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ABSTRACT

This study was a vicarious participation analogue directed at determining the effects of counselor responsibility, counselor sex, and subject sex on perceived counselor expertness and effectiveness. The 204 male and female subjects listened to a brief audiotape of a counseling interaction between a male client and either a male or female counselor exhibiting one of three levels of counselor responsibility. The interaction occurred at the generation of alternatives stage of the counseling process. Written information presented prior to the audiotape briefly described the counselor, the client, and their past interaction. Counselor responsibility was operationalized by having the counselor either: (a) prompt the client to generate alternative courses of action (low counselor responsibility); (b) work collaboratively with the client to generate alternatives (moderate counselor responsibility); or (c) tell the client what he ought to do to solve his problem (high counselor responsibility). In general counselors who assumed a moderate amount of responsibility were seen as most expert and effective, followed by those who operated at high and finally low levels of responsibility. The precise nature of the influence of counselor responsibility varied somewhat across the four central dependent measures. Although overall, male and female counselors were viewed as equally expert and effective, the sex of the counselor did interact with counselor responsibility to determine effectiveness in one instance. Perceived expertness and effectiveness were found to be moderately and positively related. The findings of this study generated several questions for further investigation.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Psychotherapy can be viewed as a branch of applied social psychology. Psychotherapy is a setting for interpersonal influence, an area of study in social psychology. The major targets for change in psychotherapy are client behaviors in social interactions. How clients feel about themselves (vis-a-vis others), how effective they are in controlling themselves (in social interaction), and how effectively they control their environments (mostly other people) are aspects of behavior in social interaction, which is the major focus of social psychology (Strong, 1978, p. 101).

These comments by Strong are representative of the increasing attention being given to the relevance of social psychological theory and research for counseling and therapy. As detailed by Strong, the application of social psychology to therapy began with Kurt Lewin, who was an important contributor to the early development of experimental social psychology. Some of the concepts having the most relevance for counseling/therapy were generated by such Lewin students as Leon Festinger (cognitive dissonance), Darwin Cartwright (social power), and Harold Kelley (causal attribution). Another Lewin student, Jerome Frank, suggested in his classic book, Persuasion and Healing (Frank, 1963), that therapy was in part a social persuasion and influence process.

The application of theory and research in social psychology to the investigation of the counseling/therapy process began in earnest in the 1960's. In 1966, Goldstein, along with Heller and Sechrest, published an influential book which emphasized the appropriateness of such an application (Goldstein, Heller, & Sechrest, 1966). The advent of the behavior therapies during this same time altered prevailing
notions of therapy in a fashion that made them more compatible with the social psychological tradition (Goldstein & Simonson, 1971). Further emphasis on the relevance of social psychology for therapy was added by Strong (1968), who reasserted Frank's (1963) view of therapy as an interpersonal influence process and began to conduct research exploring this process (Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a, 1970b). Goldstein and Simonson (1971) reviewed research on interpersonal attraction, role playing, and group dynamics and discussed their applications to therapy. At the time of their review, these areas of inquiry were just beginning to come under experimental scrutiny in therapy contexts. Strong (1978) stated that in the years following the Goldstein and Simonson paper, a number of social psychologically oriented psychotherapy studies were reported, but that the number and diversity of the studies remained relatively small. Thus Strong's (1978) review focused largely on major approaches and findings in social psychology and how they could be applied to therapy. Specifically, Strong attempted to integrate and apply concepts and findings from three dominant theories in social psychology in the last 30 years: consistency theory, attribution theory, and social power theory.

Counseling as an Interpersonal Influence Process

Strong's (1968) theory of counseling as an interpersonal influence process is one of the major attempts to date to apply social psychology to the counseling context. Social power and attitude change are the theoretical cornerstones upon which Strong has built his interpersonal
influence model. Social power theory specifies the factors and processes which determine one agent's ability to influence and control another agent's behavior (Cartwright, 1959; French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965). The component of attitude change theory (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953; McGuire, 1969) that is most central to Strong's interpersonal influence model concerns the characteristics of a communicator that contribute to attitude change in the recipient of the communication—specifically, the perceived credibility (expertness and trustworthiness) and attractiveness of the communicator.

The model of counseling as an interpersonal influence process describes how client-counselor interaction leads to client change (Strong, 1968; Strong, 1978; Strong & Matross, 1973). Strong has suggested that counselors influence their clients to acquire and accept new information about themselves and events in their lives and to subsequently use this information to change themselves and their environments. The counselor's ability to influence the client, termed "power" (Strong & Matross, 1973), presumably is based on the client's belief that he or she needs help and on the client's perception that the therapist possesses resources appropriate to the client's needs.

According to the interpersonal influence model, the two major sources of counselor power are the client's attraction to the counselor and the client's conclusion that the counselor is credible. It is proposed that attraction arises from the client's need to have value consistency and from his/her perception that the counselor has values similar to his/her own. Thus, the counseling relationship provides an
opportunity to test value consistency. The client's need to be liked and accepted, the counselor's liking and acceptance of the client, and the counselor's physical attractiveness are also viewed as promoting attraction. The client's conclusion that the counselor is credible is thought to arise from the client's need to solve problems and his/her perception of the counselor as expert and trustworthy. According to the model, perceived trustworthiness is based on the client's view of the counselor as genuinely interested in helping him/her and as having no ulterior motives. Finally, the client's perception of the counselor as expert is believed to involve the client's belief that the therapist possesses knowledge and skills for helping people solve their problems.

Research Concerning Counselor Characteristics Central to the Interpersonal Influence Model

The portion of the interpersonal influence model of therapy that has received the most research attention concerns the counselor characteristics that promote the counselor's ability to influence the client (Strong, 1978). Research concerning these characteristics has progressed in several directions. One major thrust of this research has been to validate counselor expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness as dimensions of clients'/observers' perceptions of the counselor (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; LaCrosse & Barak, 1976).

A second important vein of research concerning counselor expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness has investigated whether these client-perceived characteristics actually increase counselor social power, resulting in changes in the client's actions, feelings, or
thoughts (Bergin, 1962; Beutler, Johnson, Neville, Elkins, & Jobe, 1975; Binderman, Fretz, Scott, & Abrams, 1972; Browning, 1966; Dell, 1973; Guttman & Haase, 1972; Heppner & Dixon, 1978; Hokenson, 1973; Merluzzi, Merluzzi, & Kaul, 1977; Patton, 1969; Schmidt & Strong, 1971; Sprafkin, 1970; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a). Studies in this area have largely been of the quasi-counseling analogue variety (Helms, 1976), involving a one-session interaction between a counselor and client-surrogate. Typically, certain counselor characteristics or behaviors have been manipulated and the counselor has attempted to influence the client's attitudes and/or behavior. Presession, postsession, and sometimes follow up measures of the relevant client attitudes or behaviors have been examined for changes due to the counselor influence attempt. Results of this research provide support for perceived counselor expertness and trustworthiness as important sources of counselor power and client change (Strong, 1978). It has not been clearly established that attractiveness is a basic source of power, although when a counselor lacks strong credibility, his/her attractiveness seems to to be an important consideration (Strong, 1978).

In the third important area of investigation concerning counselor characteristics central to the interpersonal influence model, researchers have explored the cues to counselor expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness that are used by clients or naive observers. Quasi-counseling and vicarious participation analogue studies (Helms, 1976) have delineated a variety of counselor characteristics and behaviors that serve as cues (Atkinson & Caruskaddon, 1975; Atkinson, Maruyama, &
INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT STUDY

Cues to Counselor Expertness

The present study was directly concerned with cues to counselor expertness. The perception of a counselor as expert, as possessing knowledge and skills for client problem solving and change, is important both prior to and during counseling. Tinsley and Harris (1976) demonstrated that among the strongest expectations of counseling held by undergraduate college students was the expectation of seeing an experienced, expert counselor. Atkinson and Carskadden (1975) and Barak and Dell (1977) found that perception of counselors in videotaped interviews as expert was positively related to willingness to refer oneself to the counselor for a variety of problems. Once counseling contact has been initiated, the counselor's ability to influence the client depends in part on the client's perception of the counselor's expertness (Bergin, 1962; Binderman et al., 1972; Browning, 1966; Dell, 1973; Guttman & Haase, 1972; Merluzzi et al., 1977; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a).

Setting and initial information cues

Research on cues to counselor expertness has revealed that initial information about the counselor presented to subjects and the physical features of the counseling setting influence perceived counselor expertness. A quasi-counseling analogue by Heppner and Pew (1977) yielded evidence that counselors displaying diplomas and awards on their office walls were perceived as significantly more expert than those without
these visible credentials. Bloom, Weigel, and Trautt (1977) explored the effects of office decor, subject sex, and therapist sex on perception of credibility. Results indicated that a female therapist was perceived as more credible when occupying a "traditional-professional" office than a casual, "humanistic" office, while the reverse was true for male therapists. Initial information presenting a counselor as having considerable experience (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977; Greenberg, 1969), a reputation as an expert, a strong professional interest in counseling, extensive training, and a Ph.D. in psychology (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977) all have been shown to enhance perceptions of counselor expertness.

Behavioral cues

Schmidt and Strong (1970) proposed that the behavioral cues a counselor emits may be even more important in determining impressions of counselor expertness than are information and setting cues. A number of investigations have demonstrated that counselor behavior may indeed strongly influence perceived counselor expertness. Atkinson and Carskaddon (1975) discovered that a male counselor's knowledge of psychology was rated higher when he employed abstract psychological jargon than when he used concrete layman's language. Results of a study by Kerr and Dell (1976) indicated that the perceived expertness of female counselors was influenced jointly by counselor attire (professional or casual) and role (expert or attractive). In the expert role, counselors followed a logical order of questioning, tried to obtain complete information, structured the interview and minimized client
responses, while in the attractive role, counselors were more concerned
with client feelings and structured the interview less. Expertness
ratings obtained when role and attire were consistent (expert-professional
or attractive-casual) were higher than when they were inconsistent. Dell
and Schmidt (1976) found that perceived expertness of both male and
female counselors was enhanced by hand gestures, verbal fluency, a
friendly, relaxed manner, and evidence of concern for the client and
preparation for the interview.

Counselor responsibility

Three studies concerning behavioral cues to counselor expertness
(Atkinson, Maruyama, & Matsui, 1978; Schmidt & Strong, 1970; Slaney,
1977) deserve more detailed consideration. The cues to expertness
delineated by these studies involved related counselor behaviors perhaps
best described by the term "counselor responsibility" (Torresdal, 1977).
This term denotes the degree of responsibility for the sequential tasks
of counseling that is assumed by the counselor. Counselor responsibility
concerns the extent to which the counselor, relative to the client,
assumes responsibility for such counseling tasks as clarification of the
client's problem, generation of alternative ways of dealing with the
problem, formation of a specific plan of action, or implementation of
the plan.

