must have been evident to them, because they evidenced the most change from expectations to perceptions of the counseling relationship.

The low dogmatic counselors studied held the highest expectations for the kinds of counseling relationships they would provide. These expectations might have been predictive of reality as they would experience it in counseling, but their clients' perceptions did not validate such beliefs. As mentioned earlier, the high dogmatic counselors were perceived to provide the most favorable counseling relationship. The low dogmatic counselors may have held high expectations based upon self-perceptions of their own interpersonal relationship successes, and an optimism that clients would view positively such
interpersonal relationship skills as openness, flexibility, and non-authoritativeness—ways of behaving which may have been quite successful in other interpersonal relationship situations. The low dogmatic counselors may also have expected to be perceived positively because of a belief that the effective counselor is open, flexible, and non-authoritative.

However, even though the perceptions of the clients of the low dogmatic counselors did not validate their expectations, the low dogmatic counselors still perceived themselves as providing more favorable counseling relationships than did either the medium or high dogmatic counselor. A possible explanation for this result is that the low dogmatic counselors may believe certain of their behaviors are important facilitators of client therapeutic gain, but their clients may not share that view. That is, what are desirable behaviors to facilitate some interpersonal relationships may not be viewed by clients as important counselor actions to alleviate client concern.

Future research on counseling relationships and dogmatism, then, should, perhaps, not only be concerned with measuring the extent to which favorable perceptions and personality variables are present in the dyad, but also the kinds of behaviors characteristic of populations studied, and the ways clients and counselors function to reinforce therapeutic gain.

Further, the present research has some implications for Rokeach's conceptualizations of dogmatism, the effect of training programs on dogmatism, and the assertion of some that the effective counselor is open-minded or low in dogmatism.
Rokeach (1960) stated that the highly dogmatic individual is more inflexible, closed-minded and resistant to change than the low dogmatic person. However, in the present research, the high dogmatic counselors changed the most from expectations to perceptions, while the low dogmatic counselors, who expected to be perceived the most favorably and were not, changed the least from expectations to perceptions of the counseling relationship. Also, the high dogmatic clients, who expected to perceive the least favorable counseling relationships, changed the most from expectations to more favorable perceptions. It is possible, therefore, that the dogmatism trait may not be the central factor influencing flexibility and resistance to change. It could be that some situational variable, such as the kind of interaction being conducted, is a more powerful variable influencing closed-mindedness than the measured dogmatism levels of the interaction system participants. For example, it might be much easier for a counselor to give up preconceived notions of how he will be perceived by clients after counseling than for a highly religious individual to change his beliefs about the nature of eternity as a result of participating in a discussion group. It would seem, therefore, that further interest in dogmatism might be centered around the conditions under which, for example, the high dogmatic counselor is flexible and the low dogmatic counselor inflexible, rather than simply attempting to relate dogmatism levels to some outcome measure, such as counseling effectiveness.

In addition, Ehrlich and Lee (1969), in an investigation of Rokeach's authority figure and dogmatism concept, reported that highly dogmatic individuals are less successful at evaluating interpersonal
relationships than low dogmatic persons because of a difficulty
distinguishing between the source of stimuli and the quality of the
stimuli. However, as reported earlier, the high dogmatic counselors
were more successful at evaluating their counseling relationships
realistically, as judged by clients' perceptions, than the low dogma-
tic counselors. Again, then, the critical issue may not be one's
level of dogmatism but the situational variables present which influ-
ence the extent to which one is able to evaluate one's interpersonal
relationships. For example, a highly dogmatic individual, being
corrected by one he views as his superior, might have more difficulty
evaluating this interpersonal relationship than a high dogmatic coun-
selor who is attempting to assess the quality of a counseling rela-
tionship with a peer. The implication for research is again, then,
that attention should perhaps be directed toward investigating the
situational variables which influence the behavior of the dogmatic
individual rather than simply attempting to relate the dogmatism
personality factor to probable interpersonal relationship occurrences.

