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Introduction

Researchers have suggested that client change in counseling is dependent on the impact of the counselor on the client (Atkinson & Carskaddon, 1975; Gardner, 1964; Heller & Goldstein, 1961; Helms & Simons, Note 1; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Matross, 1973; Strong & Schmidt, 1970). This has been called the counselor's credibility, and most counselors believe that the more credible they appear to their clients, the more counselors will be able to influence their clients. Strong (1968) suggests that a highly credible counselor can change many client attitudes and beliefs with little loss of credibility, but a more easily discredited counselor would change few of the client's attitudes and beliefs while enduring a lot of derogation. It is therefore valuable to identify characteristics that influence counselor credibility.

Helms and Simons (Note 1) have observed that potential contributors to counselor credibility may be classified as either changeable or rather constant, depending on consistency across time. Changeable aspects include those that change with the counselor's mood and concentration (Rice, 1973; Simonson, 1976), those that change across clients or across counseling sessions (Bryson & Cody, 1973; Wolkon, Morivaki, & Williams, 1973), and others that change because of formal training or because of self-observation. Some examples of the variable sources of counselor credibility include the counselor's non-verbal and verbal behaviors, neatness of dress and physical appearance, quality of advice and information given to the client, and amount of empathy.
Other sources of counselor credibility are more constant or stable. Some do not change at all (e.g., sex of counselor, counselor's height), some change slowly with time (e.g., counselor's age, counselor's weight), and other sources seldom change, but upon occasion these sources of credibility may change abruptly by stepping into a whole new category (e.g., educational degree held by the counselor, counselor's marital status).

The factors that contribute to credibility can also be classified as behavioral or non-behavioral in nature. Behavioral factors of counselor credibility include language, self-disclosure, and empathy. Some of the non-behavioral factors that have been shown to contribute to credibility (Strong, 1968; Strong & Dixon, 1971) are educational degree of counselor, office decor, and diplomas.

This study deals with three factors of counselor credibility that are both non-behavioral and constant in nature. The study considers sex, age, and educational level of the counselor as components of perceived counselor credibility. These factors were chosen because they are potential influences on the client's impression of the counselor right from the beginning of the counseling relationship. They represent information usually known or estimated by the client. They are also relatively stable aspects of the counselor with perception of sex being constant, perception of age changing very slowly, and perception of educational degree changing only rarely during the course of the counseling. In addition, sex, age, and educational level of the counselor have been examined occasionally in previous counseling research and each has been shown to be a potentially important
factor in the impression the client forms of the counselor. Arbuckle (1972) cites sex, age, and education (elitism) as important features of the counselor because our society evaluates persons on the basis of these variables. He also illustrates how little we currently know about the specific effects these features do have on the client.

These particular variables also have significant implications for counseling research. An examination of counseling research suggests that the majority is done with young counselors, and more research is done with male counselors than female counselors (Litwack, Gelson, & Saltzman, 1968). Since previous studies such as Helms and Simons (Note 1), Simons and Helms (in press), and Boulware and Holmes (1970) have found that sex and age of the counselor influence perceived counselor credibility, our counseling research results may not correspond to counseling practice.

Counselor Credibility

All counselors try to maximize their credibility, but not all counselors would agree on how this should be done. While most counselors believe that their sex, age, and educational degree affect their clients' perceptions of themselves as counselors, there is not a unified opinion of what effects these factors have (Arbuckle, 1972; Strong, 1968). This diversity in opinions can be seen in the beliefs that counselors-in-training hold about how to improve the impression they make on their clients.

In the author's personal experience, some practicum students thought they would appear more credible if they could be seen as an expert. These practicum counselors usually counseled in suits or dresses. Diplomas on
the wall and an office bookcase well-stocked with intellectual books were seen as good ideas. A common opinion of this group was that the older one appeared the more one would be assumed by the client to be credible. The final touch would be when the counselor could finally introduce himself or herself as "Hello, I'm Doctor ..." (Strong, 1968).

Some members of this group felt that being a male counselor helped build counselor credibility since males are more often seen as experts; others thought that being female contributed to counselor credibility because the characteristics of a competent counselor are largely ones considered typically feminine. Still others in this group thought that the counselor's sex would not contribute to expertness and therefore not influence counselor credibility.

A second group of practicum students thought that their credibility as counselors was enhanced by being similar to the clients. These practicum counselors would have liked to do their counseling dressed in jeans. Diplomas and a well-stocked bookcase would not be as important as a "friendly," at-home atmosphere in the office. They believed that clients probably would like having a counselor similar in age, and they also thought that they would not introduce themselves as "Doctor" after leaving graduate school. For this group, counselor credibility was seen as being higher for same-sex dyads (Arbuckle, 1972).

A few others did not really think that their sex, age, and amount of education would significantly alter the perceptions their clients have of them as credible counselors. They believed that as long as the client put
that label of counselor on one, one had a good chance of being seen as credible to the client regardless of sex, age, and education.

These different views exist for more experienced counselors too. In every counseling center there are counselors whose strategy is to appear more expert than the client, and other counselors who try to decrease differences between themselves and their clients. Some counselors find themselves changing back and forth between the strategies with different clients.

Figure 1 summarizes the preceding discussion. Factors in counseling can be classified along the two dimensions of non-behavioral-behavioral and constant-changeable. These factors influence the client's perception of the counselor credibility in two possible ways: (a) credibility can be influenced when an aspect of the counseling situation raises or lowers the perceived similarity between the client and counselor; (b) credibility can be influenced when some factor of the counseling situation affects how the client perceives the counselor in terms of expertness. In turn, counselor credibility helps to influence counseling outcome. Clients might also infer relationships among the various factors; e.g., constant-non-behavioral factors may be seen as connected with changeable-behavioral factors and so forth. A hypothetical example is that one client might assume that older females would be more empathic and self-disclosing but give poorer arguments than a young male.

Research in counseling psychology is largely atheoretical, so there is no available comprehensive theory of counselor preferences based on either
Figure 1. Behavioral and non-behavioral factors of credibility of constant and changeable nature which are potential contributors to counselor credibility.
counselor expertness or counselor similarity. By far the best available theoretical framework (and the one most suitable for this study) is that of Strong (1968), in which counseling is seen as an interpersonal influence process. Besides expertness and similarity (attractiveness) of the counselor, the Strong framework considers the effects of counselor trustworthiness, communication discrepancy, and involvement on outcome.

**Strong's Interpersonal Influence Theory**

Strong (1968) describes counseling as an interpersonal influence process with the goal of client attitude and behavior change. Strong and Schmidt (1970) summarize this as "the counselor's task is to influence the client in helpful ways, and the client's task is to be influenced" (p. 81). Of course, what the counselor does influences counselor credibility (and therefore the amount of client change), but probably also what a counselor is has some influence on counselor credibility.

Strong (1968) defines counselor credibility similarly to Hovland, Janis and Kelley's (1953) definition of communicator credibility. The two major components are the counselor's expertness (the extent to which the client perceives the counselor to be a source of valid behaviors) and the counselor's trustworthiness (how much confidence the client has in the counselor's interest and commitment). A third factor that influences the client's evaluation of the counselor is the client's perceived similarity to the counselor. Zytowski (Note 2) further suggests that the importance of counselor expertness as opposed to counselor similarity may differ for male and female clients. For example, male clients may pay more attention to the expertness level of counselors than do female clients.
Perhaps the most important effect is that of perceived expertness. Strong (1968) interprets this influence from the framework of Festinger's (1957) cognitive dissonance theory. When a counselor and client differ in opinions, attitudes, or feelings, the client experiences dissonance. The client can reduce dissonance by changing his or her own cognitions, by influencing the counselor's cognitions, by decreasing the importance of the topic involved, or by seeking support for his or her position outside of the counseling situation. The client's perception of the counselor's expertness moderates the degree to which the client changes his or her views to those of the counselor (Strong, 1968; Strong & Schmidt, 1970).

Strong (1968) and Strong and Schmidt (1970) suggest that expertness is evidenced by (a) objective evidence of specialized training (e.g., diplomas, certificates, titles), (b) reputation as an expert, and (c) behavioral evidence within the counseling session (e.g., coherent arguments, good advice, confidence). The hypothesis in this study is that the counselor's age and the counselor's educational level also influence perceived expertness. In addition, Strong (1968) believes that the counselor's perceived trustworthiness is determined by perceived honesty, sincerity, and openness plus lack of motivation for personal gains.

Strong (1968) also believes counselor attractiveness or similarity is an important factor. While Strong refers mainly to similarity in background and opinions, similarity in this study is on the chosen characteristics of sex, age, and educational level. Boulware and Holmes (1970) and Byrne, London, and Reeves (1968) suggest that the first impressions that
the client has of the counselor are most influenced by overt stimulus characteristics of the counselor, such as the counselor's sex, age, and attractiveness.

The experimenter hypothesizes that counselor credibility is increased when age of counselor and education of the counselor contribute to expertness and when sex of counselor contributes to similarity. The counselor should be seen as most credible when both expertness and similarity of counselor with client are enhanced. Involvement in counseling should enhance these influences, and there should be more involvement in personal than in vocational counseling.

Counselor's Sex

This factor seems to be the most confusing one in this study. Some studies suggest an overall preference for male counselors while others suggest a same-sex counselor preference. But more confusing than the conflicting results are the number of possible conflicting interpretations—just about any result could be interpreted as based on expertness or similarity.

The first research to look at the preferences clients have for male and female counselors was done by Koile and Bird (1956). Using freshmen college students, the researchers found that there was an overall preference for male counselors; i.e., women college students were more willing to consult a male counselor than were men college students to consult a female counselor.

Fuller (1963), Fuller (1964), Boulware and Holmes (1970), Mezanno (1971), and Chesler (1971) also provide evidence that male counselors are
evaluated more positively than female counselors by both male and female clients. Fuller (1964) found that male and female college clients preferred male counselors and a non-client college sample also held this preference pattern. Female subjects were more likely than male subjects to state no sex preference for counselor. When broken down by vocational versus personal presenting problem, there was an interesting difference. With a vocational counseling concern, both male and female subjects preferred male counselors, but with a personal counseling concern, both male and female subjects preferred a same-sex counselor.

Boulware and Holmes (1970) found that older males were the preferred counselors in all cases except that female subjects with a personal counseling problem preferred older women the most. With a vocational problem, the preferences for male subjects from high to low were older males, older females, younger males and younger females, but for the female subjects the preferences were older males, younger males, older females, and younger females.

The study of Boulware and Holmes (1970) is also of interest to the present study in that not only did it ask subjects which of the counselors would they prefer to talk to, but also to anticipate the counselor's attitudes and behaviors within the counseling session. Significant differences between older males and younger females were found on items that measured expected counselor's experience, knowledge of helpful information, understanding of client's concern, and liking of client by the counselor. These items were incorporated into the scale used in this research so that good
comparisons could be made between the findings of the present study and the study done by Boulware and Holmes (1970).

Mezanno (1971) ran a study using seventh through twelfth graders. He found that female students usually preferred male counselors as did male students. There was, however, some shift in the higher grades to female counselors if problems were family concerns.

The Mezanno (1971) study used the problem areas of the Mooney Problem Check List with these directions:

Pretend you are in a school that has two counselors. One is a man, the other is a woman. Both are exactly alike in age, appearance, and the way that they work with students. You may choose to see either one of these two counselors to talk to. Remember, the only difference between them is that one is a man and the other is a woman. (p. 43)

These directions are so restrictive that it is possible that they might have eliminated some of the ways one might usually react differently to male and female counselors. In other words, this study might tell us that if two counselors are identical in behaviors and attitudes, most young people choose the man, but it fails to shed light on whether young persons expect men and women counselors to actually behave and believe identically.

Chesler (1971) looked at 1001 middle-income clients (538 women and 463 men) who sought counseling in New York City between 1965 and 1969. She found that 24% of the women and 14% of the men requested a counselor specifically by sex. Whether male or female client, when a request was specified, they overwhelmingly requested a male rather than a female counselor.

These five studies suggest that male counselors are much preferred to female counselors, especially for vocational counseling, but findings of
later research have not been consistent with these studies. While Pfeifel (1971) did not get a significant effect for counselor sex, his findings did approach significance ($p=.09$) with female counselors rated higher than male counselors. This study used actual clients of secondary school counselors. In another study involving client evaluation of counselors in a college setting, Rosen and Zytowski (Note 3) found no differences in evaluation of female and male counselors.

In a study run in 1975, Helms and Simons (Note 1) explored the effects of age and sex of counselor on perceived counselor credibility. Subjects stated their preference for female and male counselors and also were required to anticipate how their counseling behaviors would be altered by interacting with counselors of either sex. Similar to Boulware and Holmes (1970), the subjects responded to pictures of counselors paired with a brief neutral description. In this study, subjects were not "tuned in" to the purpose of the study; i.e., they were not informed that age and sex of counselor were factors being investigated.

The results of Helms and Simons (Note 1) were that there were no significant differences for counselor preference based on counselor's sex. Nor was there a sex difference in expected counselor competence or counseling climate. Female subjects were more unwilling to ask questions of a female counselor than of a male counselor, while male subjects were least reluctant about asking questions of a female counselor. To summarize, this study found that college students did not evaluate counselors on the basis of sex alone. Helms and Simons state, "That they did not anticipate that
either sex would be more competent in delivering counseling services nor
demonstrate any overt preference for either sex, suggests that college stu­
dents may expect counselors to have certain skills in common with the role
of counselor regardless of sex."

Simons and Helms (in press) found a strong preference for female coun­
selors for both college and noncollege women. The authors suggest two pos­
sible explanations. First, the directions in this study stated that the
counselors worked mainly with women. Subjects might have felt that coun­
selors who declare such expertise would best demonstrate the appropriate
skills if they were women. A second explanation is that Fabrikant's (1974)
prediction that women clients would shift their counselor preferences in
favor of female counselors rather than male counselors is indeed taking
place.

Other counseling research that is relevant to this area are studies in
which sex of client and/or counselor have been varied and differences in
behaviors during the counseling session have been noticed. In the area of
empathy, for example, Allport (1937), Wolf and Murray (1937), Olesker and
Balter (1972), and Hill (1975) all found that same-sex pairs of clients and
counselors exhibited greater empathy. Hackney (1974) used only female sub­
jects and found more empathy when the females were paired with female coun­
selors than when paired with male counselors. If subjects can anticipate
this relationship, it should suggest a preference for male counselors by
male subjects and a preference for female counselors by female subjects.

On the other hand, there seems to be more self-disclosure in opposite­
sex pairs. Brooks (1974) found that subjects disclosed more in dyads
containing a female; i.e., male counselor–male client pairs resulted in the least self-disclosure. The most self-disclosure was in opposite-sex dyads. Hill (1975) also found the most self-disclosure in opposite-sex pairings.

The hypothesis in this study is that there will be a same-sex preference, especially in the personal problem condition. This prediction is made on the basis of the most recent counselor preference studies and arguments set forth by Fabrikant (1974) and Simons and Helms (in press). A male preference for male counselors has been a fairly consistent finding and is the strongest part of the hypothesis. This hypothesis is seen as consistent with Strong's (1968) theory in that same-sex preference could be made on the basis of either expertness (i.e., men best understand a male's problems while women best understand a women's problems therefore the level of expertness is maximized by a counselor of the same sex as the client) or similarity.