Schmidt and Strong (1970) presented 37 male undergraduates with
5-minute videotaped segments of interviews between six male counselors
and the same male confederate client. After viewing each interview seg-
ment, subjects rated the counselors' expertness and listed counselor
behaviors or personal characteristics indicative of expertness or inexpertness. Subjects' responses suggested that counselors whom they rated as inexpert were perceived as awkward, tense, dominating, formal, uninterested, unprepared, vague, and abrupt. Counselors rated as expert were seen as being interested, relaxed, friendly, attentive, confident, prepared, fluent, logical, spontaneous, and responsive to the client. Most importantly, counselors who suggested possible solutions to the client's problem were viewed as more expert by Schmidt and Strong's subjects.

Atkinson, Maruyama, and Matsui (1978) explored the effects of counselor race and counseling approach on willingness to refer oneself to the counselor and on counselor credibility. Counselor credibility was assessed by items pertaining to the counselor's expertness, ability to help the client, knowledge of psychology, and comprehension of the client's problem. Two tape recordings of a counseling session were prepared in which the client responses were identical but the counselor responses differed, one depicting a logical, rational, directive counseling style and one a reflective, affective, nondirective style. Each tape recording was paired with two different introductions, one in which the counselor was identified as Asian American and one in which the counselor was described as Caucasian American. The effects of counselor race on perceived credibility differed for two separate groups of Asian American students. However, among both groups, the counselor was rated as more credible and approachable when employing the directive approach than when using the nondirective approach. This finding seems
related to Schmidt and Strong's (1970) evidence that a counselor's suggestion of possible solutions, a relatively active, directive approach, is used as a cue to counselor expertness.

Slaney (1977) examined differences in students' perceptions of two counseling approaches. One approach used the Carkhuff-defined facilitative conditions as a treatment, while the second approach used them as an intermediate step leading to the suggestion of a specific behavioral treatment, assertion training. Data were obtained from 100 male and 100 female college students who read one of two transcripts of a counseling session representing the two levels of counseling approach. Ratings of the counselor for the two conditions indicated that the behavioral treatment counselor was seen as more expert and appealing than the facilitative conditions counselor. No differences were found on counselor understanding. Estimates of the eventual effectiveness of counseling also favored the approach in which a specific treatment had been prescribed.

Counselor directiveness (Atkinson et al., 1978), suggestion of possible solutions (Schmidt & Strong, 1970), and prescription of a specific treatment (Slaney, 1977) all seem to involve relatively greater counselor than client responsibility for one or more of the tasks of counseling. The fact that these counselor behaviors enhanced perceived expertness suggested that counselor responsibility might be a cue to expertness in the eyes of clients/observers. The current study was an investigation of the impact of counselor responsibility on perceived counselor expertness.
Literature on individuals' expectations and preferences in regard to counseling provides clues to the level of counselor responsibility that may maximize perceptions of expertness. College students appear to expect and prefer that a counselor assume a moderate degree of responsibility for the tasks of counseling (Dreman, 1977; Dreman & Dolev, 1976; Nowicki & Duke, 1978; Tinsley & Harris, 1976; Torresdal, 1977). In a study by Tinsley and Harris (1976), undergraduates completed a questionnaire about their expectations of counseling which contained a subscale concerning counselor directiveness (e.g., expect the counselor to decide what we talk about, to frequently offer me advice). On the average, subjects indicated that these statements concerning expectations of counselor directiveness were somewhat to fairly true for them. Nowicki and Duke (1978) presented several measures, among them an expectancy questionnaire, to undergraduate clients prior to their first counseling session. Results indicated that 51% of the clients expected to receive counseling characterized by advice-giving, as opposed to behavior therapy (12%), group therapy (6%), or individual psychotherapy (31%).

College students seem not only to expect but also to prefer that the counselor assume a moderate degree of responsibility for the work of the counseling process. Dreman (1977) and Dreman and Dolev (1976) investigated the counseling expectations and preferences of 100 clients and 100 nonclients, respectively, within a college population. With regard to counselor responsibility, they found that clients and nonclients hold moderate expectations and preferences that the counselor explain and interpret the client's problems and relieve the client of immediate
responsibility for his/her actions and decisions, although ultimately trying to help the client to be independent. In general, both clients and nonclients preferred a more active counselor than they expected.

Torresdal (1977) directly examined preferences for allocation of responsibility for four sequential counseling stages or tasks: problem clarification, generation of alternative ways of dealing with the problem, formation of a plan of action, and implementation of the plan of action. Subjects preferred a relatively equal division of responsibility between themselves and the counselor during the first two of these stages. They wanted to assume the majority of responsibility themselves (65%) for forming a specific plan of action, and wished to take nearly total responsibility (90%) for carrying out the plan. The stage of the counseling process appeared to be an important influence on individuals' preferences concerning counselor responsibility.

The results of Dreman (1977), Dreman and Dolev (1976), and Torresdal (1977) suggested that a moderate rather than an extreme degree of counselor responsibility may be desired, with the client preferring to assume increasing responsibility as counseling progresses. If a moderate degree of counselor responsibility is most preferred by clients or subjects for the earlier stages of counseling, it seems reasonable to expect that early perceptions of counselor expertness might be maximized by moderate rather than either low or high counselor responsibility.

The investigations by Atkinson et al. (1978) and Slaney (1977) are the only studies to date in which counselor behaviors that are components of counselor responsibility have been manipulated and their effects on
perceived counselor expertness assessed. Both of these studies compared the effects of low versus relatively high levels of counselor behaviors related to counselor responsibility. The current investigation explored the effects of low, moderate, and high levels of counselor responsibility on perceived counselor expertness. Since the stage or task of the counseling process appears to affect individuals' attitudes toward counselor responsibility (Torresdal, 1977), this study involved a single stage, generation of alternative ways of dealing with the client's problem. Based on the findings of Atkinson et al. (1978) and Slaney (1977), it was predicted that a high level of counselor responsibility at the generation of alternatives stage would result in greater perceived counselor expertness than would a low level of counselor responsibility. As suggested by the work of Dreman (1977), Dreman and Dolev (1976), and Torresdal (1977), it was further predicted that perceived expertness would be greatest when the counselor assumed a moderate amount of responsibility for generating alternatives.

Perceived Counselor Effectiveness

A variable that may be related to perceived counselor expertness is perceived effectiveness. It will be recalled that expertness, as defined in Strong's interpersonal influence model (Strong, 1968; Strong & Matross, 1973), concerns the degree to which the counselor possesses knowledge and skills for client problem solving and change. Perceived counselor effectiveness, sometimes referred to as competence, has not
always been clearly defined or distinguished from expertness. Spiegel (1976) has provided perhaps the clearest distinction between expertness and effectiveness. She has adopted the social influence conception of expertness and has defined effectiveness as the degree to which the counselor's behavior is seen as being helpful to the client in setting and achieving goals. To Spiegel (1976), expertness seems to involve the counselor's resources, while effectiveness involves the use of these resources in interaction with the client in a way that fosters client problem solving or change.

In an analogue investigation, Spiegel (1976) obtained evidence that perceived counselor expertness and perceived effectiveness are related. She examined the effects of two levels of counselor similarity and expertness and two types of client problem (affiliative and academic) on perceptions of a counselor's effectiveness. The basis for client-counselor similarity was age and student status; the basis for expertness was experience and training. Subjects were 311 undergraduates who read one of eight biographical sketches of a counselor's background in which the independent variables were manipulated. All subjects then listened to the same 8-minute segment of a simulated initial counseling interview between a male client and a male counselor and indicated their perceptions of the counselor's effectiveness on a 16-item Likert scale. Neither similarity, presenting problem, nor any interactions significantly influenced perceived effectiveness. There was a significant main effect for expertness: high-expertness counselors were perceived as more effective than low-expertness counselors.
Scheid (1976) also found that the counselor's expertness, as suggested by level of experience and training, influenced perceived counselor competence or effectiveness. In Scheid's analogue study, 120 male and female subjects were assigned to one of three groups: (1) One group received an introduction to a videotaped counselor emphasizing the counselor's excellent training and years of experience; (2) A second group received an introduction indicating that the counselor had minimal training and experience; (3) A third group received no introduction. Subjects then viewed a 10-minute videotaped excerpt of a staged counseling interview between a male counselor and male client. Following videotape presentation, subjects completed six dependent measures, among them a bipolar adjective scale addressing counselor competence. The counselor was rated as more competent when he was introduced as having considerable training and experience than when he was presented as having minimal training and experience or was not introduced.

In contrast to Spiegel (1976) and Scheid (1976), Guttman and Haase (1972) failed to find a relationship between counselor expertness and effectiveness. The 31 male undergraduate subjects in this quasi-counseling analogue met with one of two male counselors for a brief vocational counseling session. Experimentally induced sets of high and low expertness were implemented by the introduction of the counselor and the physical characteristics of the interview room. In the high expertness condition, the counselor was introduced to the subject as "Dr. Dave Smith," member of the counseling service staff, and the session took place in a large office with diplomas, certificates of professional
achievement, numerous books and periodicals, and attractive furnishings. In the low expertness condition, the counselor was introduced as a graduate student in counseling, and the interview was conducted in a relatively small, barren office without symbols of prestige. Subsequent to the interview, subjects completed several dependent measures, including a scale concerning counselor effectiveness. Counselor expertness failed to exert an effect on perceived effectiveness.

The discrepancy between the results of Guttman and Haase (1972) and the results of Spiegel (1976) and Scheid (1976) may be due to differing methodologies. The latter two studies were both vicarious participation analogues, while the Guttman and Haase study involved actual interaction with the counselor. Schmidt and Strong (1970) suggested that the behavior of the counselor may be the most important determinant of perceived counselor expertness. Perhaps this is true for perceived effectiveness as well, particularly when one interacts with the counselor rather than merely observing him/her. In the Guttman and Haase study, the counselor's behavior in interaction with the client may have overridden the counselor's introduction and the physical setting in determining perceived effectiveness.

The present study examined the effects of counselor responsibility on perceived effectiveness as well as on perceived expertness. In keeping with Strong's interpersonal influence model, expertness was defined as the degree to which the counselor possesses knowledge and skills for client problem solving and change. As did Spiegel (1976), this study defined effectiveness as the degree to which the counselor's
behavior is helpful to the client. Expertness and effectiveness were thus clearly defined and distinguished from each other. Based on evidence provided by Scheid (1976) and Spiegel (1976) indicating a relationship between perceived expertness and effectiveness, and on Slaney's (1977) demonstration that counselor behaviors related to counselor responsibility may enhance both perceived expertness and effectiveness, it was predicted that counselor responsibility would influence perceptions of counselor expertness and effectiveness in the same fashion. Specifically, it was predicted that a moderate level of counselor responsibility for generating alternatives would maximize perceived counselor effectiveness, with high and finally low levels of counselor responsibility resulting in progressively less perceived effectiveness.