The effect of counselor education programs on highly dogmatic
counselor trainees may also partially explain the present research
results. If it is true that high dogmatic individuals are inflexible,
resistant to change and generally experience less productive inter-
personal relationships than low dogmatics, the present research result
that the high dogmatic counselors were perceived by their clients to
offer more favorable counseling relationships than medium or low
dogmatics raises the possibility that counselor training programs may
be providing the high dogmatic counselor trainees with counseling and
interpersonal relationship skills which complement certain of their personality factors and ways of behaving resulting in favorable perceptions by dyad partners. Counselor education training programs may reinforce and encourage low dogmatic ways of functioning in their trainees, but low dogmatic counselors might be viewed by their clients as providing less favorable counseling relationships than high dogmatic counselors who have acquired certain counseling and interpersonal relationship skills through the training program. Counselor education programs, therefore, might become interested in relating low dogmatic ways of functioning to meaningful criterion measures of client change, rather than possibly assuming that to be low dogmatic is good, and facilitative of counseling success. The implication can also be drawn that counselor education programs should research high dogmatic ways of behaving that may be reinforcing for client change, and structure learning experiences for counselor trainees to best complement their basic personality traits, rather than attempting to change all trainees to some preconceived personality norm of the effective counselor. In addition, counselor education programs which screen candidates for admission on the basis of dogmatism should realize that to be high dogmatic is not necessarily detrimental to a counselor's functioning, and to be low dogmatic does not insure one's potential success as a counselor.

It could be possible, in fact, that the high dogmatic and low dogmatic populations may each be composed of at least two sub-groups. The high dogmatic population might consist of individuals who are closed-minded, inflexible, resistant to change, and generally
unsuccessful in their interpersonal relationships and at counseling. However, some high dogmatic individuals might also possess these basic characteristics which, when combined with certain ways of behaving, result in favorable perceptions by others and success at counseling. This sub-group might be perceived by clients, for example, as possessing self-understanding, self-assurance, and confidence in their counseling abilities. Such client perceptions of high dogmatic counselors might serve a placebo function and influence therapeutic gain. For example, clients come to counselors because the clients cannot seem to solve their problems themselves. The client assumption may be that the counselor knows what is troubling the client and can help him discover more effective ways of functioning. A low dogmatic counselor, with his open-mindedness, flexibility, and non-authoritativeness, may appear to the client as indecisive, non-directive, and lacking in his own confidence as a counselor, resulting in ambiguity which could cause the client to become anxious and lose confidence in the counselor's ability to help him. The high dogmatic counselor, however, might be perceived as sure of himself, his abilities, and his understanding of the client's problem and how he could function more successfully, thus resulting in greater client confidence in the counselor and more faith in the outcome of the counseling.

The low dogmatic population may be composed of individuals who are open-minded, flexible, able to assimilate and evaluate stimuli which are contradictory to prior expectations, and successful in interpersonal relationships. Also, this population might consist of individuals so open-minded that they are perceived as vacillators who
lack confidence in their own judgments, counseling skills, and abilities to facilitate the successful resolution of client concerns. Individuals who are dogmatic about their right to be open-minded might also be found in this sub-group. They include those who insist upon openness, honesty in interpersonal relations, and "doing your own thing" regardless of the possible consequences of this totally honest, open, and unrestricted behavior to the environment. Perhaps extreme openness is not viewed by clients as either an important, necessary, or desirable condition for a favorable counseling relationship, and may not be a central condition for counseling effectiveness. The implication of this discussion is that the individuals on the extreme ends of the dogmatism continuum, including both the low and high dogmatic persons, might be given special attention when screening for counselor training programs. Care should be taken to determine whether the low or high dogmatism personality factor present in the counselor candidate is such that his success as a counselor will be enhanced, rather than being concerned only with whether the applicant measures low or high on the dogmatism scale.