Counselor's Age

Very few studies have paid attention to the role played by the counselor's age. Those that have been done usually looked at both sex and age, so most of the studies discussed here have already been mentioned in the previous section.

An early study by Holman (1955) and another by Levy and Iscoe (Note 4) found that both male and female clients prefer an older rather than younger counselor for both vocational and personal problems. In both of these studies, age was divided into only two groups.

Boulware and Holmes (1970) also found a strong preference for older counselors. The young group in this study was 25 to 29 years old and the
old group was 45 to 49 years old. Older males were seen as the most understanding, givers of the most advice, most capable of handling their own problems, the most experienced helpers, the most up-to-date on counseling techniques and information, the most likable, and also liking the client the most. Older females were considered to make the strongest moral evaluations of the client's behavior. Younger males were evaluated as being the most similar in interests and attitudes, having experienced the same problems, and the most accepting of the client as a person. Younger females tended to receive the lowest ratings.

In Helms and Simons (Note 1) subjects anticipated that they would interact differently with male and female counselors of four age groups. All subjects expected to verbally interact more with counselors of ages 25 to 45 if of the opposite sex, and with counselors of age 55 to 65 if of the same sex. On the whole, male and female students reacted similarly to counselors whose ages ranged from 35 to 45 and from 55 to 65. However, women anticipated being more comfortable with counselors of ages 45 to 55 than did the men, while the reverse was true for counselors of ages 25 to 35.

The two studies reported in Simons and Helms (in press) found that college women preferred women counselors in the 35 to 45 and 55 to 65 years age ranges, while the non-college women most preferred counselors in the 55 to 65 years age range.

On the whole, the studies suggest that clients prefer older counselors. Some counselors, however, believe that age is a negative influence
in the counseling relationship. Arbuckle (1972) states that "Another curse counselors face today is the apparent belief that the onset of senility and idiocy takes place at about the age of 31" (p. 786). Despite Arbuckle's opinion, it seems that increasing age of counselor will increase counselor credibility because age is associated with expertness.

Counselor's Education

Preference for counselors of varying educational level has been studied indirectly in that several experimenters have manipulated effect of counselor credibility or expertness in terms of counselor's educational level. This has been done by Hartley (1969), Sprafkin (1970), Strong and Dixon (1971), Gottman and Haase (1972), Binderman, Fretz, Scott, and Abrams (1972), and Atkinson and Carskaddon (1975). Most of the studies suggested that people react more positively to and are more influenced by the counselor with the more impressive credentials. Exceptions to this finding are Sprafkin (1970) and Gottman and Haase (1972).

The conflicting results in this area of research can be seen in these quotes from two studies. Gottman and Haase (1972) state that "Expertness, as communicated to the client by status introduction, prestige symbols, the presence of experience and degrees, does not appear to affect counseling outcome positively" (p. 175). On the other hand, Atkinson and Carskaddon (1975) state:

Individuals perceive a counselor as a more credible source of assistance if he is introduced as a highly prestigious professional and if he uses a preponderance of highly abstract, psychological jargon than if the counselor is assigned a low level of expertness and employs easy-to-understand layman's language.
This finding, combined with research on the effects of interpersonal expectation on behavior change, suggests that counselors should attend to showmanship attributes that affect their credibility as a counselor as well as to counseling tendencies techniques if they hope to bring about client behavior change. (p. 184)

Bergin (1962) assigned subjects to high and low credibility conditions and varied amount of communication discrepancy. The credible communicator used an office which displayed diplomas and certificates and wore a white lab coat. The low-credibility communicator was an undergraduate student. Bergin found that changes on masculinity-femininity ratings were a linear function of discrepancy in the high-credibility condition, but not in the low-credibility condition.

Browning (1966) found that a larger number of large discrepancy interpretations were accepted by clients in the high-prestige-counselor condition than in the low-prestige-counselor condition. Heilbrun (1971), using female subjects and male counselors, found that women preferred counselors with high educational level.

It is expected that counselors with a high educational degree will be seen as more credible because the higher the degree, the more the counselor will be evaluated as an expert. Counselors with a Ph.D. will be more favorably evaluated than those with an M.S. and both of these groups would be rated higher than those with only a B.A.

Type of Counseling Problem

A feature of the present study is that the imagined counseling problem of the subject is varied as either vocational-educational or personal in nature. Previous studies have failed to differentiate type of presenting
counseling problem (Koile & Bird, 1956; Pfeifel, 1971) or used only personal problems (Helms & Simons, Note 1; Simons & Helms, in press) yet the results of Boulware and Holmes (1970), Fuller (1964), and Mezanno (1971) suggest that type of counseling problem does influence client preference for counselor.

In previous studies subjects only had to react to a given category of problems. Instead of evaluating actual counseling interactions, subjects were given a checklist of one or more problems and marked whether they would prefer discussing them with a male or female counselor. For example, Mezanno (1971) merely asked subjects to state preference for a male or female counselor to types of problems described like: "School concerns such as: Not spending enough time in study, not liking school, worrying about grades." In the present study subjects had to describe a specific vocational-educational or personal concern that was a current or former real concern, and then they had to anticipate how their counseling behaviors and attitudes would be influenced by the counselor with which they were paired.

**General Features of This Research**

Basically this research examines only the initial influences of the counselor's sex, age, and educational level on the client's preference for and evaluation of the counselor. It is important to examine the first impressions clients form of counselors because the initial impressions are the most important (Strupp, Fox, & Lesslar, 1969). They influence, for example, whether the client decides to terminate or continue in the counseling relationship, and how the client organizes later information.
acquired about the counselor (Jones & Gerard, 1967). Numerous studies (Asch, 1946; Dailey, 1952; Luchins, 1957; Anderson, 1965) suggest that first impressions heavily influence later impressions, and therefore the more known about initial impressions, the more one could predict about later impressions the client would have of the counselor.

The research reported here examines the counselor preferences of both male and female college students since previous studies by Boulware and Holmes (1970), Fuller (1964), and Helms and Simons (Note 1) have found that males and females differentially evaluate counselors who differ in sex and age. There are some indicants that the feminist movement is changing the perception of female counselor credibility especially by female subjects (Fabrikant, 1974; Simons & Helms, in press; Westervelt, 1973).

The present study is similar to Boulware and Holmes (1970), Helms and Simons (Note 1), and Simons and Helms (in press) in that subjects were asked to respond to a specific picture and description of a counselor. Helms and Simons (Note 1) believe that this is a refinement in the approach to measuring preference because when simply imagining the counselor to whom they would prefer talking about their problems they seemed to "imagine the counselor who was likely to be most prestigeful and credible according to societal standards--a male around their father's age" rather than according to their own personal biases.

Thus the current study examines the effect of counselor sex, age, and education on male and female college students' initial perception of counselor credibility and preference for counselors under the two conditions of
presenting problem: vocational-educational concern and personal concern. This represents a more complete and thorough design for studying preference for counselor than any previous study. The study goes beyond this, however, and tries to examine what behavior and attitude differences are expected with the various counselor sex, age, and education combinations. Of concern here is whether male and female college students expect counselors who differ in sex, age, and educational level to differ in (a) their behaviors and attitudes exhibited in counseling, (b) their beliefs and activities on a wide range of topics, (c) their counseling competencies, and (d) their personal characteristics. Also of concern is how the students anticipate that their own behavior and attitudes as clients would be influenced by the (credibility of the) counselor evidenced by (a) how they would feel and act in counseling, (b) what topics they would discuss during counseling, (c) expectations about the quality of counseling sessions, and (d) how many sessions they thought the counseling interactions would consist of before termination.

Hypotheses

1. Male subjects will prefer male counselors, and female subjects will prefer female counselors. The male preference for male counselors will be found for both counseling problem conditions; the female preference for female counselors will at least be found in the personal problem condition.

2. Subjects will prefer older counselors to younger counselors.

3. Counselors with a Ph.D. will be rated higher by subjects than
counselors with an M.S. degree. Counselors with a B.A. degree will be rated the lowest.

4. Females will tend to rate counselors higher than will male subjects.

5. Significant interactions of sex, age, and education of counselor and type of counseling concern and subject's sex are expected. Interactions of interest will be discussed up to the level of a three-way interaction. No specific interactions are hypothesized.
**Method**

The experimental design for the study is a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3 \times 4$ analysis of variance with two levels of counseling problems (vocational and personal), two levels of subject sex, two levels of counselor sex, three levels of counselor education (B.A., M.S., and Ph.D.), and four levels of counselor age (25-35 years, 35-45 years, 45-55 years, and 55-65 years).

**Subjects**

The 384 subjects (192 females, 192 males) were undergraduate students at Iowa State University who were currently enrolled in psychology courses. For participation in the experiment the volunteers received credit toward their grade in the psychology course. Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 23 years ($\bar{X} = 18.7$ years). Subjects were randomly assigned to conditions with the stipulation that each condition had equal numbers of female and male subjects.

**Counselor Descriptions**

The counselor descriptions consisted of a picture and a paragraph of information about the pictured counselor. Eight pictures identical to ones used by Simons and Helms (in press) represented male and female counselors of four age groups (25-35 years, 35-45 years, 45-55 years, 55-65 years).

The eight pictures used in this study were actually a subset of the 32 pictures used by Helms and Simons (Note 1). This same subset was used by Simons and Helms (in press). The subset was chosen so that pictures would be representative for each sex in each age group while eliminating pictures of minority counselors that existed in the original group of 32.
The pictures were all 24 mm x 30 mm three-fourths frontal head views of males and females who were not smiling. All of the pictures were of Caucasians. After photoduplication the attractiveness characteristics of these individuals were minimized so that all persons seemed rather neutral in attractiveness. However, the photoduplication provided a good enough picture so that age differences among these individuals were retained. Subjects in the study had to estimate the counselor's attractiveness and the counselor's age so that these two assumptions could be checked.

The paragraphs accompanying the pictures contained neutral information (i.e., all conditions gave the research interest of the counselor as "situational satisfaction" and the hobbies as "music and skiing.") plus the educational level of the individual, which was varied as B.A., M.S., and Ph.D.

Counselor Evaluation Scale

The questionnaire (see Appendix) used in the study adopted items used in previous studies by Boulware and Holmes (1970), Orlinsky and Howard (1966), Helms and Simons (Note 1), and Brown, Strong, and Rencher (1973). In addition, one part of the questionnaire consisted of original items.

Part A of the scale was composed of items from Boulware and Holmes (1970) and Helms and Simons (Note 1). This section was designed to evaluate the subjects' impressions of the way they would interact with the counselor to which they were assigned. Six of the items (1–6) required the subjects to estimate their own behaviors as a client. Subject's estimated self-disclosure was measured by how much they could discuss with the
counselor, the ability to ask questions of the counselor, and how open with their emotions they could be in interacting with the counselor. How comfortable they would feel in the first interview and in later interviews, and the degree of anxiety experienced during counseling were the items used to measure counseling climate as experienced by the client.

The next six items (7-12) required the subjects to estimate the counselors' behaviors in terms of counselor competence (i.e., degree of counselor's understanding of the problem, amount of advice counselor would give, and how current the counselor's information was) and in terms of counselor trustworthiness (i.e., counselor's interest in helping subject, degree to which the counselor liked and accepted the subject, and degree of moral evaluations made by counselor about the subject's behavior). The last three items asked for overall evaluations of the counselor's credibility in terms of the counselor as an expert, the counselor as a person, and the counselor as the subject's counselor.

Each of these items was rated on a scale of 1 to 99 and each was analyzed separately. In addition, a summed score of the first six items and a summed score of the next six items were analyzed.

Part B of the scale consisted of twelve possible topic areas. Subjects were asked to indicate to what degree (on a 1-7 scale) they would be willing to discuss each topic area with a counselor. These twelve topic areas (My Family, Anticipated Family, Fantasy and Future, Career and Education, Therapy, Religion, Peer Relations, Isolation versus Intimacy, Self-Identity, Independence versus Dependence, Sex and Guilt, and Anger and
Fear) were factors found by Howard, Orlinsky, and Hill (1969) and Orlinsky, Howard, and Hill (1970) and seem to represent a wide range of possible counseling subjects.

Part C of the Counselor Evaluation Scale consisted of twelve descriptive dimensions taken from Brown, Strong, and Rencher (1973). These particular adjective pairs were chosen mainly for research purposes outside the domain of this thesis. They are used here to compare the subjects' perceptions of counselor characteristics based on the counselor's sex, age, and educational degree.

Part D of the questionnaire required the subjects to estimate the counselor's attitudes and beliefs. These items had not been used in a previous study although most of the items were pre-tested during the Simons and Helms (in press) study. The 14 items assessed what the subjects expected the counselor to believe politically and socially as well as what they expected the counselor's characteristics to be like in terms of intelligence, humor, and attractiveness. The items on intelligence, religion, and attractiveness are three additional descriptive dimensions used by Brown, Strong, and Rencher (1973). The item on physical attractiveness provided a check on the experimenter's assumption that the pictures were "neutral" (i.e., average) in attractiveness.

Section D was included in this study to provide some insight on whether male and female counselors of different age groups are seen by college students to differ in beliefs. There does not appear to be any previous research in this area.
After estimating the counselor's position on each of these items on a 1-99 scale, the subjects went back through these 14 items and indicated where they thought their own attitudes and abilities fell. This was done for two main reasons: First, to see whether subjects merely saw the counselor as someone similar to themselves in beliefs; second, to be able to see whether male and female subjects had similar or dissimilar attitudes (since differences might help to account for sex differences in counselor preferences if any were found).

Next, all subjects were asked to estimate the counselor's age in years, the counselor's yearly income, and the number of counseling sessions one would spend with this counselor on working out the problem. Four final items adapted from Orlinsky and Howard (1966) were used to have subjects estimate how they would feel about counseling if they had actually been in therapy with this particular counselor.

**General Information Sheet**

After filling out the Counselor Evaluation Scale, subjects were asked to fill out a final sheet of questions that asked for subject's gender, subject's age, subject's year of classification in college, and previous counseling experience. Subjects were also asked to list what characteristics they thought were most important for a counselor to have.

Last, subjects were given five different dimensions and asked to make a counselor preference on each of these dimensions. This was included to allow a comparison to early, relatively simple, sex preference studies in the counseling area. This section was as follows:
Below are several dimensions on which people vary. If you had to make a choice among counselors varying on these dimensions, which could you prefer? For each line below circle your preference.

1. counselor's gender: female male
2. counselor's marital status: married single
3. counselor's educational level: B.A. M.S. Ph.D.
4. counselor's age: 25-35 35-45 45-55 55-65
5. counselor's experience: little some lots

Procedure

Subjects participated in the study in groups from the size of 10 individuals to the size of 60 depending on how many persons signed up for each time period. All 384 subjects were run in a ten-day period. Subjects were randomly assigned to experimental conditions with the stipulation that an equal number of female and male subjects filled each experimental cell.

Subjects were given a set of stimulus materials and informed that they could work at their own rate. When finished they could turn in the questionnaires and leave the experimental room. The experimenter was available at this time to debrief the subjects and answer their questions about the purpose of the study.

Half of the subjects, those in the "personal" problem condition, were given the following written directions:

As a participant in this study you are asked to imagine that you have a personal problem and you decide to talk with a counselor about your problem. Examples of personal problems include conflicts with your parents, inability to be assertive in social situations, lack of dating opportunities, and low self-confidence in interpersonal situations.