The Influence of Counselor Sex on Perceived Expertness and Effectiveness

Behavioral cues to perceived counselor expertness and effectiveness ought not to be assessed without concurrent consideration of counselor sex. Unless transcripts of counselor-client interaction are used as stimulus materials, counselor sex will be apparent to clients or subjects and may either exert a direct effect or may interact with other counselor characteristics or behaviors to influence perceived expertness and effectiveness. Rumenik, Capasso, and Hendrick (1977) reviewed experimenter sex effects in such behavioral research areas as task performance, clinical and psychological testing, social and person perception, and role relationships (client-counselor, teacher-student). They concluded
that, although the evidence was mixed, there were indications that sex of experimenter may be a potent variable. Rumenik et al. recommended that most psychological research routinely incorporate sex of experimenter as well as sex of subject as variables. The findings and conclusions of Rumenik et al. (1977) have implications for counseling research in which clients or subjects are asked to indicate their perceptions of the counselor. Whether the individual influencing another person's perceptions or behavior is an experimenter or a counselor, sex may be an important variable.

The results of social psychological studies concerning evaluation of the competence of male and female stimulus persons also suggest that the effects of counselor sex ought to be evaluated in studies of perceived counselor expertness or effectiveness. In these studies, subjects generally have rated the competence of male or female individuals who performed at equivalent levels on the same task, or to whom the same work (paintings, articles) was attributed. As summarized by Deaux (1976), these studies of the perceived competence of male and female stimulus persons have demonstrated that when the quality of the stimulus person's performance is not well-established, male individuals are seen as more competent than female individuals (Deaux & Taynor, 1973; Goldberg, 1968; Pheterson, Keisler, & Goldberg, 1971). In contrast, when clearcut information regarding the quality of performance is given, male and female individuals are perceived as equally competent (Deaux & Emswiller, 1974; Pheterson, Keisler, & Goldberg, 1971; Pheterson, Note 1).
Clients or subjects in counseling analogue studies who are asked to evaluate the expertness or effectiveness of the counselor may find that they have minimal or no well-established external criteria upon which to base their evaluations. Particularly when clients/subjects are forced to rely primarily upon the counselor's behavior as a cue to counselor expertness or effectiveness, counselor sex may play a role in the evaluation process. The social psychological competency studies suggest that in this situation, a male counselor might well be rated as more expert and effective than a female counselor, even though their behaviors in the counseling interaction were identical.

Surprisingly, only three studies concerning cues to counselor expertness have explored the effects of counselor sex (Bloom et al., 1977; Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Heppner & Pew, 1977). Heppner and Pew (1977) found no differences in the perceived expertness of a male and a female counselor, even though subjects had relatively little clearcut information about the counselor's competence. However their study is flawed by the fact that they used only one male and one female counselor. This opens the possibility that the absence of counselor sex effects was due simply to the two particular individuals involved. Bloom et al. (1977) found that counselor sex interacted with office decor to influence perceptions of counselor credibility. Subjects perceived a female counselor as significantly more credible when she occupied a traditional-professional office than a humanistic office, while the reverse was true for male counselors.
The results of Dell and Schmidt (1976) indicated that sex of counselor did not influence ratings of counselor expertness. The nature of Dell and Schmidt's experimental design may be responsible for this finding. In their study, subjects' evaluations of the counselor were based solely on the videotaped performances of the counselors. This would seem to be a situation in which clearcut information regarding the quality of the counselor's performance was lacking—a situation in which one would expect male counselors to be rated as more expert than female counselors, according to the social psychological literature discussed previously. Each subject in Dell and Schmidt's study rated one male and one female counselor at the same level of experience. The experimenter told subjects that they were not being asked to compare the counselors, but only to report their impressions of each counselor individually. However the experimental situation may have suggested to subjects that the experimenter was really interested in their relative evaluations of the male and female counselors. Given the current zeitgeist concerning equality of men and women, Dell and Schmidt's subjects may have viewed the socially desirable response as rating the male and female counselors equally competent. Social desirability would be expected to play a relatively stronger role in responses to obvious as compared to subtle measures of competence. On an obvious dependent measure, an 8-point interval scale of counselor expertness, subjects did rate male and female counselors as equally expert. But on a more subtle measure, a semantic differential scale of the potency of the counselor, male counselors were rated as more potent than female counselors. Had subjects
rated either a male or a female counselor, rather than both, perhaps this effect would have emerged on the expertness measure as well.

Only three studies concerning cues to counselor expertness have assessed the role of counselor sex (Bloom et al., 1977; Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Heppner & Pew, 1977). Two of these studies (Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Heppner & Pew, 1977) appear to have experimental artefacts that suggest caution in interpreting their results. Thus, there is very little reliable evidence concerning the effects of counselor sex on perceived counselor expertness. The influence of counselor sex on perceived effectiveness also appears to be relatively unexplored. None of the four studies concerning perceived effectiveness cited earlier (Guttman & Haase, 1972; Scheid, 1976; Spiegel, 1976; Slaney, 1977) varied counselor sex.

The present study evaluated the influence of counselor sex on both perceived expertness and effectiveness in a situation in which little concrete information regarding the quality of the counselor's performance or general competence was given. Based on the results of social psychological studies involving evaluation of the competence of male and female individuals when the quality of their performance is not well-established (Deaux & Taynor, 1973; Goldberg, 1968; Pheterson et al., 1971), it was predicted that male counselors would be perceived as more expert and effective than female counselors.
As Rumenik et al. (1977) suggested, the current study explored the effects of subject sex as well as counselor sex on perceived counselor expertness and effectiveness. The few studies concerning cues to counselor expertness and effectiveness that have assessed the effects of subject/client sex have yielded mixed results. Some studies have found that male and female subjects do not differ in their perceptions of counselor expertness (Atkinson & Carskaddon, 1975) or effectiveness (Slaney, 1977; Spiegel, 1976). In contrast, Bloom et al., (1977) discovered that female subjects rated counselors as more credible than did male subjects. Slaney's (1977) results indicated that female subjects perceived counselors as more expert than did male subjects, while Dell and Schmidt (1976) noted a tendency in the same direction, although it was not statistically significant. Social psychological studies assessing the effects of subject sex on perceived competency of a stimulus person also have yielded mixed results. Deaux and Emmswiller (1974) and Deaux and Taynor (1973) found no significant differences between the perceptions of male and female subjects, while Silverman, Shulman, and Wiesenthal (1972) noted that female subjects judged experimenters to be more competent than did male subjects.

Although a firm conclusion cannot be drawn from the results of the studies just presented, the weight of the evidence seems to favor the similarity of male and female subjects' evaluations of the competence of a stimulus person. When evaluation differences have occurred, female
subjects have rated stimulus persons as more competent than have male subjects. In regard to the present study, it was tentatively expected that male and female subjects would not differ significantly in their perceptions of counselor expertness and effectiveness. If differences should arise, it was expected that female subjects would view counselors as more expert and effective than would male subjects.

Only two studies concerning cues to counselor expertness or effectiveness (Bloom et al., 1977; Dell & Schmidt, 1976) have concurrently varied both counselor and subject sex and have addressed whether these two variables interact to influence perceived expertness/effectiveness. Both Bloom et al. (1977) and Dell and Schmidt (1976) failed to find an interaction between counselor and subject sex, although Dell and Schmidt's results must be treated with caution due to the possible artefact in their study mentioned previously. Within the social psychology literature, Deaux and Emswiller (1974) and Deaux and Taynor (1973) found no evidence of an interaction between stimulus person sex and subject sex in evaluations of stimulus person competency. Based on these findings, an interaction between counselor sex and subject sex in ratings of counselor expertness or effectiveness was not expected in the present study.

Overview of the Present Study

This study was a vicarious participation analogue (Helms, 1976) directed at determining the effects of counselor responsibility, counselor sex, and subject sex on perceived counselor expertness and
effectiveness. Subjects listened to a brief audiotape of a counseling interaction between a male client and either a male or female counselor exhibiting one of three levels of counselor responsibility. The interaction occurred at the generation of alternatives stage of the counseling process. Written information concerning the counselor, the client, and their past interaction presented prior to the tape gave no clear indication of the counselor's degree of expertise or effectiveness. Counselor responsibility was operationalized by having the counselor either: (a) prompt the client to generate alternative courses of action concerning his problem situation (low counselor responsibility); (b) work collaboratively with the client to generate alternatives (moderate counselor responsibility); or (c) tell the client what he ought to do to solve his problem (high counselor responsibility). Following presentation of the audiotaped interaction, subjects completed several measures of perceived counselor expertise and effectiveness and indicated their willingness to talk with the audiotaped counselor were they seeking therapeutic assistance.

It was predicted that a moderate level of counselor responsibility for generating alternatives would maximize perceived expertise and effectiveness, with high and finally low levels of counselor responsibility resulting in progressively less perceived expertise and effectiveness. Additional predictions were that male counselors would be perceived as more expert and effective than female counselors and that perceived expertise and effectiveness would be positively related. It was not anticipated that male and female subjects would differ in their
perceptions of counselor expertness and effectiveness or that counselor sex and subject sex would interact to influence perceived expertness and effectiveness.
METHOD

Design

A completely randomized $2 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2$ partial hierarchical design was employed in this study. The four fixed effect factors were counselor sex, individual counselor (four levels), counselor responsibility (three levels), and subject sex. Individual counselor was nested in counselor sex; all other factors were crossed. The dependent variables were perceived counselor expertness and effectiveness and, secondarily, willingness to talk with the audiotaped counselor.

Subjects

Subjects were 102 female and 102 male undergraduate volunteers, primarily freshmen and sophomores, who received course credit in their psychology classes at Iowa State University for their participation in the study. Subjects ranged in age from 17 to 28; mean age of the subjects was 19.4. Male and female subjects were randomly assigned to 1 of 24 experimental conditions based on counselor sex, individual counselor, and counselor responsibility. In each of the 24 experimental conditions, roughly half of the subjects were male individuals and half were female individuals.

Procedure

The study was described to prospective volunteers as one in which they would listen to a tape-recorded segment of a counselor-client interaction, read some information about the counselor and client involved, and indicate their perceptions of the counselor. Volunteers met in
groups of 6-10 with a male experimenter who began by reiterating the nature of study participation. Subjects then read information about the counselor, the client, and what had occurred in their counseling sessions prior to the tape-recorded segment. They were asked to imagine themselves experiencing the situation and concerns of the client as they listened to the tape. Following this, subjects heard a nine-minute audiotape of a counseling interaction between a male client and either a male or female counselor exhibiting one of three levels of counselor responsibility. At the conclusion of the audiotape, subjects completed a questionnaire consisting of the dependent and manipulation check measures. Subjects were then debriefed, cautioned not to inform prospective volunteers about the nature of the study, and excused.

Stimulus Materials

Written information

The written information presented to subjects indicated that the counseling segment they would be hearing was a dramatization of a counseling interaction that had taken place at a university student counseling service. Subjects were told that to protect the anonymity of the client, they were being presented with the dramatization rather than a recording of the actual interaction.

Information concerning the counselor in the counseling interaction was based on a survey of Iowa State University Student Counseling Service staff members concerning what their clients typically knew about their professional training, experience, and accomplishments by the end of the
first counseling session. The counselor was presented to subjects as either John or Joan Evans, a counselor on the staff of a university student counseling service. No clear indication was given of the expertness and effectiveness of the counselor.