These possibilities also have some implications for the position of those who maintain that the effective counselor is open-minded or low dogmatic (Allen, 1967; Russo, Kelz, and Hudson, 1964). It may be that high dogmatic counselors, taught certain counseling behaviors, could be more effective with their clients than low dogmatic counselors. The training of counselors who are extremely open or low dogmatic may be a misdirected objective if the openness is thought of as an ultimate counseling technique rather than a counselor personality
dimension and useful adjunct to the counseling process. It needs to be made clear that openness may be a desirable counselor personality trait for self-understanding and flexibility in attempting to understand and work with the client, but that openness is not necessarily a utopian technique for counseling effectiveness with all clients. Under some conditions, high dogmatic counselors may be as successful as, and perhaps more so than, their low dogmatic peers.

Research implications

Several research questions worthy of investigation have evolved from the study.

1. A further investigation of the relation between dogmatism and dyadic counseling relationship congruency should be conducted using different client and counselor populations, such as public school students and counselors.

2. A study of the differences in ways of behaving between high dogmatic counselors and low dogmatic counselors would be useful.

3. The effect of various forms of counselor behavior on client perceptions of the counseling relationship should be investigated.

4. A study of the relation between client behavior and counselor perceptions of the counseling relationship would be worthwhile.

5. A similar type of study should be conducted with educational-vocational counseling cases.
6. An investigation of dyadic counseling relationship congruency at different stages of the counseling process would be of value. Dyadic counseling relationship congruency may be enhanced or decreased by further interaction following the initial interview.

7. Research should be conducted on the interaction of counselor orientation (e.g. Behavioral, Rational, Rogerian) and dogmatism in the dyad with respect to dyadic counseling relationship congruency over several interviews, and specific client behavioral changes. Client behavioral indices might include client changes from cognitive to affective discourse or client evidence of more effective problem-solving behavior.

8. Research directed toward identifying the conditions under which the high dogmatic counselor is flexible and the low dogmatic counselor inflexible is needed.
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APPENDIX A

ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

Write in +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.</td>
<td>-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.</td>
<td>-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.</td>
<td>-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.</td>
<td>1: I AGREE A LITTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.</td>
<td>2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.</td>
<td>3: I AGREE VERY MUCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most people just don't give a &quot;damn&quot; for others.</td>
<td>1: I AGREE A LITTLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.

12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.

15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.

16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.

18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.

23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one’s own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

29. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

30. There are two kinds of people in this world: Those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he’s wrong.

32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.

35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.
APPENDIX B

BARRETT - LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

1. He respects me as a person.
2. He wants to understand how I see things.
3. His interest in me depends on the things I say or do.
4. He is comfortable and at ease in our relationship.
5. He feels a true liking for me.
6. He may understand my words but he does not see the way I feel.
7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way he feels about me.
8. I feel that he puts on a role or front with me.
9. He is impatient with me.
10. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
11. Depending on my behavior, he has a better opinion of me sometimes than he has at other times.
12. I feel that he is real and genuine with me.
13. I feel appreciated by him.
14. He looks at what I do from his own point of view.
15. His feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him.
16. It makes him uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.
17. He is indifferent to me.
18. He usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.
19. He wants me to be a particular kind of person.
20. I nearly always feel that what he says expresses exactly what he is feeling and thinking as he says it.
21. He finds me rather dull and uninteresting.

22. His own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him from understanding me.

23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him without really making him feel any differently about me.

24. He wants me to think that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.

25. He cares for me.

26. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels.

27. He likes certain things about me, and there are other things he does not like.

28. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.

29. I feel that he disapproves of me.

30. He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.

31. His attitude toward me stays the same; he is not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.

32. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.

33. He just tolerates me.

34. He usually understands the whole of what I mean.

35. If I show that I am angry with him, he becomes hurt or angry with me, too.

36. He expresses his true impressions and feelings with me.

37. He is friendly and warm with me.

38. He just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.

39. How much he likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything I tell him about myself.
40. At times I sense that he is not aware of what he is really feeling with me.

41. I feel that he really values me.

42. He appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.

43. He approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.

44. He is willing to express whatever is actually in his mind with me, including any feelings about himself or about me.

45. He doesn’t like me for myself.

46. At times he thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.

47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make him feel any more or less appreciative of me.