Take a few moments now to think of a personal problem. It would probably be easiest to choose a current or former problem that you have actually had or a problem that one of your close friends has had. Now write a brief description of your "counseling" problem here.
The remainder of the subjects, those in the "vocational-educational" problem condition, received these directions:

As a participant in this study you are asked to imagine that you have a vocational-educational problem and you decide to talk with a counselor about your problem. Examples of vocational-educational problems include bad grades, indecision about a major, lack of career goals, and lack of knowledge about one's abilities.

Take a few moments now to think of a vocational-educational problem. It would probably be easiest to choose a current or former problem that you have actually had or a problem that one of your close friends has had. Now write a brief description of your "counseling" problem here.

After writing down the problem, all subjects read the following general instructions:

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS:
You have been given a brief description of a counselor working in a counseling center in the midwest. This description appeared in the 1968 issue of the Journal for the Advancement of Professional Counseling.

You are to imagine that you are bothered a lot by the problem which you wrote down on the first sheet. You go to the counseling center to talk over your problem with a counselor and are assigned to the counselor described here. Imagine what your reactions would be to this counselor. Use the scales that follow to describe how effective you feel the counselor would be in handling your particular problem.

I know your impressions can't be really accurate because you don't actually know this person, but use your imagination and make the best estimates you can.

Make sure you have read the counselor's description carefully and also your own "counseling" problem description. You may work on the Counselor Evaluation Scale at your own pace. When you are finished turn all materials in to the experimenter.

The subjects then read the counselor description and proceeded to answer the Counselor Evaluation Scale and the general information sheet.

Statistical Procedures

Means and standard deviations for each variable were determined. The
means of the topic areas and the type of problems written by the subjects were used to determine if subjects of the personal problem and vocational problem groups tended to describe problems of different levels of difficulty. The means and standard deviations of the subjects' own attitudes and characteristics in Part D were used to see if male and female subjects were similar or dissimilar in beliefs.

A correlation matrix of the items in the questionnaire was made to help indicate the interrelationships of the items. A chi-square was used to analyze the data on the general information sheet.

Individual item analyses of variances were run on the first four parts of the Counselor Evaluation Scale. The experimental design was a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3 \times 4$ ANOVA with all between factors and equal $n$. Newman-keuls test was used to test the significance of comparisons among means.

Prior to analysis, Wolins and Dickenson's (1973) certainty transformation was used to transform the data from the 1-99 item scales to control for defensive set of the respondents. The certainty transformation changes the appearance of the data. The ratings of 1-99 now range from approximately -2.50 to +2.50. Thus, a rating of 50 (the average or "neutral" score) becomes 0.00. Above average scores are positive numbers and below average scores are negative numbers.
Results

The Subjects

There were 192 female and 192 male subjects who were all enrolled as undergraduate students at Iowa State University. All of the subjects were single in marital status, and the mean age of the subjects was 18.7 years (with a range of 18 to 23 years). Two hundred and seventy-seven of the subjects had some previous counseling experience, mostly within the high school setting.

Subjects were asked to rate themselves on various beliefs and characteristics. The means and standard deviations on these items are given in Table 1. On the whole, subjects in this study tended to be somewhat "conservative" in beliefs (mean of -.101 for seven items) and expressed opposition to the legalization of marijuana, homosexuality as an acceptable lifestyle, and school busing for racial integration and were only slightly in favor of premarital sex. Subjects strongly stressed the importance of academic grades. The most liberal position taken by the subjects was on behalf of the Equal Rights Amendment.

There were several differences in the ratings of male and female subjects. Male participants rated themselves as significantly more liberal in political views than did the female participants. Male subjects rated themselves as less opposed than the female subjects to the legalization of marijuana as well as more in favor of premarital sex. On the other hand, female subjects rated themselves less in opposition to accepting homosexuals and more in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment than did the male
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics and beliefs</th>
<th>Female subjects</th>
<th>Male subjects</th>
<th>All subjects</th>
<th>Sex mean differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political views(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Equal Rights Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-legalization of marijuana</td>
<td>-.352</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-premarital sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of academic grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuality acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.671</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-busing for integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own voting behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own sense of humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can handle own problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own sex appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The higher the mean the more acceptable the position is to the subjects or the more the subjects thought this characteristic described herself or himself.

\(^a\)The higher the mean, the more politically liberal.

\(^{**}p<.01\)
subjects. Female subjects also saw themselves as more religious and as putting more emphasis on good academic grades. All of these sex mean differences were at the .01 level of confidence.

Subjects' Counseling Problem

Subjects in both the vocational concern and personal concern conditions had to specify a counseling problem. The subject's concern was classified according to the twelve topic areas of the Counselor Evaluation Scale.

The 192 subjects of the vocational concern condition had problems of a career or educational nature. This area had a mean of 5.745 which indicates a fairly non-threatening topic area.

The 192 subjects of the personal concern condition had diverse concerns, which broke down like this: 5 had career or educational concerns, 15 had independence and dependence concerns, 22 had concerns about self-identity, 30 wanted to discuss their families (mostly defined as parental conflicts), 4 had religious concerns, 4 were concerned about anger and fear, 1 wanted to talk mainly about his anticipated future family, 70 wanted to deal with peer groups (40 of these concerned meeting someone of the opposite sex; 21 were roommate difficulties), 18 had problems with isolation and intimacy, 5 were concerned with the future and fantasies, and 18 had sexual concerns. The mean for willingness to discuss the topic was 3.934 which indicates a fairly threatening level.

Estimation of Counselor's Age

Subjects were asked to estimate the age of the counselor with whom they were paired. This was done to check the experimenter's assigned age
range for each picture. It was essential to this study that subjects could
detect differences in the ages of the counselor. From youngest to oldest
age groups, the experimenter assigned age ranges of 25-35, 35-45, 45-55,
and 55-65. The mean of the estimated age by subjects for each age group
was in the expected range, but for each of the four age groups the mean
was towards the lowest end of the range. Means for the four groups were
27.8, 36.9, 46.8, and 56.3.

Estimated ages for the female counselors were 28.8, 36.2, 47.8, and
56.3. Estimated ages for the male counselors were 26.8, 38.0, 45.6, and
56.2.

Correlation between the experimenter's four age groups and the ages
estimated by the subjects was .910, thus the subjects essentially agreed
with the experimenter's estimation of counselor age.

Estimation of Counselor's Attractiveness

The pictures used in this study were not prejudged on attractiveness
and were assumed to be "neutral" or "average" in attractiveness. Average
attractiveness (or even equal attractiveness) of the counselors was not an
essential assumption to the study, but if the pictures were equivalent in
attractiveness it would help to eliminate possible explanations for sex and
age differences.

The mean rating on counselor's physical attractiveness was .176 with a
standard deviation of .534. Female subjects gave an average rating of .220
(SD = .505), and male subjects gave an average rating of .132 (SD = .558).
The mean for female subjects was significantly higher (p = .01) than the
mean for male subjects.
By age groups, from youngest to oldest, the mean ratings for counselor attractiveness were .13, .34, .14, and .09. Counselors of age group 35-45 were rated higher in physical attractiveness than the other groups ($F = 4.332, p = .005$). There was also a significant counselor sex x counselor age interaction with the female counselors in the 35-45 range being rated higher ($M = .47$) than any other group.

Youngest female counselors ($M = .00$), 45-55 female counselors ($M = .02$), and the oldest male counselors ($M = .01$) were rated less attractive than the other counselors.

**Correlations of Counselor Evaluation Scale Items**

Table 2 gives the correlations for items of the Counselor Evaluation Scale which measured the subject's estimation of his or her own behaviors in the counseling situation. Correlations among these six items ranged from .316 to .669. All correlations were significant at the .001 level of confidence. The highest correlation was between initial comfort level and overall comfort level.

Table 3 gives the correlations for the items that measured anticipated counselor behaviors. The correlations ranged from .080 to .555. Except for the correlations with the item on counselor's moral evaluations of client's behavior, all correlations were significant at the .001 level of confidence. The highest correlation was between the counselor's understanding of the counseling problem and the counselor's interest in the client.

Correlations between anticipated client behaviors and anticipated counselor behaviors are given in Table 4. Correlations ranged from .050 to
Table 2
Correlations of Items Measuring Anticipated Behaviors of Self as Client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item category and description</th>
<th>Self-disclosure</th>
<th>Comfort level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss anything</td>
<td>Ask anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss anything</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask anything</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open with emotions</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial comfort</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall comfort</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to relax</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All of the correlations were significant at the .001 level.
Table 3
Correlations of Items Measuring Anticipated Behaviors of the Counselor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item category and description</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand problem</td>
<td>Gives advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand problem</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives advice</td>
<td>.526***</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current information</td>
<td>.390***</td>
<td>.321***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in client</td>
<td>.555***</td>
<td>.415***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking of client</td>
<td>.378***</td>
<td>.369***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-moralizing</td>
<td>.162***</td>
<td>.131**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

***p < .001.
Table 4
Correlations Between Anticipated Behaviors of Client and Anticipated Behaviors of Counselor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor behaviors</th>
<th>Client behaviors</th>
<th></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>Self-disclosure</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></td>
<td>Discuss</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></td>
<td>anything</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></td>
<td>Ask</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></td>
<td>anything</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></td>
<td>Open with</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></td>
<td>emotions</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>Competence:</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>Understand</td>
<td>.367***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.278***</td>
<td>.442***</td>
<td>.283***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives advice</td>
<td>.250***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.247***</td>
<td>.316***</td>
<td>.242***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current information</td>
<td>.172***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.159***</td>
<td>.109*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness:</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>Interested</td>
<td>.388***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.260***</td>
<td>.386***</td>
<td>.261***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.249***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.236***</td>
<td>.376***</td>
<td>.276***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-moralizing</td>
<td>.094*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>.098*</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

***p < .001.
Four of the counselor items (interest in client, understanding of client's problem, quality of advice, and liking of client) correlated with each of the client items at the .001 level of confidence. The highest correlations were between counselor's understanding of the client's problem and client's openness with emotions (.452) and between counselor's understanding of the client's problem and client's overall level of comfort (.442).

Subjects gave three overall ratings of the counselor (counselor as expert, counselor as person, counselor as subject's counselor), and Table 5 gives the correlations between these three overall ratings and anticipated client and counselor behaviors. Expertness ratings correlate highest with counselor's information ($r = .532, p = .001$), counselor's advice ($r = .370, p = .001$), and counselor's understanding ($r = .311, p = .001$) and with client's ability to discuss anything ($r = .189, p = .001$) and ask anything ($r = .185, p = .001$). Ratings as a person correlate highest with the counselor's liking of the client ($r = .458, p = .001$), counselor's understanding of the problem ($r = .416, p = .001$), and counselor's interest in client ($r = .361, p = .001$), and with client's openness with emotions ($r = .400, p = .001$) and client's overall comfort level ($r = .345, p = .001$).

Subjects' ratings of the counselor as their own counselor correlated highest with counselor's advice ($r = .502, p = .001$) and counselor's understanding of the problem ($r = .488, p = .001$) and with client's openness with emotions ($r = .361, p = .001$) and client's ability to discuss anything ($r = .345, p = .001$).
Table 5

Correlations Between Overall Rating of Counselor and Anticipated Behaviors of Client and Counselor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client behaviors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss anything</td>
<td>.189***</td>
<td>.255***</td>
<td>.345***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask anything</td>
<td>.185***</td>
<td>.240***</td>
<td>.290***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open with emotions</td>
<td>.124***</td>
<td>.400***</td>
<td>.361***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial comfort</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.304***</td>
<td>.287***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall comfort</td>
<td>.160***</td>
<td>.345***</td>
<td>.341***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to relax</td>
<td>.109*</td>
<td>.235***</td>
<td>.280***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor behaviors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.311***</td>
<td>.416***</td>
<td>.488***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives advice</td>
<td>.370***</td>
<td>.305***</td>
<td>.502***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current information</td>
<td>.532***</td>
<td>.208***</td>
<td>.403***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>.300***</td>
<td>.361***</td>
<td>.349***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes client</td>
<td>.275***</td>
<td>.458***</td>
<td>.360***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-moralizing</td>
<td>.094*</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.146**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall ratings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As expert</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.376***</td>
<td>.501***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As person</td>
<td>.376***</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.592***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As counselor</td>
<td>.501***</td>
<td>.592**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

** p < .01.

*** p < .001.
Correlations among the twelve counseling topic areas ranged from .107 to .703. Correlations between career and family ($r = .139, p = .01$), career and religion ($r = .110, p = .05$), and career and fear-anger ($r = .107, p = .05$) were the only ones not significant at the .001 level of confidence. The highest correlations were between peers and isolation-intimacy ($r = .703$), self-identity and isolation-intimacy ($r = .671$), peers and sex-guilt ($r = .659$), isolation-intimacy and sex-guilt ($r = .618$), and independence and sex-guilt ($r = .617$).

Correlations among the fifteen adjectives describing the counselor ranged from .105 to .631. Correlation between polite and active was .105 ($p = .05$); between just and active the correlation was .145 ($p = .01$); the correlation between just and attractive was .146 ($p = .01$); and it was .141 ($p = .01$) between active and attractive. All other correlations between adjectives were significant at the .001 level of confidence.

Highest correlations among the adjectives were between likable and sociable ($r = .631$), sincere and just ($r = .614$), dependable and just ($r = .576$), likable and just ($r = .576$), polite and kind ($r = .554$), and happy and sociable ($r = .532$).

**Anticipated Behaviors as Client**

Table 6 gives the means and standard deviations for the subjects' estimates of their behaviors as the client of the counselor with whom they had been paired. Subjects expected that it would be easier to ask the counselor questions ($M = .483, SD = .744$) than to discuss things with the counselor ($M = .077, SD = .644$). While subjects anticipated little initial
Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings By Female and Male Subjects for Anticipated Behaviors of Self as Client and Anticipated Behaviors of Counselor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable description</th>
<th>Female subjects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Client's behaviors<sup>a</sup>

A. Self-disclosure
- Discuss anything: 0.090, 0.634
- Ask any questions: 0.521, 0.724
- Openness with emotions: 0.166, 0.672

B. Comfort
- Initial comfort level: -0.134, 0.629
- Overall comfort level: 0.383, 0.503
- Ability to relax: 0.016, 0.552

II. Counselor's behaviors<sup>b</sup>

A. Competence
- Understanding: 0.485, 0.621
- Gives advice: 0.284, 0.537
- Current information: 0.494, 0.640

B. Trustworthiness
- Interested in client: 0.472, 0.541
- Liking of client: 0.423, 0.516
- Non-moralizing: 0.118, 0.739

C. Overall
- Expert: 0.452, 0.575
- Person: 0.379, 0.509
- Counselor: 0.307, 0.520

<sup>a</sup>Mean and standard deviation for sum of the first six items of Counselor Evaluation Scale (CES).

<sup>b</sup>Mean and standard deviation for sum of next six items of CES.

*p<.05.