The client was presented as a male, 18-year-old, college freshman. To avoid adding to the complexity of the study, client sex was held constant. It was believed that male and female subjects would be more similar in the extent to which they could identify with the client if presented with a male client rather than a female client. Studies concerning sex effects in empathy indicate that male and female counselors and undergraduates are equally sensitive to the feelings of others (Breisinger, 1976; Petro & Hansen, 1977; Schwab, 1974), and are significantly more accurate in their discriminations of the feelings of male individuals than female individuals (Petro & Hansen, 1977; Schwab, 1974). The client was described as having sought counseling because of concerns about his living situation. The written information further indicated to subjects that the counseling segment they were about to hear occurred early in the client's second session with the counselor and that their interaction up to that point had involved exploring and clarifying the client's living situation and his concerns about it. Subjects were asked to try to imagine as they listened to the tape that they were experiencing the client's situation and concerns and were talking with the counselor. The written information presented to subjects may be found in Appendix A.
Audiotape

Following perusal of the written information, subjects listened to a nine-minute audiotape of an interaction between the male client and either a male or female counselor. Two male and two female counseling psychology graduate students served as counselors in the study. Each of these individuals made three counseling interaction tapes, one at each of three levels of counselor responsibility; 12 audiotapes were used in the study. A male psychology graduate student portrayed the client in all tapes. Three counseling interaction scripts served as the basis for the audiotapes. These three scripts were constructed to represent low, moderate, and high levels of counselor responsibility and are presented in Appendix B. In all three scripts, the interaction centers on generating alternative ways that the client can deal with his problem. In the high counselor responsibility script, the counselor largely tells the client what to do to solve his problem, allowing the client little opportunity to add his own input to the process of generating alternatives. The client and counselor work together to come up with alternatives in the moderate counselor responsibility script. In the low counselor responsibility script, the counselor provides no alternatives him/herself, but prompts the client to generate all the alternatives.

Pilot work on the stimulus materials

Three pilot studies and several revisions of the stimulus materials were carried out prior to undertaking the main study. In the third and final pilot study, 59 undergraduate volunteers, including 31 male and 28
female individuals, read the previously described written information concerning the counselor and client and heard one of the 12 counseling interaction tapes. Questionnaire responses by the subjects revealed that they were able to accurately summarize the problem that had led the client to seek counseling and could fairly easily imagine themselves experiencing the client's situation and concerns and interacting with the counselor. Male and female subjects did not differ significantly in their ability to identify with the client.

Along with questions concerning the nature of the client's problem and ease of identification with the client, Pilot III subjects responded to four manipulation check measures designed to determine if the counselors were indeed perceived differently at each of the three levels of counselor responsibility. These measures, presented in Appendix C, addressed the counselor's role in generating and elaborating alternatives, the amount of responsibility the counselor took in the interaction, and the degree to which the counselor tried to influence the client. Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations on these four manipulation check variables for each of the three levels of counselor responsibility. Directional t tests revealed that the means for the three counselor responsibility levels differed significantly in all instances but one. The means for the low and moderate counselor responsibility levels were not significantly different on the influence variable. Results of Pilot III indicated that the counselors were perceived as operating in different ways at each of the three levels of counselor responsibility.
Table 1. Means and standard deviations for counselor responsibility levels on manipulation check measures—Pilot III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor responsibility level</th>
<th>Generation of alternatives M</th>
<th>Elaboration of alternatives M</th>
<th>Responsibility M</th>
<th>Influence M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; .86</td>
<td>2.85&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1.46</td>
<td>3.05&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1.57</td>
<td>3.00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3.50&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1.19</td>
<td>5.75&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1.92</td>
<td>4.60&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1.60</td>
<td>3.60&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.00&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; .94</td>
<td>8.37&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1.92</td>
<td>8.21&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1.75</td>
<td>5.63&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Higher scores represent greater counselor activity. Generation of alternatives involved a 7-point scale, elaboration of alternatives and responsibility, 11-point scales, and influence a 10-point scale.

<sup>a,b,c</sup>Different superscripts denote that the means differ significantly as evaluated by directional _t_ tests, _p_ < .05. For low versus moderate counselor responsibility, _df_ = 38; for low versus high counselor responsibility and for moderate versus high counselor responsibility, _df_ = 37.
Dependent measures: Perceived counselor expertness

Two measures of perceived counselor expertness were included in the questionnaire that subjects completed subsequent to hearing the counseling interaction audiotape. The single-item expertness measure asked subjects to rate the counselor's expertness on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all expert) to 9 (extremely expert). Expertness was defined for subjects as "the degree to which the counselor possesses special knowledge and skills for helping people deal with problems in their lives." The single-item expertness measure may be found in Appendix D.

The second measure of perceived counselor expertness was the expertness scale of the Counselor Rating Form (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; LaCrosse & Barak, 1976). The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) consists of 36 pairs of 7-point bipolar adjectives aimed at measuring perceived counselor expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness, each of which is assessed by 12 adjective pairs. Two separate factor analyses have supported the existence of these three dimensions (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; LaCrosse, Note 2). The CRF has been used in a number of published studies (Barak & Dell, 1977; Barak & LaCrosse, 1977; Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977; Heppner & Dixon, 1978; Kerr & Dell, 1976), as well as in several other pieces of unpublished research (LaCrosse, Note 2). Since items relating to expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness are intermixed, the entire CRF was presented to subjects in this study to preserve the form of the measure. Only data from the expertness scale were
directly pertinent to the current investigation. The total expertness score, which may range from 12-84, is derived by adding the ratings on the 12 items, keeping in mind the directionality of each adjective pair. Split-half reliability for the expertness scale has been reported as .87 (LaCrosse, & Barak, 1976). A copy of the expertness scale may be found in Appendix E.

**Dependent measures: Perceived counselor effectiveness**

Subjects completed two measures of perceived counselor effectiveness. In a single-item measure (Appendix F), subjects were asked to rate how helpful they would have found the counselor's behavior to be to them, had they been the client in the counseling interaction they heard. Subjects rated the counselor's effectiveness on a 9-point scale ranging from "not at all effective" to "extremely effective."

The second measure of perceived counselor effectiveness employed in this study was a 16-item Likert scale developed by Spiegel (1976) on the basis of Goldstein's (1971) modification of the Client's Personal Reaction Questionnaire (Ashby, Ford, Guerney, & Guerney, 1957). The format consists of statements about the counselor's effectiveness to which subjects respond on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The total scale score is derived by adding the ratings on each of the items; scores for items that are indicative of negative attitudes are reversed. The potential range of scores is 16-112, with higher scores indicating greater perceived effectiveness. The scale has been found to have a test-retest reliability of .86 and a split-half
reliability of .93 (Spiegal, 1976). The Spiegal scale may be found in Appendix G.

**Dependent measures: Willingness to talk with the counselor**

As previously noted, the essential dependent variables in the study were perceived counselor expertness and effectiveness. Additionally, it seemed advisable to obtain a measure of subjects' overall evaluation of the audiotaped counselor. To this end, subjects were asked how much they would want to talk with the audiotaped counselor if they had a problem they wished to discuss with a counselor. Subjects indicated their response on a scale ranging from 1 (would definitely not want to) to 9 (would definitely want to). A copy of this dependent measure may be found in Appendix H.

**Voice quality measure**

It was believed that voice quality was the only variable on which the individual audiotaped counselors might differ, other than sex. If a main effect for individual counselor were to be observed, it was believed that it would be due to voice quality. A measure of this variable developed by Laing and Zytowski and described in Laing (1977) was included in the questionnaire completed by subjects. This Voice Quality Checklist (Appendix I) consisted of 14 antonym pairs presented in a semantic differential format.

**Manipulation check measures**

Pilot III subjects responded to four manipulation check measures designed to determine if the counselors were indeed perceived differently
at each of the three levels of counselor responsibility. These measures, presented in Appendix C, were also completed by subjects in the main study.

Form

The single-item expertness and effectiveness measures were believed to be the most direct and obvious in content of the central dependent measures. To control for order effects involving these two measures, two forms of the questionnaire were constructed, with single-item expertness and effectiveness occupying alternate positions. A listing of the order of the dependent measures in these two forms is given in Appendix J. Approximately half of the subjects in each experimental condition received Form A, while half received Form B. Across the entire sample, 104 subjects received Form A, 100 Form B.
RESULTS

Reliability of Multi-item Scales

The reliability of the expertness scale of the Counselor Rating Form was estimated by the computation of coefficient alpha across all 204 subjects who completed the measure. An alpha coefficient of .94 was obtained. This was slightly higher than the .87 split-half estimate of the reliability of the expertness scale reported by LaCrosse and Barak (1976). Coefficient alpha was also computed across all 204 subjects for the Spiegel effectiveness measure. The obtained coefficient, .92, was comparable to the .93 split-half reliability estimate yielded by Spiegel's (1976) work.

Manipulation Check Results

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of the three counselor responsibility levels on the four manipulation check measures. Prior to carrying out comparisons of these means, the homogeneity of the error variances of the 24 cells of the design was assessed by computing the \( F_{\text{max}} \) statistic (Kirk, 1968) for the four manipulation check measures. It should be noted that \( F_{\text{max}} \) has limitations, in that it is sensitive to departures from normality as well as to heterogeneity of variances. \( F_{\text{max}} \) was significant, suggesting possible heterogeneity of variance, for all of the manipulation check measures except the influence measure. To adjust for any resulting bias in tests of significance involving the generation of alternatives, elaboration of alternatives, or responsibility measures, the Behrens–Fisher modification of the \( t \) test (Winer, 1971), using Welch's formula for error degrees of freedom, was used for these
Table 2. Means and standard deviations for counselor responsibility levels on manipulation check measures-main study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor responsibility level</th>
<th>Generation of alternatives</th>
<th>Elaboration of alternatives</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.75 (.75)</td>
<td>2.32 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.68 (1.42)</td>
<td>3.24 (2.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3.52 (1.45)</td>
<td>5.16 (2.33)</td>
<td>4.61 (2.22)</td>
<td>3.82 (2.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.68 (1.13)</td>
<td>8.63 (1.71)</td>
<td>7.32 (2.58)</td>
<td>6.68 (2.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Higher scores represent greater counselor activity. Generation of alternatives involved a 7-point scale, elaboration of alternatives and responsibility, 11-point scales, and influence a 10-point scale.
measures. A standard \( t \) test was used for comparisons among counselor responsibility means on the influence variable, where the homogeneity of variance assumption had been met. The results of these directional \( t \) tests are presented in Table 3. As in Pilot III, all comparisons were significant except that involving the low and moderate counselor responsibility means on the influence variable. With only this exception, the counselors were perceived as behaving differently at each of the three levels of counselor responsibility.