48. He is openly himself in our relationship.

49. I seem to irritate and bother him.

50. He does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.

51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to his feeling toward me.

52. There are times when I feel that his outward response to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.

53. At times he feels contempt for me.

54. He understands me.

55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in his eyes than I am at other times.

56. I have not felt that he tries to hide anything from himself that he feels with me.

57. He is truly interested in me.

58. His response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him.
59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he feels toward me.

60. What he says to me often gives a wrong impression of his whole thought or feeling at the time.

61. He feels deep affection for me.

62. When I am hurt or upset he can recognize my feelings exactly, without becoming upset himself.

63. What other people think of me does (or would, if he knew) affect the ways he feels toward me.

64. I believe that he has feelings he does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.
APPENDIX C

BARRETT - LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Name __________________________________________ Date ______________

Age ______ Sex ______ Educational Level __________________________

Below are listed a variety of ways that a counselor may feel or behave in relation to a client.

Please consider each statement with reference to your expected relationship with your counselor.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it will be true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3 to stand for the following answers:

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it will be true.
+2: Yes, I feel it will be true.
+1: Yes, I feel that it will probably be true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it will probably be untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel it will not be true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it will not be true.
APPENDIX D

BARRETT - LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Name____________________________________   Date _____________

Age_____________

Below are listed a variety of ways that a counselor may feel or
behave in relation to a client.

Please consider each statement with reference to how you feel
your client will see you as a counselor.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly
you feel your client will see it as true, or not true, in this rela­
tionship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2,
-3, to stand for the following answers.

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it will be true my client will
see me in this way.

+2: Yes, I feel that it will be true my client will see me in
this way.

+1: Yes, I feel that it will probably be true, or more true than
untrue, my client will see me in this way.

-1: No, I feel that it will probably be untrue, or more untrue
than true, my client will see me in this way.

-2: No, I feel that it will not be true my client will see me
in this way.

-3: No, I strongly feel that it will not be true my client will
see me in this way.
APPENDIX E

BARRETT - LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Name_________________________________

Below are listed a variety of ways that a counselor may feel or behave in relation to a client.

Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with the counselor you have just seen.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel that it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.
APPENDIX F

BARRETT - LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Name ____________________________ Date ____________

Client ____________________________

Below are listed a variety of ways that a counselor may feel or behave in relation to a client.

Please consider each statement with reference to how you feel the client you have just seen saw you as a counselor.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel your client saw it as true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true my client saw me in this way.
+2: Yes, I feel that it is true my client saw me in this way.
+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue, my client saw me in this way.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true, my client saw me in this way.
-2: No, I feel that it is not true my client saw me in this way.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true my client saw me in this way.
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# APPENDIX G

## Data Collection Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rok</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Rok</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Rok</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Dogmatism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Data values may be subject to rounding or transcription errors.
### APPENDIX G (continued)

#### Data Collection Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>Client 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rok Exp Per</td>
<td>Rok Exp Per</td>
<td>Rok Exp Per</td>
<td>Rok Exp Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>122 160 146 183</td>
<td>147 202 196 203 167 177</td>
<td>129 157 232 132 173 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>167 194</td>
<td>126 200 195 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>207 201</td>
<td>103 215 193 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>101 228 248 232</td>
<td>146 139 167 167 129 160</td>
<td>133 201 222 124 171 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>243 200</td>
<td>95 228 234 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>89 226 193 205</td>
<td>142 119 137 144 143 190</td>
<td>122 145 167 122 165 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>180 214</td>
<td>116 207 228 224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>78 247 271 277</td>
<td>142 84 86 141 200 232</td>
<td>131 165 207 126 139 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>248 253</td>
<td>60 242 263 272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H

Ratings of Dyadic Counseling Relationship Congruency Achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Client Dogmatism</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Client 1</td>
<td>Client 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater</td>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td>Rater 2</td>
<td>Rater 3</td>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td>Rater 2</td>
<td>Rater 3</td>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td>Rater 2</td>
<td>Rater 3</td>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td>Rater 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. High
2. Medium
3. Low
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