**p<.01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male subjects</th>
<th>All subjects</th>
<th>Subject sex mean differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>F&gt;M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>F&gt;M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.291</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>F&gt;M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>F&gt;M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>k&gt;M**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>F&gt;M**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.561</td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.197</td>
<td>2.274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comfort ($M = -.231, SD = .602$), the overall level of comfort was expected to be much higher ($M = .361, SD = .482$). Female subjects rated their openness with emotions (means of $.116$ and $.063$) and their initial comfort level (means of $-.134$ and $-.291$) higher than did the male subjects ($p = .05$).

Standard deviations on these six items were quite large indicating that subjects differed quite a bit in the behaviors they expected to exhibit during counseling. Each of the six items are discussed separately in terms of the significant main effects and interactions.

**Discuss anything.** The main effects of counselor's sex, counselor's age, and counselor's education were not significant for this item. However, counselor's sex $\times$ counselor's education was a significant interaction ($F = 3.627, p = .05$). This interaction is depicted in Figure 2.

Male counselors with a Ph.D. degree ($M = .22$) and female counselors with a B.A. degree ($M = .16$) were seen as the easiest with whom to discuss things while female counselors with a Ph.D. ($M = .00$) and male counselors with a B.A. ($M = -.06$) were rated as the hardest with whom to discuss things. On the whole, there was an inverse relationship for female counselors' educational degree and subjects' expectancy for being able to discuss anything but a direct relationship for male counselors' educational degree and being able to discuss anything.

**Ask anything.** There was a significant main effect for counselor's age for the client's willingness to ask the counselor anything ($F = 5.483, p = .001$). From the youngest to oldest age group, means were $.52$, $.48$, $.68$, and $.26$. Subjects indicated that they would be most willing to ask
Figure 2. Subjects' ratings for being able to discuss anything with the counselor as influenced by counselor's sex and counselor's education.
questions of counselors ages 45-55 years and least willing to ask questions of the oldest counselors.

There was a significant interaction of problem condition x counselor’s sex ($F = 4.470$, $p = .05$). Subjects thought they could ask more questions of a female counselor in vocational counseling ($M = .63$) than either a male counselor in vocational counseling ($M = .44$) or a female counselor in personal counseling ($M = .38$).

Counselor’s age x counselor’s education was another significant interaction ($F = 2.785$, $p = .01$). Most striking here was that the oldest counselors with only a B.A. degree ($M = .09$) were rated lower than any other cell while 45-55 year-old counselors with a Ph.D. ($M = .107$) were expected to make it easier for the subjects to ask questions than any other group.

Open with emotions. This item produced no significant main effects and no significant interactions.

Initial comfort. Subjects in the vocational concern condition ($M = -.09$) anticipated more initial comfort in counseling than subjects in the personal concern condition ($M = -.34$). Type of problem was significant at the .0001 level of confidence with an $F$ of 17.840.

Counselor’s sex also significantly affected the subjects’ ratings of their own level of comfort during the first interview ($F = 7.075$, $p = .03$). Subjects thought they would be more comfortable in the initial session with a female counselor ($M = -.15$) than with a male counselor ($M = -.28$).

Subject sex x counselor’s education was a significant interaction ($F = 3.261$, $p = .03$). Male subjects’ ratings on initial comfort did not differ
according to the counselor's educational degree (means with increasing education were -.30, -.37, and -.20), but female subjects expected to feel more initial comfort with counselors who had an M.S. degree ($M = -.04$) rather than with counselors who had a Ph.D. degree ($M = -.23$).

**Overall comfort.** The only significant effect for comfort level across counseling sessions was for type of counseling problem ($F = 4.323, p = .03$). Overall comfort level was expected to be higher in vocational counseling ($M = .41$) than in personal counseling ($M = .31$).

**Ability to relax.** Once again, only type of problem was significant ($F = 7.124, p = .008$) with subjects expecting to feel more relaxed in vocational counseling ($M = .09$) than in personal counseling ($M = -.06$).

**All client behaviors.** An analysis of variance was performed on the summed total of the six items on which subjects estimated their own behaviors as clients. Type of problem was significant ($F = 7.616, p = .006$) in that subjects anticipated that their own behaviors in counseling would be better in vocational counseling ($M = 1.21$) than in personal counseling ($M = .46$).

Age of counselor was another significant main effect ($F = 2.531, p = .05$). In estimating their own behaviors with counselors from youngest to oldest, the means were .86, .89, 1.32, and .26. The oldest counselors produced a lower expected level of client behaviors.

There was a significant interaction of subject's sex $\times$ counselor's age $\times$ counselor's education. For female subjects, the youngest counselors positively affected client behaviors the most with a B.A. degree ($M = 2.07$).
than a Ph.D. (M = 1.73), and lowest with an M.S. (M = -.37). Counselor's degree did not affect client's behavior for counselors 35-45 years old (means of .46, .76, and .86 with increasing educational degree) and 45-55 years old (means of 1.76, 1.86, and 1.53 with increasing educational degree). Oldest counselors with an M.S. degree (M = 1.47) increased positive client behaviors more than did a B.A. (M = .20) or a Ph.D. (M = .18).

Male subjects rated their own behaviors with youngest counselors lower if they had a Ph.D. degree (M = .10) than if they had a B.A. (M = .95) or M.S. (M = .70). With 35-45 year old counselors, client behaviors were lower for M.S. counselors (M = .32) than counselors with a B.A. (M = 1.79) or Ph.D. (M = 1.18). With 45-55 year old counselors, those with a Ph.D. (M = 2.68) did better than those with a B.A. (M = .47) or M.S. (M = -.36). Oldest counselors did best in affecting client behaviors if they had a Ph.D. (M = .30), not as well with an M.S. (M = -.06), and lowest with a B.A. (M = -.51).

To summarize how subjects estimated their behaviors as a client, the counselor's sex, age, and education did not have an overall influence on how the client expected to act. The counselor's sex was perceived as only influencing initial comfort level in that subjects expected to feel more comfortable with female counselors. In addition, subjects in the vocational concern condition thought they would be able to ask more questions of the female counselor.

Counselor's age mainly influenced how much subjects expected to be able to ask the counselors questions with subjects being less able to ask questions of the oldest counselors.
Counselor's education was not a significant main effect, but it did interact with counselor's sex (able to discuss anything), counselor's age (able to ask anything), and subject's sex (initial comfort).

Type of counseling concern was significant for initial comfort, overall comfort, and ability to relax with higher ratings being given in the vocational concern condition.

**Anticipated Behaviors of Counselor**

Table 6 gives the means and standard deviations for the subjects' estimations of the counselor's behaviors in the counseling session. Overall the subjects rated the counselors positively, especially in understanding the problem \( (M = .462, SD = .626) \), knowledge of current information \( (M = .453, SD = .650) \), and interest in the client \( (M = .434, SD = .551) \). Subjects seemed quite ambiguous on the item whether the counselor would morally evaluate their behavior \( (M = .076, SD = .703) \) and it seems subjects differed in opinion on whether this was a good or bad characteristic for a counselor to have.

Females rated counselors higher in interest in the client \( (M = .479) \) than did the male subjects \( (M = .389) \).

**Counselor's understanding.** Subjects thought that counselors would have significantly more understanding of the client's problem \( (F = 3.805, p = .05) \) in the vocational concern condition \( (M = .52) \) than in the personal concern condition \( (M = .40) \).

Counselor's education was a significant main effect for this item \( (F = 2.883, p = .05) \). Subjects rated counselors with an M.S. degree \( (M = .36) \)
as less understanding of the problem than counselors with either a B.A. 
(M = .55) or a Ph.D. (M = .47).

Counselor's quality of advice. On this item there were no significant 
main effects or two-way interactions. There was a significant interaction 
of problem condition × subject's sex × counselor's sex (F = 3.977, p = 
.04). Female subjects in the personal condition rated both female (M = 
.24) and male (M = .26) the same, but in the vocational condition females 
rated female counselors (M = .36) higher in quality of advice than male 
counselors (M = .28). While male subjects rated female counselors (M = 
.32) higher than male counselors (M = .15) in quality of advice in the per­ 
sonal condition, in the vocational condition male subjects rated male coun­ 
selors (M = .40) higher than female counselors (M = .21).

Another significant three-way interaction was subject's sex × counsel­ 
or's sex × counselor's age (F = 3.207, p = .02). Female subjects rated the 
35-45 year old female counselor (M = .38) and 45-55 year old female coun­ 
selor (M = .45) higher than other female counselors (Ms = .21, .15); female 
subjects rated both the youngest (M = .32) and the oldest (M = .30) male 
counselors higher than the male counselor 45-55 years old (M = .21). The 
male counselor age 35-45 received a mean rating of .25. For female sub­ 
jects, for age groups the youngest and the oldest, male counselors were 
rated higher in quality of advice, but for the middle two age groups female 
counselors were rated higher.

Male subjects rated the oldest male counselor (M = .07) lower in qual­
ity of advice than other male counselors (means of .30, .33, and .39).
Males rated female counselors significantly different with each age group so that high to low goes: 35-45 female (M = .45), oldest female (M = .30), youngest female (M = .27), and 45-55 female (M = .03). For male subjects, youngest counselors were rated equally across sex, the 35-45 female counselor was rated higher than the male counselor of that age group, the male counselor age 45-55 was rated higher than 45-55 year old female counselor, and for oldest counselors male subjects rated the female counselor higher.

**Current information.** There was a significant counselor's sex x counselor's age interaction (F = 3.081, p = .02). As shown in Figure 3, younger female counselors (means of .62 and .52) were seen as having more current information than the older female counselors (means of .32 and .37), yet male counselors were rated as having more current information if they were older (means of .58 and .44) than younger (means of .35 and .44).

Female counselors of age group 3 (45-55) were rated as significantly lower in current information than the two younger age groups of female counselors. The youngest female counselors were also seen as knowing more current information than the oldest female counselors. Male counselors who were 45-55 years old were expected to know more current information than any of the other male counselors. Thus, age group 3 is seen quite differently in terms of the counselor's sex.

There was a significant interaction of counseling problem x subject's sex x counselor's sex (F = 4.033, p = .05). Female subjects rated female (M = .40) and male (M = .42) counselors similarly in the personal condition, but rated female (M = .65) counselors higher than male counselors
Figure 3. Subjects' ratings for counselor's current knowledge as influenced by counselor's sex and counselor's age.
in the vocational counseling condition. Males also rated female (M = .46) and male (M = .33) counselors similarly in current information in the personal condition, but in the vocational condition male subjects rated male (M = .54) counselors higher than female (M = .31) counselors. In most aspects this reflects the same pattern as the item on the counselor’s quality of advice.

Counselor's interest in client. No significant differences were found for this item. Overall mean for this item was .454 (SD = .551).

Counselor's liking and accepting client. In a vocational problem condition, subjects rated female (M = .46) counselors higher in liking and accepting the clients than the male (M = .31) counselors (F = 3.598, p = .05). Male (M = .43) and female (M = .39) counselors were rated equally on this item in the personal problem condition.

The interaction between counselor's sex and counselor's education is depicted in Figure 4 (F = 3.545, p = .05). Female counselors with a B.A. (M = .47) were seen as more liking and accepting of the client than female counselors with a Ph.D. (M = .34). Male counselors with a Ph.D. (M = .52) were seen as more accepting of the client than either males with an M.S. (M = .36) or males with a B.A. (M = .31). Thus, subjects thought that the lower educational degree female counselors and the higher educational degree male counselors would be more accepting of the client as a person.

Counselor's Non-Moralizing Approach. There was a significant main effect for counselor's age on the item that measured the degree to which the counselor would avoid moralizing about the client's behavior (F =
Figure 4. Subjects' ratings of counselor's acceptance of the client as influenced by counselor's sex and counselor's education.
Younger counselors, those ages 25-35 (M = .17) and ages 35-45 (M = .20) were rated less likely to "moralize" than older counselors of ages 45-55 (M = .00) and 55-65 (M = -.06).

All counselor behaviors. Scores of the six items for which the subject estimated how he or she expected the counselor to behave were summed and analyzed. Figure 5 gives the significant interaction of subject's sex X counselor's sex X counselor's age (F = 3.752, p = .01). Female subjects rated the oldest female counselors (M = 1.48) lower on counselor behaviors than the other three female counselors (means of 2.68, 2.84, and 2.62 with increasing age). The female subjects also rated the middle groups of male counselors, those ages 35-45 (M = 1.78) and 45-55 (M = 1.63), lower than the youngest (M = 2.76) and oldest (M = 2.48) male counselors.

Male subjects rated 45-55 year old female counselors (M = 1.01) lower than female counselors that were younger (means of 2.26 and 2.32) or older (M = 1.95). Male subjects who rated male counselors rated the middle two age groups, those 35-45 years (M = 2.53) and those 45-55 years (M = 2.34), higher than both the youngest (M = 1.66) and oldest (M = 1.25) male counselors. With male counselors, female subjects and male subjects differed substantially in the ages of preferred counselors.

To summarize how subjects estimated the counselor's behavior, the counselor's sex, counselor's age, and counselor's education seldom were significant main effects, but contributed to several interesting interactions. Counselor's sex alone was not significant on any of the six items. Counselor's age was significant only on the item concerning counselor's
Figure 5. Subjects' ratings of perceived counselor's behaviors as influenced by subject's sex, counselor's sex and age.
tendency to moralize or make critical judgments concerning the client’s behavior. Older counselors were rated as more likely to make moral judgments. Counselor's educational degree was only significant in estimating counselor's understanding, and counselors with an M.S. degree were rated less understanding.

**Overall Ratings of Counselors**

Three overall ratings of the counselor were elicited from the subject: the counselor as an expert, the counselor as a person, and the counselor as the subject's counselor. Table 6 gives the means and standard deviations for the subjects' estimations on these three items.

**Counselor as expert.** The counselor's educational degree was a significant main effect ($F = 14.728, p = .0001$) for the item in which subjects estimated the counselor's degree of expertness. With increasing education, counselors were rated more expert. Thus, counselors with a Ph.D. ($M = .62$) were rated higher than those with an M.S. ($M = .42$), who were rated higher than counselors who had only a B.A. ($M = .25$).

As shown in Figure 6, there was a significant interaction between counselor's age and counselor's sex ($F = 6.120, p = .0007$). The younger female counselors (means of .53 and .50) were rated more expert than older female counselors (means of .36 and .43). Older male counselors (means of .54 and .57) were rated more expert than younger male counselors (means of .12 and .37). Female counselors in the younger two age groups were rated more expert than the male counselors of the same ages, while male counselors in the older two age groups were rated more expert than the
Figure 6. Subjects' ratings for perceived counselor expertise as influenced by counselor's sex and counselor's age.
corresponding female counselors. Overall conclusion appears to be that with age, female counselors decrease in perceived expertness, but male counselors increase in perceived expertness.

Counselor as person. There was a significant interaction ($F = 3.894, p = .04$) between problem condition and counselor's sex. In the vocational condition, female counselors ($M = .40$) were better liked as a person than were male counselors ($M = .30$). Female counselors in the vocational condition were also significantly better liked as a person than female counselors in the personal condition ($M = .28$). Male counselors in the personal condition received a mean rating of .37, which was not a statistically significant difference with the other three groups.

Another significant interaction ($F = 5.028, p = .02$) was found for subject sex x counselor sex. Male counselors were rated the same in being liked as a person by both female ($M = .32$) and male ($M = .35$) subjects. Female counselors were rated more likable by female ($M = .43$) subjects than they were by male ($M = .24$) subjects. Female subjects gave higher ratings on this item to female counselors while male subjects gave higher ratings to male counselors. Thus, when estimating how much they would like the counselors as persons, there was a same-sex preference.