Analyses of Variance on Dependent Measures

It will be recalled that a \( 2 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \) partial hierarchical design was employed in which the four fixed-effect factors were counselor sex, individual counselor (four levels), counselor responsibility (three levels), and subject sex. Individual counselor was nested in counselor sex; all other factors were crossed. Analyses of variance based on this model were conducted on each of the dependent variables. Since the ns of the 24 cells of the design were unequal, ranging from 6-12, the analyses of variance were carried out by means of a regression run for each of the dependent variables, with the same model statement (Table 4) being used in each case.

**Single-item expertness measure**

On this dependent measure, analysis yielded a sequential \( F (2, 172) = 3.64, p < .05 \) and partial \( F (2, 172) = 2.90, p < .06 \) for the counselor responsibility main effect. Since counselor responsibility was
Table 3. Comparisons among counselor responsibility level means on the manipulation check measures—main study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Generation of alternatives</th>
<th>Elaboration of alternatives</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>error df</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>error df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low CR-moderate CR</td>
<td>-8.85*</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-9.16*</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate CR-high CR</td>
<td>-9.39*</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-9.91*</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low CR-high CR</td>
<td>-23.12*</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-25.24*</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CR = Counselor Responsibility; all *t* tests were directional.

* *p < .0005.
Table 4. Order of entry of independent variables into model statement for ANOVA via multiple regression run

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor responsibility by counselor sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor responsibility by subject sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor responsibility by individual counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor sex by subject sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject sex by individual counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor responsibility by counselor sex by subject sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor responsibility by subject sex by individual counselor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

considered the independent variable of greatest interest and since predictions had been advanced concerning its impact, the counselor responsibility main effect was treated as significant based on the sequential $F$ ratio. Contrary to prediction, the counselor sex main effect did not achieve significance.

The potential range of scores on the single-item expertness scale was 1-9, 9 being "extremely expert." Single-item expertness means for the low, moderate, and high counselor responsibility levels were, respectively, 4.78, 5.66, and 4.95. Computation of the $F_{\text{max}}$ statistic for the single-item expertness measure indicated that the homogeneity of variance assumption had been met. Planned comparisons among the counselor responsibility means were carried out by a standard directional
test procedure. As predicted, the moderate counselor responsibility mean was significantly greater than both the high counselor responsibility mean, \( t (130) = 2.22, p < .025 \), and the low counselor responsibility mean, \( t (137) = 2.67, p < .005 \). Contrary to prediction, the high and low counselor responsibility means did not differ significantly.

**Expertness scale—counselor rating form**

On the CRF expertness measure, the counselor responsibility main effect again achieved significance, sequential \( F (2, 172) = 5.77, p < .001 \), partial \( F (2, 172) = 5.24, p < .01 \). Again contrary to prediction was the lack of a significant counselor sex main effect. The \( F_{max} \) statistic for the CRF expertness measure was significant, indicating heterogeneity of cell error variance and necessitating use of the Behrens-Fisher \( t \) test modification, with Welch's formula for error degrees of freedom, for planned comparisons. Scores on the CRF expertness scale may range from 12-84, with higher scores representing greater perceived expertness. Means for low, moderate, and high counselor responsibility were, respectively, 56.49, 64.40, and 61.22. As predicted, the moderate counselor responsibility mean was significantly greater than the low counselor responsibility mean, \( t (141) = 3.40, p < .001 \). However, the difference between the moderate and high counselor responsibility means failed to reach significance. Also as predicted, the high counselor responsibility mean was significantly greater than the low counselor responsibility mean, \( t (136) = 1.91, p < .05 \).
**Spiegel effectiveness measure**

The counselor responsibility main effect again was significant on the Spiegel effectiveness measure, with sequential $F (2, 172) = 4.33$, $p < .05$, partial $F (2, 172) = 4.13$, $p < .05$. As on the other dependent measures, the counselor sex main effect was not significant, in contrast to what had been predicted. The possible range of scores on the Spiegel effectiveness measure was 16-112, with higher scores denoting greater perceived effectiveness. The low, moderate, and high counselor responsibility means were 67.92, 77.64, and 73.22. The $F_{\max}$ statistic suggested use of the Behrens-Fisher $t$ test modification, with Welch's error degrees of freedom formula, to make planned comparisons of the counselor responsibility means. The pattern of significant mean differences that emerged was the same as that for the CRF expertness measure. Directional $t$ tests indicated that the moderate and low counselor responsibility means differed significantly, $t (137) = 2.93$, $p < .005$. The high counselor responsibility mean was significantly greater than the low counselor responsibility mean, $t (136) = 1.64$, $p < .05$, but did not differ significantly from the moderate counselor responsibility mean.

**Single-item effectiveness measure**

On this measure, the counselor responsibility main effect reached significance as predicted, sequential $F (2, 172) = 8.21$, $p < .001$, partial $F (2, 172) = 8.02$, $p < .001$. Although the counselor sex main effect was again not significant, the counselor responsibility by counselor sex interaction was significant, partial $F (2, 172) = 3.11$, $p < .05$. 

p < .05, sequential $F (2, 172) = 4.13, p < .05$. Due to this significant interaction, no further assessment of the nature of the counselor responsibility main effect was undertaken. Rather, comparisons among the six counselor responsibility by counselor sex means were evaluated by means of an $a$ posteriori multiple comparison procedure, Tukey's wholly significant difference (WSD) test (Miller, 1966; Ryan, 1959). The $F_{\text{max}}$ statistic computed for the single-item effectiveness measure indicated that the cell error variances were heterogeneous. A modified form of Tukey's WSD (Games & Howell, 1976; Howell & Games, 1974; Keselman & Rogan, 1977) which adequately controls the rate of Type I error in the presence of heterogeneous variances was used. A .05 alpha level of significance was adopted for the set of all possible pairwise comparisons among the six counselor responsibility by counselor sex means. Of the pairwise comparisons possible, nine comparisons, those across the rows and columns of the $3 \times 2$, counselor responsibility by counselor sex, matrix were evaluated. The six cell means and the results of the nine pairwise comparisons are presented in Table 4. Two of these comparisons reached significance. For female counselors, the moderate counselor responsibility mean was significantly greater than the low counselor responsibility mean, with $|t| = 4.78$, exceeding the critical value of $q (.05; 6, 56)/\sqrt{2} = 2.97$. Additionally, the high counselor responsibility mean was significantly greater than the low counselor responsibility mean for females counselors, with $|t| = 3.10$ exceeding the critical value of $q (.05; 6, 62)/\sqrt{2} = 2.94$. The moderate and high counselor responsibility means did not differ significantly. Thus the
pattern of significant counselor responsibility mean differences that emerged overall on the CRF expertness and Spiegel effectiveness measures was present for female counselors on the single-item effectiveness measure. There were no significant differences among counselor responsibility means for male counselors on this measure.

**Willingness to talk with the counselor**

On this measure, the counselor responsibility by counselor sex interaction obtained a sequential $F (2, 172) = 3.21, p < .05$ and a partial $F (2, 172) = 2.75, p < .07$. This dependent variable was one for which no predictions had been advanced and which was of secondary interest in the study. Additionally, no predictions had been made concerning a counselor responsibility by counselor sex interaction for any of the dependent variables. For these reasons, the more conservative partial $F$ was used as the basis for a decision to treat the counselor responsibility by counselor sex interaction as nonsignificant. No further analysis of this interaction was undertaken.

**Intercorrelations Among the Dependent Measures**

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for each possible pair of the five dependent measures and are presented in Table 5. The $n$ for each correlation coefficient was 196, rather than 204 (the total sample size), since 8 subjects failed to fully complete one or more of the dependent measures and were excluded from all intercorrelation computations. As predicted, perceived counselor expertness and effectiveness were significantly and positively related. Additionally, willingness
to talk with the counselor was moderately related to perceived expertise and effectiveness.

Table 5. Counselor responsibility by counselor sex means and standard deviations on the single-item effectiveness measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of counselor</th>
<th>Counselor responsibility level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low M SD</td>
<td>Moderate M SD</td>
<td>High M SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female counselors</td>
<td>3.17(^{a}) 1.76</td>
<td>5.61(^{b}) 2.29</td>
<td>4.69(^{b}) 2.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male counselors</td>
<td>4.46 2.39</td>
<td>5.06 2.04</td>
<td>4.88 2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a,b}\)Different superscripts denote that the means differ significantly as evaluated by modified Tukey's WSD, with the alpha level for the set of all possible pairwise comparisons among means set at .05.
Table 6. Intercorrelations among the dependent measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRF expertness</th>
<th>Single-item effectiveness</th>
<th>Spiegel effectiveness</th>
<th>Willingness to talk with the counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-item expertness</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF expertness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-item effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiegel effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.
DISCUSSION

The primary conclusion to be drawn from this study is that counselor responsibility does influence perceived expertness and effectiveness. In general, counselors who assumed a moderate amount of responsibility for generating alternatives were seen as most expert and effective, followed by those who operated at high and finally low levels of responsibility. The precise nature of the influence of counselor responsibility varied somewhat across the four central dependent measures. Although, contrary to prediction, male and female counselors were generally viewed as equally expert and effective, the sex of the counselor did interact with counselor responsibility to determine effectiveness in one instance. As anticipated, male and female subjects did not differ in their evaluations of counselors, nor was there a significant counselor sex by subject sex interaction on any of the dependent variables.

Since there were strong positive relationships among the dependent measures, the presence of the same general pattern of results across these measures was not surprising. An understanding of the slight variations in the impact of counselor responsibility across the four key dependent measures might be facilitated by first looking more closely at the nature of these measures and their interrelationships.

Although the correlations between the dependent measures did not vary widely, some differences did appear. The two most highly correlated measures were the CRF expertness scale and the Spiegel effectiveness measure. Both of these were highly reliable, multi-item measures and seem to be the most general, broad-based measures in the study. Both included a mixture
of items pertaining to the counselor's interview behavior, knowledge, and skills. Additionally, the Spiegel effectiveness measure included items concerning the counselor's personal characteristics and willingness to refer oneself or others to the counselor. According to Spiegel (Note 3), factor analysis suggests the presence of two factors: Warmth-Effectiveness and Non-Interference.

The CRF expertness and Spiegel effectiveness measures seem to address concepts of expertness and effectiveness somewhat broader in scope than the explicitly defined concepts of expertness and effectiveness articulated in this study. These explicitly defined concepts are directly addressed by the single-item expertness and effectiveness measures. The correlation between these two measures perhaps best represents the theoretical relationship between perceived expertness and effectiveness, as defined in this study. This moderate correlation (.69) is the lowest among the expertness and effectiveness measures. This may be due in part to attenuation caused by the level of reliability of these single-item measures. However, it may also reflect the fact that expertness and effectiveness are related, yet distinct, dimensions of the way counselors are perceived.