Counselor as the subject's counselor. On this item the subjects were asked to rate how much they would like the counselor as their own counselor. This item required the subjects to express an overall impression of the counselor.

There was a significant interaction ($F = 9.006, p = .003$) for subject sex x counselor sex. Female subjects rated female counselors ($M = .41$)
higher than male counselors (M = .21), and male subjects rated male counselors (M = .31) higher than female counselors (M = .19). There was a strong same-sex preference for counselors. The female subjects' ratings of female counselors were significantly higher than the male subjects' ratings of male counselors. The male subjects' ratings of female counselors and female subjects' ratings of male counselors were about the same.

The significant interaction of problem condition \times\ counselor's sex \times counselor's age is shown in Figure 7. In the personal problem condition, female counselors were rated equally at all age levels (means with increasing age of .34, .27, .15, and .31). In the vocational condition, the oldest female counselor (M = .02) was rated lower than the other female counselors (means of .48, .36, and .38).

In the personal condition, the oldest male counselor (M = .02) was rated lower than the other age levels (means of .29, .28, and .28). In the vocational condition, the youngest male counselor (M = .09) was rated lower than the other male counselors (means with increasing age were .34, .35, and .44).

In the personal problem condition, female and male counselors in the oldest age group were evaluated differently. In the vocational condition, both the youngest and oldest counselors were evaluated differently by sex.

Another significant interaction (F = 4.567, p = .004), shown in Figure 8, was for subject's sex \times counselor's sex \times counselor's age. Female subjects rated oldest female (M = .23) lower than the other female counselors (means with increasing age of .43, .51, and .47). They rated the male
Figure 7. Subjects' ratings for having counselor as their own counselor as influenced by type of counseling problem, counselor's sex, and counselor's age.
Figure 8. Subjects' ratings for having counselor as their own counselor as influenced by subject's sex, counselor's sex, and counselor's age.
counselor 45-55 years old (M = .08) lower than the oldest male counselor (M = .33) and the male counselor 35-45 years old (M = .24). The youngest male counselor (M = .18) was rated lower than the oldest male counselor.

Male subjects rated the youngest female counselor (M = .39) higher than any other age level (means with increasing age of .12, .07, and .18). They rated the 45-55 year old male counselor higher than male counselors of other age levels (means with increasing age of .20, .38, .54, and .13). Striking here is the low rating given to the opposite sex 45-55 year old counselor while a high rating was given to the same-sex counselor of that same age group. Also note that both male and female subjects rated the youngest female counselor significantly higher than the youngest male counselor.

**Willingness to Discuss Topic Areas**

Subjects were asked to rate on a seven-point scale their willingness to discuss twelve different topic areas. The means and standard deviations for the subjects' ratings on willingness to discuss the topic areas with the counselor are given in Table 7. Career and education (M = 5.745) was the topic area that subjects were most willing to discuss with the counselor; subjects were least willing to discuss aspects of sex and guilt (M = 3.331) with the counselor.

Combining all twelve topic areas, there was no subject sex mean difference in willingness to discuss these topics in the counseling situation. Combined mean for the twelve areas was 51.534; combined mean for female subjects was 51.573 and for male subjects as the combined mean was 51.494.
Table 7
Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings of Female and Male Subjects for Willingness to Discuss Topic Area With the Counselor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic areas</th>
<th>Female subjects</th>
<th>Male subjects</th>
<th>All subjects</th>
<th>Subject sex mean differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career &amp; education</td>
<td>5.823</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>4.974</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>4.521</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>4.344</td>
<td>1.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4.245</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>1.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger &amp; fear</td>
<td>4.276</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td>1.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future family</td>
<td>4.266</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>4.110</td>
<td>1.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>4.193</td>
<td>1.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>3.990</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>4.146</td>
<td>1.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation &amp; intimacy</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>1.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3.678</td>
<td>1.521</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex &amp; guilt</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>1.696</td>
<td>3.479</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Using these means to indicate difficulty of counseling topic areas (with greater difficulty indicated by lower numbers), the mean for subjects in the vocational concern condition was 5.745 and the mean for subjects in the personal concern condition was 3.934.

*The higher the mean the more willing the subjects were to discuss aspects of the topic area with the counselor.

bCombined means for the twelve areas is 51.534 (51.573 for female subjects, 51.494 for male subjects).

*p<.05.
There were a few subject sex mean differences for individual topic areas. Female subjects were more willing than male subjects to discuss the topics of independence and also career and education. Male subjects were more willing than female subjects to discuss the topic area of sex and guilt.

Even though subjects were asked to indicate their willingness to discuss the area in relationship to the assigned counselor, an analysis of variance on these twelve areas found no significant main effects or interactions for counselor's sex, counselor's age, and counselor's education.

Most of the areas (all but career and education, future family, and therapy) were rated by subjects in the personal problem condition as more willing to be discussed than by subjects in the vocational problem condition.

Counselor Characteristics

Table 8 gives the means and standard deviations for the subjects' ratings of the counselor on seventeen adjectives. Counselors were rated highest on intelligence (M = .821) and lowest on sexiness (M = -.070). On intelligent, polite, kind, confident, ambitious, strong, and attractive, female subjects gave higher mean ratings than did the male subjects.

Counselor's intelligence. Subjects in the vocational concern condition (M = .88) saw counselors as significantly ($F = 4.785, p = .02$) more intelligent than subjects in the personal condition (M = .77).

Another significant main effect ($F = 4.639, p = .03$) was for counselor's sex. Subjects rated female counselors (M = .88) as higher in intelligence than male counselors (M = .77).
Table 8
Means and Standard Deviations for Female and Male Subjects' Ratings of Counselors on Adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Female subjects</th>
<th>Male subjects</th>
<th>All subjects</th>
<th>Subject sex mean differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religions</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05.

**P<.01.
A third significant main effect for counselor's intelligence is counselor's educational level ($F = 10.321, p = .0002$). Subjects rated counselors with a Ph.D. degree ($M = .98$) higher in intelligence than counselors with an M.S. ($M = .76$) or B.A. ($M = .73$).

Educational level of the counselor and counselor's sex was a significant interaction ($F = 4.556, p = .01$). As shown in Figure 9, female counselors with a Ph.D. were rated significantly higher than all other groups. Educational degree did not affect the intelligence rating given to male counselors. With increasing educational degree, the mean ratings for female counselors were .72, .77, and 1.14, and the mean ratings for male counselors were .73, .75, and .82.

Subject's sex × counselor's sex × counselor's age was a significant interaction ($F = 3.249, p = .02$) for counselor's intelligence. Means for this interaction are given in Table 9.

The youngest female counselor rated by female subjects received a significantly higher rating than any other group. Female subjects rated male counselors of age groups 25-35 years and 45-55 years as well as the oldest female counselor lower in intelligence than other groups. Male subjects saw the oldest female counselor as most intelligent. Male subjects rated both the youngest and oldest male counselors lower in intelligence than the other groups.

In comparing the intelligence ratings subjects gave themselves with the ratings for the counselors, the counselors were given higher intelligence ratings ($p = .001$).
Figure 9. Subjects' ratings of counselor intelligence as influenced by counselor's sex and counselor's education.
Table 9
Means for Counselor's Intelligence Rating as Influenced by Subject's Sex, Counselor's Sex, and Counselor's Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's sex</th>
<th>Counselor's sex</th>
<th>Counselor's age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (25-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.19&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Rating significantly higher than all other groups.

<sup>b</sup>Rating significantly higher than all other ratings by male subjects.
Counselor's politeness. There was a significant interaction of subject sex \times counseloR sex \times counselor age on this item (F = 3.353, p = .01). The means for this interaction are given in Table 10. The youngest female counselor rated by female subjects received a higher rating on politeness than any other group. Yet the youngest female counselor rated by male subjects received the lowest rating (though not significantly lower than ratings given the youngest male counselor by either male or female subjects). The next highest ratings were given to female and male counselors ages 45-55 by female subjects, and all subjects ratings of the oldest opposite-sex counselor.

Table 10

Means for Counselor's Politeness Ratings as Influenced by Subject's Sex, Counselor's Sex, and Counselor's Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's sex</th>
<th>Counselor's sex</th>
<th>Counselor's age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (25-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.09*a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Rated significantly higher than all other groups.

*b Rated significantly higher than all other ratings by male subjects.

Counselor's kindness. Figure 10 shows the significant interaction (F = 2.485, p = .05) for counselor's sex \times counselor's age on the item
Figure 10. Subjects' ratings for counselor's kindness as influenced by counselor's sex and counselor's age.
measuring subject's perception of counselor's kindness. With increasing age, the mean ratings for female counselors were .87, .77, .67, and .76 and the mean ratings for male counselors were .60, .65, .81, and .81. Younger female counselors (ages 25-35 and 35-45), the oldest female counselor, and older male counselors (ages 45-55 and 55-65) were rated significantly higher than the other groups. The youngest female counselor was also rated significantly higher than the oldest female counselor. On the whole, younger female counselors and older male counselors were seen as more kind.

Counselor's confidence. Table 11 gives the means for the significant interaction (F = 2.959, p = .008) of counselor's sex × counselor's age × counselor's education.

Table 11
Means for Counselor's Confidence Ratings as Influenced by Counselor's Sex, Age, and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor's age</th>
<th>1 (25-35)</th>
<th>2 (35-45)</th>
<th>3 (45-55)</th>
<th>4 (55-65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two younger female counselors were rated as more confident if they had Ph.D. degrees. The two older female counselors did not have their ratings on confidence affected by educational degree.
For male counselors, a Ph.D. improved ratings for counselors ages 35-45 and 45-55 but decreased the ratings of the youngest and oldest counselors.

Counselor's sincerity. Female counselors (M = .70) were seen as significantly more sincere (F = 5.745, p = .01) than male counselors (M = .58).

Counselor's dependability. Education had a significant effect on dependability ratings (F = 3.554, p = .03). Ph.D. counselors (M = .69) were rated highest, M.S. counselors (M = .62) were next, and B.A. counselors (M = .54) were lowest.

The means for the interaction of counselor's age and counselor's education (F = 2.188, p = .04) are given in Table 12. The youngest counselors received lower ratings of dependability if they had an M.S. degree, while the oldest counselors received higher ratings with an M.S. degree. The middle two age groups of counselors were rated more dependable as educational degree increased. With the Ph.D. degree, all counselors were rated the same except that the oldest counselors were rated much less dependable.

Table 13 gives the means for the significant interaction of subject's sex X counselor's sex X counselor's age (F = 3.442, p = .01). Female subjects rated the youngest female counselor as more dependable than the youngest male counselor, but they gave higher ratings of dependability to the oldest male counselor rather than the oldest female counselor. Female subjects rated the males and females of the middle age groups equally. Male subjects only rated the fourth age group differently by counselor sex,
with the oldest female counselor seen as more dependable than the oldest male counselor. Subjects rated the oldest, opposite-sex person higher in dependability than the oldest, same-sex person.

Table 12
Means for Counselor's Dependability as Influenced by Counselor's Age and Counselor's Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor's education</th>
<th>1 (25-35)</th>
<th>2 (35-45)</th>
<th>3 (45-55)</th>
<th>4 (55-65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
Means for Counselor's Dependability as Influenced by Subject's Sex, Counselor's Sex, and Counselor's Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's sex</th>
<th>Counselor's age</th>
<th>1 (25-35)</th>
<th>2 (35-45)</th>
<th>3 (45-55)</th>
<th>4 (55-65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counselor's sex x counselor's age interaction was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The two youngest female counselor groups and
the two oldest male counselor groups were seen as more dependable than the older four groups. With increasing age, means for the female counselors were .65, .73, .46, and .55 and the means for the male counselors were .42, .46, .69, and .74. On the whole, ratings of dependability decreased with age for female counselors and increased with age for male counselors.

**Counselor's justness.** The interaction of counselor's sex x counselor's age was a significant one ($F = 3.241, p = .02$) for the adjective just. With increasing age, female counselors received mean ratings of .81, .59, .58, and .57 and male counselors received mean ratings of .50, .53, .62, and .56. All groups received equivalent ratings except that youngest female counselors were seen as most just.

Subject's sex x counselor's sex x counselor's age was also a significant interaction on this item ($F = 3.949, p = .009$). Female subjects rated the youngest female counselor ($M = .93$) much higher than the youngest male counselor ($M = .41$). Female subjects rated the oldest male counselor ($M = .71$) higher than the oldest female counselor ($M = .47$). Male subjects also rated the youngest female counselor ($M = .70$) higher than the youngest male counselor ($M = .60$). The male subjects rated the oldest female counselor ($M = .64$) higher than the oldest male counselor ($M = .41$). Subjects rated the oldest opposite-sex counselor higher than the oldest same-sex counselor.

Figure 11 depicts the significant interaction ($F = 3.010, p = .05$) of subject's sex x counselor's sex x counselor's education. Female subjects saw female counselors with a Ph.D. ($M = .73$) as more just than female
Figure 11. Subjects' ratings for counselor's justness as influenced by subject's sex, counselor's sex, and counselor's education.
counselors with a B.A. (M = .64) or M.S. (M = .57). Female subjects saw an inverse relationship between the educational level of male counselors and the characteristic of being just (means of .70, .58, and .48). Male subjects thought that female counselors with a B.A. (M = .65) or an M.S. (M = .67) would be more just than those with a Ph.D. (M = .57). But male subjects thought male counselors with a Ph.D. (M = .64) would be more just than those with a B.A. (M = .53) or M.S. (M = .53). Considering counselors who had a Ph.D. degree, subjects thought that a same-sex counselor would be more just but an opposite-sex counselor would be less just.

Counselor's likability. The interaction of counselor's sex x counselor's age was significant (F = 3.099, p = .02). The female counselor age 35-45 years was rated more likable than all others. The youngest male counselor was rated higher than the female counselor age 45-55 but lower than all of the other groups. With increasing age groups, female counselors had mean ratings of .65, .76, .42, and .63 while male counselors had mean ratings of .49, .59, .62, and .64.

Counselor's happiness. On ratings of how happy they thought the counselor was, there was a significant effect for counselor's age (F = 3.295, p = .02). All age groups were rated higher than counselors ages 45-55. The counselors of ages 35-45 were also rated happier than the youngest counselors. From youngest to oldest age groups, the mean scores for counselor's happiness were .56, .67, .45, and .63.

Table 14 gives the means for the significant interaction (F = 3.418, p = .03) for problem condition x subject's sex x counselor's education.
Female subjects in the personal condition rated counselors with a B.A. degree happier than the others. Female subjects in the vocational condition rated counselors with an M.S. degree the highest. Male subjects in the personal condition did not differ in how they rated the happiness of counselors. Male subjects in the vocational condition rated counselors with a Ph.D. as happiest.

Table 14
Means for Counselor's Happiness as Influenced by Problem Condition, Subject's Sex, and Counselor's Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's sex</th>
<th>Problem condition</th>
<th>Counselor's education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counselor's sociability. On the item in which subjects rated how sociable they thought the counselor was, there was a significant interaction of counselor's sex × counselor's age ($F = 5.220, p = .002$). With increasing age, mean ratings for female counselors were .65, .73, .46, and .55, and the mean ratings for male counselors were .42, .46, .69, and .74. The two younger female counselors were rated more sociable than the older female counselors and also more sociable than the younger male counselors.
The oldest female counselor was also seen as more sociable than the female counselor 45-55 years old. The two older male counselors were rated more sociable than the younger male counselors and the older female counselors. On the whole, younger female counselors and older male counselors were rated more sociable than other groups.

Counselor's ambition. Counselor's sex, counselor's age, and counselor's education did not have an effect on ratings of how ambitious the counselor was. The only significance on this item was that female subjects (M = .59) saw counselors as more ambitious (F = 3.57, p = .05) than did male subjects (M = .50).

Counselor's activity. Subjects in the vocational problem condition (M = .49) rated counselors higher (F = 6.445, p = .01) in activity than did the subjects in the personal problem condition (M = .33). This difference is attributed to the ratings by the male subjects as shown by the significant problem condition x subject's sex interaction (F = 4.337, p = .03). Female subjects in the personal (M = .46) and vocational (M = .44) problem conditions rated the counselors equally active. Male subjects in the personal problem condition (M = .22) saw counselors as less active than did the male subjects in the vocational problem condition (M = .50).

Counselor's education was a significant main effect on this item (F = 3.709, p = .02). Both counselors with a B.A. (M = .44) and a Ph.D. (M = .49) were seen as more active than those with an M.S. (M = .29).

Counselor's religiousness. Female counselors (M = .45) were rated more religious (F = 5.516, p = .01) than were the male counselors (M = .33).
Counselor's age also significantly affect the counselor's rating as religious ($F = 2.945, p = .03$) with counselors age 45-55 years rated more religious than counselors of other ages. With increasing age, the mean ratings on counselor's religion were .31, .35, .52, and .37.

Religious nature was one of the items for which subjects rated themselves as well as the counselor. There was no significant mean difference for the subject's rating of his or her own degree of religion and that of the subject's rating of the counselor's degree of religion.

**Counselor's strength.** Counselor's sex, age, and education did not have an effect on ratings of how strong the counselor was. The only significance on this item was that female subjects ($M = .45$) saw counselors as stronger ($F = 5.802, p = .01$) than did male subjects ($M = .35$).

**Counselor's humor.** Counselor's age had a significant effect on how humorous the counselor was rated ($F = 3.734, p = .01$). With increasing age, the mean ratings were .17, .33, .17, and .39. The oldest counselors and counselors 35-45 years old were seen as having better senses of humor.

Subjects rated themselves as having a better sense of humor than the counselors ($p = .01$).

**Counselor's attractiveness.** This item was discussed fully earlier in the results section. To summarize, counselors of age group 2 (35-45 years) were rated higher than the other groups, especially the female counselor of this age group.

Subjects rated themselves as more attractive than the counselors ($p = .001$).
Counselor's sex appeal. On sexiness, there was a significant interaction for counselor's sex \times counselor's age (F = 5.777, p = .001). With increasing age, female counselors were rated -.28, -.24, -.39, and -.41. With increasing age, male counselors were rated -.23, -.44, -.26, and -.54. Older female counselors, those ages 45-55 and 55-65, were rated less sexy than the two younger groups of female counselors. Male counselors of ages 25-35 years and 45-55 years were rated sexier than the other two age groups. The oldest male counselors were rated less sexy than any other group. It is interesting that the male counselor age 35-45 was rated low on sexiness, since this counselor did quite well on his physical attractiveness rating.

Table 15 gives the means for the ratings on sex appeal by counselor's age and counselor's education, an interaction significant at the .001 level of confidence. Oldest counselors with a B.A. degree received a lower rating on sex appeal than did any other group. Youngest counselors with only a B.A. received a higher rating on sex appeal than any other group.

Table 15

Means for Counselor's Sex Appeal as Influenced by Counselor's Age and Counselor's Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor's education</th>
<th>1 (25-35)</th>
<th>2 (35-45)</th>
<th>3 (45-55)</th>
<th>4 (55-65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For youngest counselors, those with a B.A. rated higher than those with an M.S. or Ph.D. degree. For counselors who were 35-45 years old, those with a Ph.D. received higher ratings. For the 45-55 year old counselors, those with an M.S. received lower than the other two. For the oldest group of counselors, those with only a B.A. received lower ratings of sexiness than those with either an M.S. or Ph.D.

Overall, counselors were not seen as being very sexy. Subjects rated themselves significantly higher ($p = .001$) in sex appeal than the counselors.

**Counselor's Attitudes and Beliefs**

Means and standard deviations for the subjects' ratings of counselors on a number of beliefs are given in Table 16. Counselors were seen as politically conservative, against the legalization of marijuana, opposed to both premarital sex and homosexuality, neutral towards school busing for integration, and in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment. Counselors were expected to believe that academic grades were important. Voting behavior of counselors was expected to be quite consistent. Counselors were also seen as fairly capable of handling their own problems.

On most items female and male subjects did not differ in how they rated the counselors. Male subjects did rate the counselors as less politically conservative than did the female subjects. Female subjects saw the counselors as more capable of handling their own problems than did the male subjects.

On all of the items there were differences in the subjects' perceptions of their own beliefs (means given in Table 1) and their perceptions
Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations for Female and Male Subjects' Ratings for Counselor Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Female subjects</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male subjects</th>
<th></th>
<th>All subjects</th>
<th></th>
<th>Subject sex mean differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political views</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>M&gt;F**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Equal Rights Amendment</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-legalization of marijuana</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-premarital sex</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>-.772</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of academic grades</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuality acceptable</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>-.370</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>-.348</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-busing for integration</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting behavior</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling own problems</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>F&gt;M**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex appeal</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The higher the mean, the more acceptable the position was assumed to be by the counselor or the more the subjects thought this characteristic described the counselor.

*The higher the mean, the more politically liberal.

**p < .01.
of what the counselor's beliefs would be. All significant mean differences were at the .001 level of confidence. Subjects saw themselves as more politically liberal than the counselors. Subjects thought themselves to be more strongly in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment, more in favor of pre-marital sex, and less opposed to the legalization of marijuana.

Counselors were not as strongly opposed as the subjects to homosexuality and school busing for integration. Counselors were perceived as putting more emphasis than the subjects on good academic grades, being more likely to vote, and being more capable of handling their own problems.

**Counselor's political views.** There was a significant main effect of counselor's age on ratings of counselor's political views ($F = 2.937, p = .03$). Means with increasing age were -.06, .00, -.18, and -.17. Older counselors (age groups 3 and 4) were seen as more politically conservative than the younger counselors (age groups 1 and 2).

A significant interaction was found for counselor's sex × counselor's education ($F = 2.835, p = .01$). With increasing education, females got mean ratings of -.02, -.12, and -.11 and males got mean ratings of -.10, -.18, and -.10. Female counselors with a B.A. were seen as politically more liberal than male counselors with an M.S.

**Counselor's E.R.A position.** Subjects in the vocational problem condition ($M = .45$) rated the counselors more positive ($F = 5.994, p = .01$) toward the Equal Rights Amendment (E.R.A.) than did the subjects in the personal problem condition ($M = .30$).

Female counselors ($M = .50$) were seen as more in favor ($F = 18.931, p = .0001$) of the E.R.A. than were the male counselors ($M = .24$).
Problem condition × counselor's sex × counselor's age was a significant interaction ($F = 2.620, p = .04$) and the means are given in Table 17.

Table 17

Means for Counselor's Position on Equal Rights Amendment as Influenced by Type of Counseling Problem, Counselor's Sex, and Counselor's Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem condition</th>
<th>Counselor's sex</th>
<th>Counselor's age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (25-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.88\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Rated lower than any other group.

\textsuperscript{b}Rated higher than any other group.

The oldest male counselor was rated more positive to E.R.A. in the vocational concern than personal concern (oldest male counselor in the personal condition was rated less favorable toward the E.R.A. than any other group). All other male counselors were equally rated in both the personal and vocational conditions. The youngest female counselor and the 45-55 year old female counselor were seen as more pro-E.R.A. in the vocational condition. Youngest female counselors in the vocational condition were rated more pro-E.R.A. than any other group.

Counselor's legalization of marijuana position. Age of counselor had a significant effect on how opposed to legalization of marijuana the
subjects perceived the counselors to be ($F = 2.890, p = .03$). With increasing age, the mean ratings for the counselors were -.18, -.19, -.40, and -.33. Older counselors (ages 45-55 and 55-65) were seen as more opposed to the legalization of marijuana than were the younger counselors (ages 25-35 and 35-45).

A look at the subject's sex $\times$ counselor's sex $\times$ counselor's age interaction ($F = 4.217, p = .006$) shows that female and male subjects differently rated female counselors of ages 25-35 and 45-55 and male counselors of ages 25-35, 35-45, and 45-55. The means are given in Table 18.

Table 18

Means for Subjects' Estimations of Counselor's Attitudes Toward Legalization of Marijuana as Influenced by Subject's Sex, Counselor's Sex, and Counselor's Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor's age</th>
<th>1 (25-35)</th>
<th>2 (35-45)</th>
<th>3 (45-55)</th>
<th>4 (55-65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counselor's attitude toward premarital sex. Age of counselor had a significant effect on how the subjects perceived the counselors' attitude toward premarital sex ($F = 4.500, p = .004$). With increasing age, the means were -.05, .02, -.18, and -.24. The two younger age groups of
counselors were seen as more accepting of premarital sex than counselors in the two older age groups.

There was also a significant subject's sex x counselor's sex interaction ($F = 3.720, p = .05$). The male subjects' rating of male counselors' approval of premarital sex ($M = -.02$) was significantly higher than that of female subjects' rating of male counselors ($M = -.20$). Female subjects gave a mean rating of -.09 to female counselors, while male subjects gave a mean rating of -.13 to female counselors.

**Counselor's attitude toward academic grades.** Subject's sex x problem condition was a significant interaction ($F = 4.041, p = .04$). In the personal problem condition, female subjects gave the counselors a mean rating of .43, but male subjects gave a mean rating of .61. Female subjects gave a mean of .59, and males gave a mean of .56 in the vocational condition. Female subjects in the personal condition thought counselors put less stress on good grades than did any other groups of subjects.

Problem condition x counselor's education was a significant interaction ($F = 3.239, p = .04$). For the vocational problem condition, means with increasing education were .60, .51, and .46. For the personal problem condition, means with increasing education were .48, .58, and .67. Ph.D. counselors in the vocational condition were seen as stressing academic grades more than counselors with a B.A. or M.S. In the personal condition, counselors with a B.A. were seen as stressing grades more than counselors with a Ph.D.

Also significant was the interaction of problem condition x subject's sex x counselor's sex ($F = 3.869, p = .04$). This is shown in Figure 12.
Figure 12. Subjects' ratings of counselor's emphasis on academic grades as influenced by subject's sex, counselor's sex, and problem condition.
For female subjects, male counselors (M = .46) and female counselors (M = .41) were rated equally in the personal condition, but in the vocational condition female counselors (M = .66) were rated as placing more emphasis than male counselors (M = .52) on academic grades. For male subjects, male (M = .58) and female (M = .54) counselors were rated equally in the vocational condition. In the personal condition male subjects rated female counselors (M = .70) as putting more importance on academic grades than did the male counselors (M = .53).

Counselor's acceptance of homosexuality. Counselor's sex, age, and education did not significantly affect the ratings on this item.

Counselor's view of school busing. There was a significant interaction at the .001 level of confidence for problem condition \times subject's sex \times counselor's sex on this item. In the personal problem condition, female subjects thought male counselors (M = -.11) were more opposed than female counselors (M = .06) to busing for racial integration. Female subjects rated male counselors (M = .11) and female counselors (M = -.14) in the opposite direction in the vocational problem condition.

Male subjects in the personal problem condition rated female counselors (M = .01) as more opposed to busing than male counselors (M = .10). Yet in the vocational problem condition male subjects rated male counselors (M = -.17) as more opposed to busing than the female counselors (M = .08).

Counselor's voting behavior. Counselor's sex, age, and education did not significantly affect the ratings on this item.

Counselor's handling of own problems. Counselor's sex, age, and education did not significantly affect the ratings on this item.
Forced-Choice Preferences

At the end of the study subjects were required to choose counselors on the basis of the dimensions of counselor's sex, education, age, marital status, and amount of experience. These preferences are given in Table 19. Chi-squares were performed to determine differences in preference.

Counselor's sex. Male subjects preferred male counselors to female counselors, while female subjects more often chose female counselors rather than male counselors. When sex preferences were found in the other parts of the study, it was usually also a same-sex preference.

Counselor's education. Male subjects' choices were not significantly different by educational degree. Females, however, did not choose counselors with a B.A. degree as much as those with an M.S. or Ph.D. degree.

Counselor's age. Both male and female subjects overwhelmingly chose younger counselors. This preference was stronger here than in other parts of the study.

Counselor's marital status. Both male and female subjects indicated a preference for married counselors. This was not a dimension studied in the research reported here.

Counselor's experience. Male and female counselors preferred counselors with much counseling experience.

Limitations of this section. Subjects were not allowed to express a choice of no preference. Earlier studies, for example, suggest that more female subjects than male subjects have no preference for counselor on the basis of sex (Fuller, 1964). Second, subjects dealt with only one
Table 19

Male and Female Subjects' Forced-Choice Preferences for Counselors Along Various Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor's dimension</th>
<th>Male subjects</th>
<th>Female subjects</th>
<th>All subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Amount of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi-squares were performed for each dimension by male subjects, female subjects, and all subjects. A chi-square for all subjects on counselor's sex was not significant. A chi-square for male subjects on counselor's education was not significant. All other chi-squares were significant at the .01 level of confidence.
dimension at a time so that interactions of sex × age or marital status × sex are not indicated. Thus, the results of this section are more simple (and possibly more deceptive) than the earlier described results.
Discussion

Subjects in the present study tended to have favorable impressions of the counselors. College students expected counselors to be competent, understanding, accepting, and, in general, good persons. The counselors were given above average ratings on sixteen of seventeen adjectives, on all six items measuring expected counselor behaviors, and on the overall ratings of counselor as an expert, as a person, and as the subject's counselor. Female subjects held more favorable impressions of the counselors and gave significantly higher ratings than did the male subjects on 47% of the adjectives used in the study. While none of the counselor descriptions used in the study received many negative evaluations, on several stated impressions the counselors received different evaluations due to counselor differences in gender, age, and education. The strength of the preferences suggests that college students do expect counselors of different educational levels, ages, and sexes to think and behave differently.

It should be emphasized, however, that the subjects also anticipated that these three attributes of the counselors would have no influence on some of the characteristics of the counselors and the counseling behaviors. That is, the influence of the counselor's sex, the counselor's age, and the counselor's education is only on specific aspects rather than being a general influence on all aspects of counselor credibility. The significant differences do tend to be in consistent patterns and these patterns of differences are discussed here.
Counselor Sex

The findings of the present study did not at all support the findings of earlier studies (Boulware & Holmes, 1970; Fuller, 1964; Koile & Bird, 1956; Mezanno, 1971) that both female and male subjects prefer male counselors to female counselors; rather both male and female subjects preferred the female counselors to the male counselors in a number of specified ways.