Willingness to talk with the counselor was moderately related to expertness, a finding consistent with the results of other research demonstrating a relationship between perceived counselor expertness and self-referral (Atkinson & Carskaddon, 1975; Barak & Dell, 1977). Willingness to talk with the counselor was also moderately related to perceived counselor effectiveness. Of the two effectiveness measures, the self-
referral measure may bear the most similarity to the single-item effectiveness measure, on which subjects were asked to indicate how helpful the counselor's behavior would have been to them, had they been in the client's position. Willingness to talk with the counselor and single-item effectiveness seem the most personally relevant of the dependent measures.

Keeping in mind these characteristics of the dependent measures and their interrelationships, attention might next shift to the precise nature of the influence of counselor responsibility on each of the dependent measures.

On the single-item expertness measure, counselors were perceived as most expert when they assumed moderate responsibility for generating alternatives. They were rated as significantly less expert when operating at high or low levels of responsibility. Based on the work of Atkinson et al. (1978) and Slaney (1977), it had been predicted that high counselor responsibility would yield a significantly higher expertness rating than would low counselor responsibility. This did not occur; high and low counselor responsibility were seen as equally expert. Of the four key dependent measures in this study, the single-item expertness measure seems most similar to the dependent measures in the Atkinson et al. and Slaney studies. The discrepant results between these studies and the current study do not appear to be accounted for by differences in the dependent measures. Rather, differences in the experimental conditions may be responsible for the discrepancy. The high counselor
responsibility level in the present study was probably comparable to the behavioral treatment condition in the Slaney study and the logical, rational, directive condition in the Atkinson et al. study. However, the low counselor responsibility level may well not have been comparable to the Atkinson et al. reflective, affective, nondirective condition or the Slaney facilitative response condition. In contrast to these styles of counselor behavior, the low counselor responsibility level remains a somewhat active, problem-solving approach and seems to involve greater responsibility on the part of the counselor. Thus the low and high counselor responsibility conditions may have been less different from each other than were the two treatment conditions in the Atkinson et al. and Slaney studies. This may account for the lack of a significant difference between the low and high counselor responsibility levels on the single-item expertness measure.

The nature of the counselor responsibility effect was slightly different on the more general, broad-based CRF expertness and Spiegel effectiveness measures than it was on the single-item expertness measure. Although the counselor responsibility means again fell in the predicted direction, the pattern of significant differences between means was somewhat different than had been the case on the single-item expertness measure. On the CRF expertness and Spiegel effectiveness measures, moderate and high counselor responsibility received significantly higher ratings than did low counselor responsibility, but did not differ significantly from each other. It appears that when subjects were asked to integrate their perceptions of the counselor along several dimensions,
they viewed moderate and high counselor responsibility as equally posi­
tive, with low counselor responsibility seen as clearly less desirable. This finding probably does not address the question of how counselor responsibility influences perceived expertness and effectiveness, as these concepts were defined and distinguished from each other in this study. However the CRF expertness and Spiegel effectiveness results may more closely approximate the overall judgments of actual clients, who may integrate their perceptions of counselors along a variety of dimensions.

The third and final pattern of results involving counselor responsi­bility was found on single-item effectiveness and willingness to talk with counselor, previously described as the most personally relevant of the dependent measures. A significant counselor responsibility by coun­selor sex interaction emerged on single-item effectiveness, with this effect nearing significance on the self-referral measure. The predicted counselor sex main effect failed to appear on any of the dependent measures, as will be discussed. However, on the two measures most personally relevant for subjects, counselor sex did play a role. Further investigation of the counselor responsibility by counselor sex interaction on the effectiveness measure revealed different evaluation patterns for male and female counselors. Male counselors were considered equally and moderately effective no matter what level of counselor responsibility they assumed. However female counselors were perceived as significantly more effective when assuming moderate or high responsibility than low responsibility.
The effectiveness of female counselors may have been enhanced when they assumed moderate or high responsibility because they were seen as acting in ways considered typical for men but unexpected for women. Men have traditionally been expected to be assertive, active, skilled in leadership, and dominant, while women have been viewed as submissive, nurturant, empathic, and caring (Forisha, 1978; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). In the moderate and high counselor responsibility conditions, the counselor's behavior may have been seen as basically masculine. The low counselor responsibility condition may have been perceived as involving more typically feminine behavior. Taynor and Deaux (1973) found that when a man and woman performed the same stereotypically masculine act, namely responding in an active, clear-headed, capable way in an emergency, the woman was perceived as performing more effectively than the man. The effectiveness of the woman's behavior was enhanced when she acted in an unexpected, "masculine" manner. In the same fashion, female counselors in the present study may have been rated as more effective in the moderate and high counselor responsibility conditions as opposed to the low counselor responsibility condition because in the former they were viewed as behaving in an unexpected, "masculine" way. A similar evaluation process may have occurred in the Bloom, Weigel, and Trautt (1977) study, in which a female counselor was perceived as more credible when occupying a "traditional-professional" office than a casual, "humanistic" office, while the reverse was true for male counselors. In the present study, the absence of enhanced effectiveness for male counselors in the more "feminine" low responsibility condition may have been due to the fact
that, in general, low counselor responsibility was seen as less desirable.

As noted previously, counselor sex failed to exert a main effect on perceived expertness and effectiveness. It had been expected that in general, male counselors would be viewed as more expert and effective than would female counselors. This prediction was based on social psychological studies involving evaluation of the competence of male and female individuals when the quality of their performance is not well-established (Deaux & Taynor, 1973; Goldberg, 1968; Pheterson et al., 1971). The lack of a counselor sex main effect in this study may be due to the fact that a bias against women in terms of competence does not operate in the population sampled. Alternatively, the available information concerning the counselor may have clarified overall competence to a degree sufficient to override any predisposition to evaluate men as more competent than women.

The present study suggested that counselor responsibility may well have an impact on perceived counselor expertness and effectiveness. In this fashion, counselor responsibility may additionally play a role in the counselor's ability to influence the client—in the counselor's "power" in the interpersonal influence process of counseling. This study also suggests that under certain circumstances, the sex of the counselor may interact with counselor responsibility to affect clients' perceptions of counselors. This may occur when clients are centrally concerned with the counselor's immediate helpfulness to them in the interview, rather than with the counselor's general therapeutic resources.
Generalization from the present study to an actual counseling situation must be tempered with caution however. This study was a vicarious participation analogue, which presents several limitations to unqualified generalization. First, the unresolved question of whether observers and clients perceive counselors in a similar fashion must be recognized. Studies investigating this question and involving dependent measures similar to those in the current study have yielded mixed results. Some of these studies have been supportive of observer/client agreement in perceptions of counselors (Barak & LaCrosse, 1977; Dell & LaCrosse, 1978), while others have not (LaCrosse, 1977). A second limitation to generalizability concerns the fact that the individual counselor independent variable was treated as a fixed-effect factor; the counselors in this study were not assumed to be a random sample of counselors in general. Other limitations associated with this experimental, analogue study include the use of audiotape, one specific client problem, and one stage of the counseling process.

The results of the present study, as well as some of the study's limitations, may be considered suggestive of directions for future research. Most importantly, further investigation might address the question of how counselor responsibility influences perceived expertness and effectiveness in the context of an ongoing counseling relationship. The possible interaction of counselor responsibility and counselor sex in this situation would seem worthy of exploration. These questions might be investigated among various populations: college counseling center clients, community mental health center clients, inpatients. One
might well expect to find variations across these populations in the role counselor responsibility plays in perceived expertness and effectiveness. Such variations might be related to the degree to which different kinds of clients hold the same expectations of mental health services as they do of medical services, where patients typically play a minor role in decisions about diagnosis and treatment. Additional factors might be considered as possible modifiers of the influence of counselor responsibility on perceived expertness and effectiveness. Such factors might include the stage of the counseling process, level of client readiness to assume responsibility, and the nature of the client's problems. The effects of these factors might be explored in either an actual counseling context or in some variety of analogue investigation.
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APPENDIX A. WRITTEN INFORMATION ON COUNSELOR AND CLIENT

Male Counselor

In a few minutes, you will be hearing a tape-recorded segment of a counseling session. This segment is a dramatization of a counseling interaction that took place at a university student counseling service. So that the client may remain anonymous, this dramatization, rather than a recording of the actual interaction, is being presented to you.

The counselor in this counseling segment, whom we'll call John Evans, is a member of the staff of the university student counseling service where this counseling session took place. The client, whom we'll call Jim, is an 18-year-old freshman at the university. The concern which led Jim to go to the counseling service involved the following situation:

Jim was near the end of his first quarter at the university. All fall he had been sharing a dorm room with two other roommates whom he hadn't known before being assigned to their room. The other two roommates had been best friends in high school and had planned to live together--Jim had the definite feeling that they had not appreciated being assigned a third roommate. Before much of September had passed, it became apparent to Jim that his life style was quite different from theirs. The hours he kept, when and how much he wanted to study, when he liked to have other people over, his level of comfort with the room's neatness or messiness were all miles away from his two roommates' approach to these things. For a while, all three roommates tried to be
tolerant, but as the weeks passed, their life style differences began to leave them more and more frustrated with each other. Conflicts and arguments arose, with Jim on one side and his roommates on the other. The roommates dealt with specific conflicts concerning use of the room as they came up—sometimes angrily—but the overall situation between them was never openly discussed. Jim's hassles with his roommates were really beginning to drive him up the wall. He was feeling angry and frustrated towards them and was spending little time in the room.

The counseling segment that you are about to hear occurred early in Jim's second counseling session. The first counseling session and the second session up to this point had involved exploring and clarifying Jim's living situation and his concerns about it. As you listen to the interaction between Jim and the counselor, imagine that you are experiencing Jim's situation and concerns and are talking with the counselor. From this perspective, pay close attention to the counselor—you will later be asked about your impressions of him.

The first voice you hear will be that of the counselor.

Female Counselor

In a few minutes, you will be hearing a tape-recorded segment of a counseling session. This segment is a dramatization of a counseling interaction that took place at a university student counseling service. So that the client may remain anonymous, this dramatization, rather than a recording of the actual interaction, is being presented to you.

The counselor in this counseling segment, whom we'll call Joan Evans, is a member of the staff of the university student counseling
service where this counseling session took place. The client, whom we'll call Jim, is an 18-year-old freshman at the university. The concern which led Jim to go to the counseling service involved the following situation:

Jim was near the end of his first quarter at the university. All fall he had been sharing a dorm room with two other roommates whom he hadn't known before being assigned to their room. The other two roommates had been best friends in high school and had planned to live together—Jim had the definite feeling that they had not appreciated being assigned a third roommate. Before much of September had passed, it became apparent to Jim that his life style was quite different from theirs. The hours he kept, when and how much he wanted to study, when he liked to have other people over, his level of comfort with the room's neatness or messiness were all miles away from his two roommates' approach to these things. For a while, all three roommates tried to be tolerant, but as the weeks passed, their life style differences began to leave them more and more frustrated with each other. Conflicts and arguments arose, with Jim on one side and his roommates on the other. The roommates dealt with specific conflicts concerning use of the room as they came up—sometimes angrily—but the overall situation between them was never openly discussed. Jim's hassles with his roommates were really beginning to drive him up the wall. He was feeling angry and frustrated towards them and was spending little time in the room.