All subjects estimated that in the initial interview they would feel more comfortable with a female counselor than a male counselor. In the vocational concern condition, both female and male subjects thought they could ask more questions of the female counselors and also perceived the female counselors as more likable as persons. Subjects saw female counselors as exhibiting the qualities of intelligence, sincerity, and religiousness more than the male counselors.

On some items support was found for the notion that subjects prefer counselors of the same sex as themselves. In the vocational concern condition, females evaluated female counselors as more positive and males perceived male counselors as more positive in both quality of advice and knowledge of current information.

More importantly, there was a same-sex counselor preference on two items that asked for an overall impression of the counselor. Female subjects had higher expectations for the female counselors, and male subjects had higher expectations for the male counselors when estimating how they would like the counselors as persons and in stating their preferences for having the counselors as the subjects' own counselor. This overall preference for a counselor of the same sex was also indicated when subjects were
asked directly to indicate counselor preference on the basis of counselor gender alone. Two-thirds of both the male and female subjects chose a same-sex counselor.

There were no same-sex rating preferences exhibited for the counselor characteristics. However, in perceptions of the counselors' beliefs, female subjects thought that female counselors were less opposed to premarital sex than the male counselors, while male subjects thought that male counselors would have a more favorable attitude toward premarital sex than the female counselors.

On most items in this study there were no significant differences for impressions of male and female counselors, suggesting that impressions of counselors are not often made on the basis of counselor's sex alone. It may be that being labeled a counselor minimizes most sex differences and expectancies. Also, preferences for counselors of a certain sex may be better predicted by client (i.e., subject) characteristics other than the client's gender. In other words, female subjects are not a homogeneous group nor are male subjects a homogeneous group when it comes to their concepts of counselor credibility and suitability.

Still, there is a need to explain the counselor sex preferences that were found and why female counselors are now in some ways preferred over male counselors. Perhaps the feminist movement has made male college students more aware of their biases toward female professionals and has had some influence on their expressed attitudes toward them. At the same time, feminism may be partly responsible for female subjects' increasing preference for female counselors (or female subjects' lessening preference for
male counselors). Some subjects may feel that characteristics a good counselor should possess are those more typically part of a woman's personality.

Subjects' preferences for counselors the same sex as themselves may be an indication that subjects need a counselor who appears to be similar to themselves (Arbuckle, 1972). Perhaps similarity makes a counselor seem more expert, or perhaps it is a belief that only a counselor who is like the client can really understand the client (Simons & Helms, in press).

**Counselor Age**

One of the few studies that explored the effects of counselor's age on the impressions subjects would form of the counselor was that done by Boulware and Holmes (1970). The results of the Boulware and Holmes study indicated that on the whole older counselors (45-49 years old) were evaluated more favorably than the younger counselors (25-29 years old). The two age groups in the Boulware and Holmes (1970) study correspond to age groups 1 (25-35 years) and 3 (45-55 years) in the present research. When age of counselor was perceived in significantly different ways in the present study, usually counselors in group 3 were more favorably perceived than those in group 1. Thus, the results here are fairly consistent with the earlier study by Boulware and Holmes (1970).

Boulware and Holmes (1970) assumed a linear relationship between age of counselor and counselor preference, but the addition of both another young age group (35-45 years) and an older age group (55-65 years) precludes such a simple interpretation for the present study. The oldest age group (55-65 years) made the lowest impressions, while age group 2 (35-45
years) was evaluated quite favorably. On the whole, counselors were evaluated more positively as they get older, but the oldest counselors were evaluated less favorably than all other age groups. One should keep in mind that subjects in this study were 18 to 23 years old; older subjects might be differently affected by counselor's age as suggested in the research of Simons and Helms (in press).

Counselors in age group 3 (45-55 years) were seen as able to help the subject act most appropriately as a client, especially in being able to ask the counselor anything, while counselors in age group 4 (55-65 years) were seen as least helpful in assisting the client's behavior. There was an inverse relationship between expecting the counselor to avoid making moral evaluations of the client's behavior and the counselor's age.

Older counselors (age group 3 and 4) were seen as more politically conservative and more opposed to premarital sex and the legalization of marijuana than were the younger counselors (age groups 1 and 2). Counselors in age group 3 were seen as more religious; counselors in age group 2 were seen as more physically attractive.

Male and female subjects did not differ in how they perceived counselors of different ages except that female subjects evaluated younger counselors as more intelligent and male subjects evaluated older counselors as more intelligent.

To summarize, subjects anticipated that counselor's age would affect how they would act as a client with the oldest counselors having the worst effect on the client's behaviors and counselors of ages 45-55 having the
best effect on the client's behaviors. Subjects expected that the counselor's age would have little effect on the counselor's behaviors (only influencing moralizing by counselor). Age of counselor did influence how the subjects evaluated a few of the counselor characteristics and beliefs. On the whole, female and male subjects agreed on how the age of counselor affected their impressions and preferences.

**Counselor Education**

In the present research, when education of counselor significantly affected the ratings, the higher educational degree usually produced more positive evaluations of the counselors.

Education of the counselor by itself did not affect how the subjects anticipated their own behaviors as a client, except that female subjects thought they would be more comfortable initially with a counselor who had an M.S. rather than a counselor who had a Ph.D. Both the counselor's sex and the counselor's age were anticipated to have more influence on how the subject would act as a client than would the counselor's education.

All subjects thought that the counselor would be less understanding if the counselor had an M.S. degree than if the counselor had a Ph.D. or a B.A. degree. Otherwise, the education of counselor was not expected to correlate with the quality of counselor's skills.

Logically, there was a linear relationship between counselor's education and the rating the counselor received for expertness. Ph.D. counselors were seen as more expert than counselors with an M.S. who were rated higher than counselors who had a B.A.
Besides being rated more expert, a counselor who had a Ph.D. was rated more intelligent, more dependable, and more active than other counselors. In the vocational concern condition, counselors with a Ph.D. were rated as putting more emphasis on the importance of academic grades than counselors with either an M.S. or B.A., but in the personal concern condition, B.A. counselors were seen as emphasizing grades more than did Ph.D. counselors. Thus, the educational level of the counselor significantly alters the impressions subjects form on characteristics closely related to expertness, but does not influence other impressions of the counselor.

Subjects seem to agree with Arbuckle (1972) or Strong (1968) who make the assumption that clients prefer counselors who have earned a doctorate. Perhaps subjects think only "good" counselors can earn a doctorate, or they would equate education with ability or expertness. On the other hand, the preference for Ph.D. counselors could indicate a stereotype that counselors should be a "doctor" or a desire on the subject's part to have a prestigious counselor.

**Counselor Sex × Age**

The interaction of counselor sex and counselor age was not a significant factor in how subjects anticipated their own behaviors as a client. However, it did influence evaluations of expected counselor behaviors. It influenced the perceptions of counselor's quality of advice and knowledge of current information, and also produced significant differences when all six items measuring anticipated counselor behaviors were combined and analyzed.
When female subjects rated the counselors according to how much they would like them as their own counselors, the oldest female counselor was rated lower than other female counselors, and the 45-55 year old male counselor was rated lower than other male counselors. Male subjects rated the youngest female counselor lower than the other female counselors, and they rated the youngest and the oldest male counselors lower than the other male counselors.

Rating the counselors as experts, the subjects gave higher ratings to the younger two female counselors than the older two female counselors. Subjects also gave higher ratings to the older two male counselors than the younger two male counselors. It seems that male counselors are seen as more expert as they get older, but female counselors are seen as less expert as they get older.

The counselor sex x counselor age interaction was significant for 41% of the adjective ratings on the counselor: intelligent, polite, kind, dependable, just, likable, sociable, and attractive. For most of these adjectives, the younger female counselors were evaluated more positively than were the older female counselors, and the older male counselors were evaluated more positively than were the younger male counselors.

The inverse relationship between age and good qualities for female counselors, and the direct relationship between age and good qualities for male counselors, was not expected. It may be interpreted as reflecting the biases and stereotypes of the whole society. Men typically gain in prestige and status as they get older; women do not benefit from a connection
between age and status. In fact, until recently the media and literature tended to portray older women in negative ways—less competent, less attractive, and more dependent. If the feminist movement is successful in changing the public image of women, future studies may show a decrease in the bias against older female counselors.

Counselor Sex x Counselor Education

Subjects were influenced by both the counselor's sex and education when anticipating how much they would be willing to discuss with the counselor. Subjects thought they could discuss more with a female counselor who had a B.A. degree than a female counselor who had an M.S. degree, and they would discuss the least with a female counselor who had a Ph.D. The perceptions were reversed for the male counselors. Subjects thought they could discuss the most with a Ph.D. male counselor and the least with a male counselor who had only a B.A. degree. Perhaps male counselors were seen as more competent counselors with increasing education, but female counselors were seen as more intimidating or threatening as they became more educated.

Subjects were asked to estimate how much the counselors would like and accept them. Female counselors with a B.A. degree were seen as more accepting of the client than other female counselors. Male counselors with a Ph.D. degree were seen as more accepting of the client than other male counselors. Once again, increasing educational degrees worked to the advantage of the male counselors, but to the disadvantage of the female counselors.
Counselor's gender significantly affected the direction of the influence of both the counselor's age and the counselor's education. Male counselors tended to be perceived as better counselors as they got older and as they got more education, while female counselors were more likely to be perceived less favorably as they got older and more educated. Age and education were seen as assets for male counselors but sometimes were perceived as handicaps for female counselors.

Probably female counselors expect to be better counselors as they get older and benefit from more counseling experience and as they get more counseling training and educational degrees. If their clients do not share these expectations they may experience considerable conflict between their self-perceptions and the perceptions the clients have of their credibility. On the other hand, it appears that younger, less educated counselors may make a better impression on the client if they are female; this may make initial counseling experiences easier and more pleasant for female counselors.

Subjects were asked to estimate the counselor's intelligence. Regardless of their educational level, all male counselors received equivalent ratings in intelligence. However, female counselors with a Ph.D. degree had a much higher rating for intelligence than other female counselors and any of the male counselors. This may reflect an attitude on the subjects' part that women must be more intelligent than men to be able (i.e., permitted) to earn a doctorate. Or, it may be the opinion of the subjects that the most intelligent men tend to enter the "hard" sciences and
mathematical fields while their female equivalents would tend to enter the social sciences due to this society's socialization process. 

There was a significant interaction for the rating on the counselor's justness, but here female and male subjects differed in their ratings. Female subjects saw Ph.D. female counselors as more just of the female counselors, but the male subjects saw Ph.D. female counselors as least just of the female counselors. Female subjects saw male counselors with a B.A. degree as more just than male counselors with an M.S. degree who were more just than Ph.D. male counselors; male subjects rated Ph.D. male counselors as more just than the other male counselors. With the same-sex counselor, a Ph.D. increased how just the counselor was expected to be. A Ph.D. decreased how just the counselor was expected to be for the opposite-sex counselor.

Counselor Age x Counselor Education

This last two-way interaction produces the most problems in interpreting results. It is clear that the counselor's age group can have an effect on how the counselor of various educational levels is seen, but no particular trend seems to emerge.

In estimating their own behaviors, subjects perceived that the B.A. counselors of age group 4 (55-65 years) would make it harder than the other B.A. counselors for the subject to ask the counselor questions. The two younger age groups were evaluated more positively than the two older age groups on this item for counselors with M.S. degrees. For counselors with Ph.D.'s, subjects thought it would be easier to ask questions of age
group 3 (45-55 years) counselors, then the age group 1 (25-35 years) counselors, and then the other two age groups.

The summed score for all anticipated client behavior was also significant, but with female and male subjects rating differently. Both male and female subjects perceived their behaviors with the youngest counselors with a B.A. as fairly high and with the oldest counselors with a B.A. as being the lowest; female subjects estimated that their behaviors with counselors of age group 3 would be better while male subjects thought that age group 2 would most positively influence their own behaviors. With the counselors who had an M.S. degree, females thought their own behaviors would be more positive with the two older counselors while the male subjects gave higher ratings with the two youngest counselors. With Ph.D. counselors, females rated their own behaviors with the youngest counselors highest and the males rated their own behaviors with this group the lowest. It is not evident why the female and male subjects expected to act so differently with the counselors, but it does suggest that research needs to be done with counselors of varying age and education to see if these expectations are realistic appraisals of behaviors in the counseling situation.

Also significant were the items of confidence and dependability. On both items, the highest rated B.A. counselors were the youngest counselors, suggesting that older counselors without higher educational degrees are expected to lose some confidence and dependability; i.e., with increasing age graduate degrees may be considered appropriate for a competent counselor to have. At the master's degree level, the oldest counselors were seen as
more confident and dependable. Perhaps the added age was considered as a factor that increases one's confidence and dependability. For Ph.D. female counselors only, with increasing age the level of confidence decreased.

Theoretical Considerations

One of the counselor's goals may be to maximize his or her credibility in order to have the most influence on counseling outcome (Strong, 1968). The assumption is made that how the clients (i.e., subjects) perceive the counselor (i.e., their impressions of the counselor) is related to the perceived or reported credibility of the counselor. Possible intermediate variables in counselor credibility include expertness and similarity.

That higher educated counselors and older counselors are preferred suggest expertness is supported as a valid mechanism, since these are the choices that connote status, power, competence, and experience. Similarity as an intermediate variable of counselor credibility is supported by preference for same-sex counselor, since this choice helps to make the counselor more similar to the subject.

The influence of expertness and similarity in counselor credibility may operate in several ways. It is possible that only one influences the way the counselors are perceived, or both expertness and similarity may be important contributions to counselor credibility. It is possible that each mechanism figures in only some dimensions (e.g., similarity for sex and expertness for educational degree), or one dimension may be influenced by another dimension thus changing which mechanism is used (e.g., sex of counselor could influence the role of age so that similarity is the primary
mechanism for female counselors and expertness is the principle mechanism for male counselors). Finally, some subjects may prefer counselors because of the perceived counselor's expertness and others prefer counselors because of the perceived similarity with the counselors. If the relative importance of expertness and similarity tends to be influenced by the sex of the subject, the effect would be picked up in this study. Future studies may wish to explore counselor preferences and their relation to other characteristics of the subjects (e.g., age, education, social class, locus of control, beliefs).

On the whole, expertness seems to be a more important influence in stated counselor preferences than is similarity. The role of expertness is seen most strongly in counselor age (i.e., older counselors are generally more preferred to younger counselors) and in counselor education (i.e., the higher the degree the more favorable the impression of the counselor). The preference for a same-sex counselor is strong support for the influence of similarity in perceived counselor credibility.

Most important, the importance of perceived counselor expertness varies by counselor sex. The role of expertness in increasing counselor credibility was most evident in the ratings of male counselors. Male counselors tended to be rated more favorably as they got older (except for the oldest male counselor) and also as they were described as more educated. On the other hand, similarity often seemed to play a role in counselor credibility for female counselors. On several items in this study, female counselors received less favorable ratings as they got older (i.e., less
similar to the subjects in age) or as they had higher educational degrees (i.e., a bigger educational gap with the subjects).

The influence of expertness, then, was more generalized for male counselors than it was for female counselors. On most items where education had a significant effect the male counselors increased their ratings as their educational level went up. While female counselors often produced an inverse relationship between education and the ratings, there was a positive relationship between educational level and ratings for female counselors on items most representative of expertness, including intelligence, dependability, activity, and expertness.