The counseling segment that you are about to hear occurred early in Jim's second counseling session. The first counseling session and the
second session up to this point had involved exploring and clarifying Jim's living situation and his concerns about it. As you listen to the interaction between Jim and the counselor, imagine that you are experiencing Jim's situation and concerns and are talking with the counselor. From this perspective, pay close attention to the counselor—you will later be asked about your impressions of her.

The first voice you hear will be that of the counselor.
APPENDIX B. COUNSELING INTERACTION SCRIPTS

Low Counselor Responsibility

Co: Jim, you sound really fed up with that whole situation with your roommates.

Cl: That's for sure...........I really am...........It's gotten to the point where I don't even feel like going back to the room after classes are over for the day...........I'm not spending much time there anymore........it's just too much of a hassle.

Co: Now that you've told me what's been happening with your roommates this quarter, maybe the next step is for you to spend some time thinking about what you could do to deal with that situation.

Cl: Well...........I've been thinking about this for a while and..I don't know that I've really come up with anything that seems like it's going to work too well...........that's why I decided to come over here to the counseling service..........'cause I didn't feel like I was really getting anywhere on my own..........What do you think I ought to do, now that you know how things have been going?

Co: Jim, I can appreciate your feeling that it would be nice to have me kind of lay out a solution for you..........but that's really not how I see my role......You know the situation firsthand, and you also know what you want and how you feel about things. I think you can come up with some good ideas about how to deal with this situation........What I'd like to do is to help you think through what it is that you want to do..........to help you come up with some alternatives that will meet your needs.
Cl: Well okay.
Co: Why don't you tell me what ideas you've had so far. What have you considered doing?
Cl: Well, I've been thinking pretty much of just moving out........ moving into another room in one of the dorms. But I checked on that with my RA and found that there just aren't any openings for winter quarter so far........ so that just really doesn't look like a possibility, at least for this next quarter........ and I sure don't want to put up with things as they are now for another quarter.
Co: Sounds like you feel pretty strongly about wanting to move........ but that moving to another dorm room is out for right now..........What else have you thought of...in terms of how you could deal with the situation?
Cl: I don't know........ maybe I could move to an apartment off campus... I know I've thought before that it'd be kind of fun to live in an apartment...... but gosh.. I just don't know if I could afford to do that......if I could swing that on the money I've got.
Co: What do you think you could do in terms of finding out just what it would cost you to move into an apartment?
Cl: Guess I could just start checking the ads in the papers.....find out what apartments are renting for........ and I s'pose one thing that would make a difference would be..how many people the rent was split up among....how many guys I got to go in with me and move into an apartment... that would probably make a difference.
Co: Okay.....anything else?
Cl: (Short silence)......Well..........I imagine I could maybe try and get some idea what some of the other stuff might cost....groceries... and..whatever else you'd have to pay living in an apartment...utilities.. that kind of stuff. A friend of mine's older brother goes to school here and has an apartment with two guys......maybe I could talk to him. Guess I'd have to compare all that with what I'm paying now living in the dorm......see what it looked like.

Co: Mmmmmhmmm.

Cl: ...............Maybe I'll spend some time checking that out...see what I think about it..............I'm going to have to do something though, 'cause our room contracts for next quarter come up pretty soon and..so I'm gonna have to kind of get cracking if I want to think about moving into an apartment.

Co: Beyond moving out, what other ideas have you had......for what you could do about that situation with your roommates?

Cl: I don't know...........moving out just seems like the best bet.....all the way around........I don't think my roommates are any happier with the situation than I am.

Co: (Short silence)......Okay...but what would you do if you found that moving out just wasn't feasible right now?

Cl: Well........I don't know...........I spose...maybe try and...sit down and talk to them about the way things are going........See if we could iron something out........work something out between us.

Co: Jim, what kind of changes do you think would have to take place before......the three of you could be....more comfortable living together?
Cl: Well......I think probably both the two of them and me would have to bend a bit......be willing to change some of the ways we're doing things....to compromise.

Co: What changes would be involved in that?

Cl: Probably...things like...the hours we kept.......when we were trying to study in the room and when we were goofing off, playing the stereo, having friends over and.......how we were going to work some of those kinds of things.......would be the main thing I guess. Cause as it is now, we're always getting in each others' way.

Co: How would you and your roommates work toward agreeing on what changes you'd each make?

Cl: Hmmmm........that's a good question...............I guess we'd just have to go through the things that are problems between us, one at a time, and work on some changes all of us can live with.......set up rules........maybe even get them in writing.

Co: Okay...............any more ideas on that?

Cl: (Short silence).............I was just thinking...........maybe one thing I could do...before I talked to them...would be to just kind of sit down myself......and make a list of what it is that they do, you know, that bugs me that I'd like to have them change............and how much change on their part I'd want to ask for..........and then maybe also..........the things that...they might want me to change.......and how much I'd be willing to change those..........Maybe that would sort of help me think about it all, you know....before I ever talked to them.

Co: I follow you.
Cl: ..............You know, the two of them might want to do that too....Maybe...maybe we'd be able to agree on a time to talk about the situation...and kind of put that a few days ahead, and then we'd all have time to think through what changes we wanted and were willing to make before our meeting came around.

Co: Mmmmmmmmmmmm......Sounds like you're getting a plan in mind.......Maybe before you go too much further with this, you ought to step back...and think about something you haven't really touched on so far.........Jim, if you were to decide that you did want to try and talk with your roommates....how would you go about bringing that up?

Cl: (Silence)......Hnnnnnnnnnnnnnnmmmmmm........I don't know...........We haven't really done anything like that................We've ended up yelling at each other, arguing over some particular incident.........but we've never just sat down and talked about the whole situation and how we could change that..............I don't know how I'd bring that up.

Co: (Silence) Try and think that through................What could you say....that would be most likely to make your roommates...willing to talk over the situation?

Cl: Seems like (tape ends in mid-sentence)

Moderate Counselor Responsibility

Co: Jim, you sound really fed up with that whole situation with your roommates.

Cl: That's for sure...............I really am...........It's gotten to the point where I don't even feel like going back to the room after
classes are over for the day..............I'm not spending much time there anymore..........it's just too much of a hassle.

Co: Now that we've talked about what's been happening with your roommates this quarter, maybe the next step is for us to spend some time thinking about what you could do to deal with that situation.

Cl: Well........I've..been thinking about this for a while and...I don't know that I've really come up with anything that seems like it's going to work too well.........that's why I decided to come over here to the counseling service.........'cause I didn't feel like I was really getting anyplace on my own..........What do you think I ought to do, now that you know how things have been going?

Co: Jim, I can appreciate your feeling that it would be nice to have me kind of lay out a solution for you..........but that's really not how I see my role..........You know the situation firsthand, and you also know what you want and how you feel about things. I think you can come up with some good ideas about how to deal with this situation. I'd like to help you do that........And I'll contribute my own thoughts and suggestions.....I have a couple of things in mind....So I hope we can work together on coming up with some options for you.

Cl: ..............Well..............okay.

Co: Why don't we take a look at the ideas you've had so far. What have you considered doing?

Cl: Well, I've been thinking pretty much of just moving out..............moving into another room in one of the dorms. But I checked on that with my RA and found out that there just aren't any openings for winter
quarter so far.........so that just really doesn't look like a possi-

bility, at least for this next quarter.............and I sure don't

want to put up with things as they are now for another quarter.

Co: Sounds like you feel pretty strongly about wanting to move........

but that moving to another dorm room is out for right now........Well

...........along the lines of moving........what about the idea of your

moving into an apartment off campus?

Cl: Hmmmmmmmm.............that's sounds pretty good...........I know

I've thought before that it'd be kind of fun to live in an apartment....

........but gosh..I just don't know if I could afford to do that........

If I could swing that on the money I've got.

Co: What do you think you could do in terms of finding out just what it

would cost you to move into an apartment?

Cl: Guess I could just start checking the ads in the papers.....find

out what apartments are renting for..........and I s'pose one thing that

would make a difference would be..how many people the rent was split up

among.....how many guys I got to go in with me and move into an apart-

ment.............that would probably make a difference.

Co: Okay..........checking on rents and how many people you might have

living with you sounds like a good place to start.............You might

also think about who you know...who's living in an apartment right now..

Maybe a friend of a friend..or someone you know directly..whoever.....

and check and find out what other sorts of expenses..you might run into

living in an apartment.......things like utilities..groceries.....just

what college students are spending living in an apartment. That might
give you a little better idea too of how much it would cost you as compared to what it costs you now for room and board...living in the dorm.

Cl: Yeah.......a friend of mine's older brother goes to school here and has an apartment with two guys...maybe I could talk to him. Guess I'd have to compare all that with what I'm paying now living in the dorm.... see what it looked like.

Co: Sounds good......Maybe those kinds of things are what you need to do next to help you evaluate that option of moving into an apartment.... rather than staying where you are now.

Cl: Maybe I'll spend some time checking that out...see what I think about it.............I'm going to have to do something though, 'cause our room contracts for next quarter come up pretty soon and...so I'm gonna have to kind of get cracking if I want to think about moving into an apartment.

Co: Beyond moving out, what other ideas have you had......for what you could do about that situation with your roommates?

Cl: I don't know...........moving out just seems like the best bet...... all the way around........I don't think my roommates are any happier with the situation than I am.

Co: (Short silence)...........Okay...but what would you do if you found that moving out just wasn't feasible right now?

Cl: Well........I don't know...............I s'pose....maybe try and.. sit down and talk to thim about the way things are going..........See if we could iron something out...............work something out between us.
Co: Jim, from what you've told me so far.....it sounds like..in order for you and your roommates..to be at all comfortable living together....probably you're going to have to compromise a bit, make some changes in some things like...when you come and go in the room, the kind of hours you keep........when you choose to study or to goof off, play the stereo,........when you have friends over.....some things like that.....how does that square with your thinking about it?

Cl: ........I think you're right. Those are the kind of things we're going to have to work out if we're going to continue living together.

Co: Let me suggest this to you, Jim......Maybe you and your roommates are going to need to compromise, work out some specific guidelines for use of the room........You might have to..take..kind of the problem areas between you and go through them..one at a time, and try to work out some changes that all of you can live with........and put those agreements in writing. Really spell out the rights and responsibilities of each of you......and get that down on paper......What do you think of that idea?

Cl: Sounds pretty good........I guess that's the kind of thing we're going to have to do................I was just thinking............maybe one thing I could do..before I talked to them.....would be to just kind of sit down myself..........and make a list of what it is that they do, you know, that bugs me that I'd like to have them change..........and how much change on their part I'd want to ask for.............and then maybe also..........the things that..they might want me to change.......and how much I'd be willing to change those..........Maybe that would
sort of help me think about it all, you know....before I ever talked to them.

Co: I think that's a good idea....to think through what it is that you'd want to ask for from them...and also what compromises or concessions you're willing to make yourself...that they might ask for........Then you could go into it being prepared.