There are some subject sex differences in expertness, similarity, and counselor credibility and preference, and these need to be considered in future research and in uses of the Strong (1968) interpersonal influence theory. The two most consistent trends seem to be that both male and female subjects see a counselor of the same sex as themselves as more credible, and female subjects tend to rate counselors more favorably than do male subjects.

The Strong (1968) interpersonal influence theory seems to be a good basis for developing a theoretical framework for impression formation in counseling. More studies are needed to determine what factors for whom contribute substantially to counselor credibility and thus to counseling outcome. Figure 1 suggests some of the kinds of characteristics that need to be examined in future impression formation studies.

A second source of material to use in developing a framework for counseling preference studies is the body of research done on impression
formation by social psychologists. Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, and Broverman (1972) found that men were stereotyped as being independent, objective, active, competitive, adventurous, self-confident, ambitious, blunt, rough, unaware of the feelings of others, and unable to express own feelings. Women were stereotyped as being dependent, passive, subjective, not competent, not adventurous, not self-confident, not ambitious, but tactful, gentle, aware of the feelings of others, and able to express tender feelings. Results in this study suggest that for male counselors both further training (i.e., more education) and more experience (i.e., increased age) result in higher levels of positive aspects of the stereotypical image and lower levels of the negative aspects of the stereotype. Women, however, gain in competence qualities with increasing education but at the expense of many of the positive affiliation qualities usually attributed to women. Furthermore, with increasing age, women tend to be negatively evaluated on both competence and affiliation characteristics. With this type of perception pattern for men and women, it is no wonder that in summarizing studies done in this area Deaux (1976a) reports that studies tend to provide evidence that "when the women is described as having the same credentials as does a man, she will be rated lower in competence, recommended for a lower position within the organizational structure, and hired less frequently" (p. 21).

Female counselors may be evaluated less positively with increasing education because they are seen as not operating in legitimate ways for women. Men are expected to present themselves in a status-assertive mode
and appear powerful, accomplished, and competent. Yet women are expected to neutralize status, decrease interpersonal distance and establish more equal links with others (Deaux, 1976b). Therefore, the educated female counselor may be viewed as not gaining control in the right way and therefore is devaluated. The educated male counselor is operating in the proper status-assertive mode and is therefore more highly evaluated.

Male counselors who are viewed as not as successful are evaluated lower than the female counselors with similar qualifications. In this research this can be seen by comparing ratings of male and female counselors with a B.A. degree or by comparing evaluations of young male and female counselors. These findings are consistent with research in the social psychology area such as studies by Deaux and Taynor (1973) and Feather and Simon (1975). Successful males tend to be rated higher than successful females, but less successful males are usually rated lower than less successful females.

**Research Implications**

The procedure used in the present research has been used in two other studies (Helms & Simons, Note 1; Simons & Helms, in press) and it is a procedure that seems worthwhile to pursue in future studies. Subjects have been able to work well with the format both when asked only a few questions about the counselor or when asked several pages of questions concerning the counselor. It is also possible to vary the number of counselors that each subject evaluates. In the present study each subject evaluated only one counselor and there were similar results to the other two studies in which each subject evaluated eight counselors.
Parts of the Counselor Evaluation Scale seem worth pursuing in future studies, and the 1-99 scale structure allows the research the convenience of evaluating each item separately. Most valuable sections for impression formation studies appear to be the first section (15 questions) and the set of adjectives used to describe the counselor's characteristics. Besides the effectiveness of these items in revealing differences in counselor preferences, these two sets of questions have been used in a number of earlier studies so that comparisons to other research are available.

One limitation of this impression formation study (and other research done on this topic) is that it examines initial impressions only. Researchers need to find out which impressions have a lasting effect over several counseling sessions. Little is known about how initial impressions of the counselor influence the behavioral aspects within the counseling sessions and influence counseling outcome. Thus, studies that (a) examine counselor preference by clients and credibility throughout the entire counseling process and (b) look at correlations between counselor impressions and behaviors of counselor and client are needed.

The impression formation studies use research subjects instead of actual clients. Actual clients may pay greater or lesser attention to these factors. Little is known about whether or not, if given the opportunity, actual clients would like to choose their own counselors according to characteristics like the counselor's sex, age, and education.

Another limitation of the subjects used in this study is that they are all college students of ages 18 to 23 years. One cannot generalize these
findings to other populations, especially other age groups and noncollege oriented groups. Studies are needed on different populations such as the research done by Simons and Helms (in press) and Mezanno (1971). The procedure used in this research is one that is convenient and simple, and therefore one that could be easily adapted to diverse subject groups.

There are few similar studies to help interpret these findings. Both counseling analogues and "real world" studies are needed. Another type of research that should be done is to directly ask the subjects why they make these particular choices. Some of the prominent questions left in this study are: Why is there a same-sex preference for counselors? Why the drop in ratings for the oldest group of counselors? Why do subjects want a Ph.D. female counselor in spite of expecting the Ph.D. female counselor to exhibit lower levels of good counselor behaviors? Why are female counselors rated higher if younger, and male counselors rated higher if older? Each of these questions could be separately addressed in research studies.

One might also address the impression formation in counseling issue from the opposite side, and ask whether counselors hold the same types of biases toward clients. One could look at what factors make a credible client.

Two general implications for counseling research are suggested by the findings of this study. First, when researchers manipulate expertness or other dimensions of their counselors in their studies by adjusting aspects such as educational degree or age, they should realize that their manipulations may in fact only influence a few aspects of the study rather than
have a generalized effect. Also, the same experimental manipulation may produce different results with a female counselor than it would with a male counselor.

Second, since the counselor is seen differently by male and female subjects and the characteristics of a counselor influence perceptions of counselor credibility, whenever possible research studies should give the sex and age of clients or subjects, and known characteristics of the counselor including the counselor's sex, age, and education.

Counseling Considerations

This research suggests that psychologists should not speak merely about a sex bias or age bias in counselor preference, but in terms of more complex interactions such as counselor sex × counselor age bias or counselor sex × education bias. Researchers need to examine whether the trends found in this study are fairly stable or whether the trends are the result of contemporary ideologies.

Counselors should note that the subjects in this study tended to give positive ratings to counselors and expected counselors to be competent and understanding. Still, subjects did express differences in counselor ratings based only on the counselor's gender, age, and education. These definite preferences suggest that diversity of counselors in a counseling center would be desirable. Perhaps clients should be allowed to express preferences for their own counselor.

Counselors might be able to learn how to use appropriate matches of client preferences to their advantage to improve counseling outcome; counselors should also be able to deal with the problems of poor matches
between counselor and client preferences. Along with this, psychologists might address whether counselors actually behave in the ways clients expect them to behave. When differences do exist between clients' expectations and actual counseling behaviors, counselors need to be able to convince clients of reality. Knowing that clients have preferences for counselors of certain characteristics, practitioners need to decide how to improve counseling by using this information.

Hypotheses and Overall Findings

1. As predicted, the same-sex preference for counselors was found for overall impressions of the counselors. The same-sex preference for counselors was also found on some of the more specific perceptions such as quality of advice and knowledge of information. On 18% of the adjectives and 1/3 of the impressions of counselor's behaviors, both male and female subjects gave more favorable ratings to female counselors than male counselors, and there were no perceptions for which both male and female subjects evaluated male counselors higher than female counselors. There were several impressions for which the counselor's sex alone was not significant.

2. Predicted preference for older counselors over younger counselors was partially confirmed in that ratings tended to increase with age until the oldest age group, which usually received the lowest ratings of all. By sex, female counselors sometimes made lower impressions with increasing age while male counselors made better impressions with increasing age.

3. On some items, the hypothesis that increasing educational level would be related to higher ratings was supported. However, it was found
in some cases that as female counselors were labeled with higher educational degrees their credibility as counselor decreased. On a few items there were significant counselor age × counselor education interactions, but no consistent trend was apparent.

4. On 47% of the adjectives, female subjects did give higher ratings to the counselors than did the male subjects.

5. Type of counseling problem did influence degree of preference in that ratings obtained in the vocational concern condition were often higher than in the personal concern condition. However, occasionally the type of counseling problem also influenced direction of preference.
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The Counselor Evaluation Scale

A. Read each of the following statements and mark the line under the statement with an X to indicate how you think you would feel if you were assigned as a client to the counselor whose description you have just read.

EXAMPLE: If the first question was: "How tall do you think this counselor would be?" On the line below you would estimate what you imagine the counselor's height would be. If you think the counselor is 4'11" then mark towards the end that says very short. If you think the counselor is 6'5" then mark towards the end that says very tall. If you think the counselor is average height, then mark your X right in the middle of the line. The person who marked this line thought the counselor would be slightly above average in height.

1 ________________________________ 99
very short __________________________ very tall

Now go on and answer the following:

1. Would you feel you could discuss anything you wished in your interview?

1 ________________________________ 99
not at all __________________________ definitely yes

2. Would you feel you could ask any questions you wished?

1 ________________________________ 99
not at all __________________________ definitely yes

3. Would you feel comfortable in your first interview?

1 ________________________________ 99
not comfortable _____________________ very comfortable at all

4. Would you feel comfortable in the following interviews?

1 ________________________________ 99
not comfortable _____________________ very comfortable at all

5. Would you feel anxious talking to this counselor?

1 ________________________________ 99
very anxious _________________________ very relaxed
6. How open about your emotions do you think you could be with this counselor?

1 __________________________________________________________________________________________ 99
not open completely open at all

7. Would you feel this counselor was genuinely interested in helping you with your problems?

1 __________________________________________________________________________________________ 99
not interested very interested at all

8. Would you feel this counselor could understand your problem?

1 __________________________________________________________________________________________ 99
not at all definitely yes

9. How much advice would this counselor give you to help you solve your problem?

1 __________________________________________________________________________________________ 99
very little very much

10. How much do you think this counselor would like and accept you?

1 __________________________________________________________________________________________ 99
very little very much

11. To what extent do you believe this counselor would make a moral evaluation of your behavior?

1 __________________________________________________________________________________________ 99
a lot not at all

12. How familiar do you think this counselor is with the most recent information concerning the different ways such a problem could be resolved?

1 __________________________________________________________________________________________ 99
very unfamiliar very familiar

13. How expert a counselor is this person likely to be?

1 __________________________________________________________________________________________ 99
not at all very much
14. How much would you like this counselor as a person?

1

not at all

99

very much

15. How much would you like this counselor as your counselor?

1

not at all

99

very much

Be sure you have marked an X on each line.

B. Now imagine what subjects you would be willing to talk about with this counselor. Place the appropriate number in front of each group of topics to indicate how willing you would be to discuss these things in counseling.

Use this guideline:

1 = not willing to discuss at all
2 = willing to discuss a little
3 = willing to discuss somewhat
4 = willing to discuss fairly much
5 = willing to discuss quite a bit
6 = willing to discuss thoroughly
7 = would insist on discussing this a lot

____ My Family: my mother, my father, my brothers and sisters, my childhood, my adolescence, conflicts with parents.

____ Anticipated Family: marital plans, family plans, financial resources or problems with money.

____ Fantasy and Future: hopes or fears about the future, body functions and symptoms, strange or unusual ideas, dreams.

____ Career and Education: work, study habits, vocational goals, grades.

____ Therapy: attitudes or feelings toward counselor, counseling goals.

____ Religion: religious feelings, religious activities.

____ Peer Relations: relations with opposite sex, relations with same sex, dating behavior.

____ Isolation vs. Intimacy: being lonely or isolated, loving—being able to give of myself, meaning little or nothing to others, being worthless or unlovable.
Self-Identity: expressing or exposing myself to others, who I am and what I want, lacking self-confidence.

Independence vs. Dependence: being dependent on others, meeting my obligations and responsibilities, being assertive or competitive.

Sex and Guilt: living up to my conscience, shameful or guilty feelings, sexual feelings and experiences, moral concerns.

Anger and Fear: angry feelings or behavior, fearful or panicky experiences, moodiness.

Be sure you have put a number in front of each group.

C. Read each of the descriptive dimensions below and indicate with an X somewhere on the line what you think this counselor would be like.

1. active 99 passive
2. unambitious 99 ambitious
3. non-confident 99 confident
4. happy 99 sad
5. weak 99 strong
6. undependable 99 dependable
7. sociable 99 unsociable
8. unlikable likable
9. unjust just
10. insincere sincere
11. kind unkind
12. rude polite

D. Read each of the following statements and place an X somewhere on the line to indicate how you imagine this counselor might believe, act, and be.

EXAMPLE: This item asks one to estimate the counselor's enthusiasm towards college football games. The person who marked the item thought the counselor was rather neutral towards the games.

Now mark each of the following items according to how you imagine the counselor whose description you have read would be like:

1. This counselor's political views.

1 very conservative 2 very liberal

2. This counselor's voting behavior.

1 never votes 2 always votes

3. This counselor's sense of humor.

1 very poor 2 very good
4. This counselor's view of the Equal Rights Amendment movement.
   1 strongly opposes 99 strongly supports

5. This counselor's intelligence.
   1 stupid 99 intelligent

6. This counselor's religious beliefs.
   1 non-religious 99 religious

7. This counselor's view of legalization of marijuana.
   1 strongly opposes 99 strongly favors

8. This counselor's view of premarital sex.
   1 strongly disapproves 99 strongly approves

9. This counselor's ability at handling own problems.
   1 very low 99 very high

10. This counselor's stress on good academic grades.
    1 not at all 99 extremely
        important  important

11. This counselor's physical attractiveness.
    1 ugly 99 good looking

12. This counselor's sex appeal.
    1 very low 99 very high
13. This counselor's attitude toward homosexuality.

unacceptable acceptable
life style life style

14. This counselor's view of busing for school integration.

anti-busing pro-busing

E. Now go back through these last 14 items and mark each of them with a Y to indicate your own attitudes and abilities. In other words, replace the word "this counselor's" with "my own."

EXAMPLE: Going back to the football item, if you love college football, the line should look like this after you mark it the second time.

none a great deal

But if you don't like football much at all, the line would look something like this.

none a great deal

Be sure that each line in part D has been marked with an X and with a Y.

F. Please estimate the following and write your estimate in the blank provided.

Counselor's age in years _______

Counselor's yearly income in dollars _______

Number of sessions you would go to the counselor to work on your problem _______

G. Imagine how you would feel after completing all counseling sessions with this counselor. Then circle the most appropriate answer for each of the following questions.
a. How did you usually feel about going to counseling sessions?
   1. Eager; could hardly wait to get there.
   2. Very much looked forward to going.
   3. Somewhat looked forward to going.
   4. Neutral about going.
   5. Somewhat reluctant to go.
   6. Unwilling; felt I didn't want to go at all.

b. How much progress did you feel you made in dealing with your problems?
   1. a great deal of progress.
   2. considerable progress.
   3. moderate progress.
   4. some progress.
   5. didn't get anywhere.
   6. in some ways my problems seem to have gotten worse.

c. How helpful do you feel the counselor was to you?
   1. completely helpful.
   2. very helpful.
   3. pretty helpful.
   4. somewhat helpful.
   5. slightly helpful.
   6. not at all helpful.

d. Counseling was
   1. perfect.
   2. excellent.
   3. very good.
   4. pretty good.
   5. fair.
   6. pretty poor.
   7. very poor.

Be sure you have answered each item on this page.