Cl: ...............You know, the two of them might want to do that too.....Maybe...maybe we'd be able to agree on a time to talk about the situation...and kind of put that a few days ahead, and then we'd all have time to think through what changes we wanted and were willing to make before our meeting came around.

Co: I think that makes a lot of sense........Maybe before we go too much further with this, we...ought to step back..and think about something we haven't really touched on so far.......I've got some ideas I'll share with you shortly, but let me ask what you think first.......Jim, if you were to decide that you did want to try and talk with your roommates, how would you go about bringing that up?

Cl: (Silence)........HMMMMMMMMMM....................I don't know........We haven't really done anything like that...............We've ended up yelling at each other, arguing over some particular incident..........but we've never just sat down and talked about the whole situation and how we could change that...........I don't know how I'd bring that up.

Co: Why don't we try and think that through..........I guess the ques­tion for us is..what could you say....that would be most likely to make your roommates...willing to talk over the situation?

Cl: Seems like...(tape ends in mid-sentence)
High Counselor Responsibility

Co: Jim, you sound really fed up with that whole situation with your roommates.

Cl: That's for sure..............I really am..............It's gotten to the point where I don't even feel like going back to the room after classes are over for the day..............I'm not spending much time there anymore...........it's just too much of a hassle.

Co: Now that I understand what's been happening with your roommates this quarter, maybe the next step is to spend some time thinking about what you could do to deal with that situation.

Cl: Well..........I've been thinking about this for a while and......I don't know that I've really come up with anything that seems like it's going to work too well...........that's why I decided to come over here to the counseling service...........'cause I didn't feel like I was really getting anywhere on my own..............What do you think I ought to do, now that you know how things have been going?

Co: Well, as a last resort...you might just move out...........try to find another living situation that seems as though it would be more to your liking..........roommates whose life styles are more similar to your own...........Perhaps you could move into another room in the dorm system.......or maybe into an apartment off campus.

Cl: Well, I've been thinking pretty much of just moving out...........moving into another room in one of the dorms. But I checked on that with my RA and found out that there just aren't any openings for winter quarter so far...........so that just really doesn't look like a possibility,
at least for this next quarter.............and I sure don't want to put up with things as they are now for another quarter.

Co: Sounds like you feel pretty strongly about wanting to move...but that moving to another dorm room is out for right now.........How about the other idea I suggested........the idea of your moving into an apartment off campus?

Cl: Hmmmmmmmm.............that sounds pretty good...........I know I've thought before that it'd be kind of fun to live in an apartment........but, gosh...I just don't know if I could really afford to do that......If I could swing that on the money I've got.

Co: In that case, I think you need to find out just what it would cost you to move into an apartment.............Start checking the ads in the papers....find out what apartments are renting for.

Cl: Yeah...........guess I could do that.

Co: Another factor in the cost for you that you might want to think about is...how many other people would be living in the apartment......how many of you would there be to split up the rent.

Cl: Yeah.....that would make a difference.

Co: You might also think about who you know...who's living in an apartment right now........Maybe a friend of a friend..or someone you know directly...whoever..........and check and find out what other sorts of expenses...you might run into living in an apartment........things like utilities..groceries.....just what college students are spending living in an apartment. That might give you a little better idea too of how much it would cost you as compared to what it costs you now for room
and board...living in the dorm.

Cl: Yeah.......A friend of mine's older brother goes to school here and has an apartment with two guys....maybe I could talk to him. Guess I'd have to compare all that with what I'm paying now living in the dorm......see what it looked like.

Co: Sounds good......Those kinds of things are what you need to do next to help you evaluate that option of moving into an apartment......rather than staying where you are now.

Cl: Maybe I'll spend some time checking that out......see what I think about it..............I'm going to have to do something though..........cause our room contracts for next quarter come up pretty soon and...so I'm gonna have to kind of get cracking........if I want to think about moving into an apartment.

Co: Well, as I said earlier, I think you should consider moving out only as a last resort...........I think first you ought to..try to discuss this whole situation with your roommates..and see if the three of you can't make some compromises............work things out between you.

Cl: (Silence)...........Hmmmmmm...........I guess we haven't really done anything like that so far...........we've ended up yelling at each other, arguing over some particular incident...........but we've never just sat down and talked about the whole situation and how we could change that.

Co: That's what I think you need to do before you think seriously about moving out.

Cl: Well.................okay.........but how would I go about doing that?
Co: In order for you and your roommates...to be at all comfortable living together...you're going to have to compromise a bit, make some changes in some things like...when you come and go in the room, the kind of hours you keep........when you choose to study or to goof off, play the stereo....when you have friends over..........some things like that.
CI: I think you're right. Those are the kind of things we're going to have to work out if we're going to continue living together.
Co: You and your roommates are going to need to compromise, to work out some specific guidelines for use of the room. When the three of you talk about this situation......take the problem areas between you...and go through them...one at a time. Try to work out some changes that all of you can live with......and put those agreements in writing..........Really spell out the rights and responsibilities of each of you.....and get that down on paper.
CI: Sounds pretty good..........I guess that's the kind of thing we're going to have to do.
Co: I think the first step is for you and your roommates..to set a time..that you're going to talk about this..a few days in advance......Then what I'd like you to do before that meeting time rolls around is to..just kind of sit down by yourself...and make a list of what it is that your roommates do that bothers you..what it is that you'd like to have them change.........In other words, what are the areas of change and what is the degree of change that you want to ask them for..when you talk with them..........Then also you ought to think through and write down..what compromises or concessions you're willing to make
yourself...that your roommates might ask for.

Cl: Okay.........I follow you.

Co: Good.......I think you can...suggest to your roommates that they do the same sort of thing..............That way you'll all go into that meeting..being prepared.....with a clear idea in mind of what it is you want from each other and...how much you're willing to give in that living situation.

Cl: Okay............yeah.............I guess that gives me a pretty good idea............how the three of us could go about discussing the whole situation.

Co: Now........before we go too much further with this..............we need to step back and think about something we really haven't touched on so far..........and thats how you can go about..initiating all this with your roommates...how you can bring this up with them........What you can say..that will be most likely to make your roommates..........willing to talk over the situation..............

Cl: Seems like...(tape ends in mid-sentence)
APPENDIX C. MANIPULATION CHECK MEASURES

Generation of Alternatives

Think of the alternative ways of dealing with Jim's problem that Jim and the counselor discussed. Who first suggested these alternatives? In other words, to what degree were Jim and the counselor each involved in initially coming up with the alternatives? (Circle one of the numbers on the scale below.)

1-Jim suggested all of the alternatives discussed; the counselor suggested none of them.
2-Jim suggested most of the alternatives.
3-Jim suggested the majority of the alternatives.
4-Jim and the counselor suggested about an equal number of alternatives.
5-The counselor suggested the majority of the alternatives.
6-The counselor suggested most of the alternatives.
7-The counselor suggested all of the alternatives discussed; Jim suggested none of them.

Elaboration of Alternatives

Again, think of the alternative ways of dealing with Jim's problem that Jim and the counselor discussed. To what degree were Jim and the counselor each involved in elaborating these alternatives—in spelling out in detail just what needed to be done? (Circle one of the numbers on the scale below.)

1-The counselor did none of this; Jim did all of it.
2-The counselor did 10% of this; Jim did 90% of it.
3-The counselor did 20% of this; Jim did 80% of it.
4-The counselor did 30% of this; Jim did 70% of it.
5-The counselor did 40% of this; Jim did 60% of it.
6-The counselor did 50% of this; Jim did 50% of it.
7-The counselor did 60% of this; Jim did 40% of it.
8-The counselor did 70% of this; Jim did 30% of it.
9-The counselor did 80% of this; Jim did 20% of it.
10-The counselor did 90% of this; Jim did 10% of it.
11-The counselor did all of this; Jim did none of it.

Responsibility

Overall, how much responsibility did the counselor and Jim each take for finding ways that Jim could deal with his problem? (Circle one of the numbers on the scale below.)

1-The counselor took no responsibility for this; Jim took all of the responsibility for it.
2-The counselor took 10% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 90% of the responsibility for it.
3-The counselor took 20% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 80% of the responsibility for it.
4-The counselor took 30% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 70% of the responsibility for it.
5-The counselor took 40% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 60% of the responsibility for it.
6-The counselor took 50% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 50% of the responsibility for it.
7-The counselor took 60% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 40% of the responsibility for it.
8-The counselor took 70% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 30% of the responsibility for it.

9-The counselor took 80% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 20% of the responsibility for it.

10-The counselor took 90% of the responsibility for this; Jim took 10% of the responsibility for it.

11-The counselor took all of the responsibility for this; Jim took no responsibility for it.

Influence

To what degree did the counselor try to influence Jim concerning how to deal with his problem? (Circle one of the numbers on the scale below.)

1-The counselor did not try to influence Jim at all.

2-
3-
4-
5-
6-
7-
8-
9-

10-The counselor tried to strongly influence Jim—told him exactly what he should do.
APPENDIX D. SINGLE-ITEM EXPERTNESS MEASURE

Rate the counselor's **expertness**. Consider expertness to mean the degree to which the counselor possesses **special knowledge and skills for helping people deal with problems in their lives**. Circle the number on the scale below that most closely corresponds to your perception of the counselor's expertness.

1-not at all expert
2-
3-somewhat expert
4-
5-moderately expert
6-
7-quite expert
8-
9-extremely expert
APPENDIX E. EXPERTNESS SCALE-COUNSELOR RATING FORM

Listed on the following two pages are several scales which contain word pairs at either end of the scale and seven spaces between the pairs. Please rate the counselor you just heard on each of the scales.

If you feel that the counselor very closely resembles the word at one end of the scale, place a check mark as follows:


OR

fair X : : : : : unfair

If you think that one end of the scale quite closely describes the counselor then make your check mark as follows:


OR


If you feel that one end of the scale only slightly describes the counselor, then check the scale as follows:


OR


If both sides of the scale seem equally associated with your impression of the counselor or if the scale is irrelevant, then place a check mark in the middle space:


Your first impression is the best answer.

PLEASE NOTE: PLACE CHECK MARKS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SPACES.
unalert ___:___:___:___:___: alert
analytic ___:___:___:___:___: diffuse
vague ___:___:___:___:___: clear
inexperienced ___:___:___:___:___: experienced
inexpert ___:___:___:___:___: expert
informed ___:___:___:___:___: ignorant
insightful ___:___:___:___:___: insightless
stupid ___:___:___:___:___: intelligent
logical ___:___:___:___:___: illogical
prepared ___:___:___:___:___: unprepared
skillful ___:___:___:___:___: unskillful
APPENDIX F. SINGLE-ITEM EFFECTIVENESS MEASURE

If you had been the client in the counseling interaction just presented, how effective would you have found the counselor's behavior to be? In other words, how helpful would the counselor's behavior have been to you? On the scale below, circle the number that most closely corresponds to your impression of the counselor's effectiveness (helpfulness to you).

1—not at all effective
2
3—somewhat effective
4
5—moderately effective
6
7—quite effective
8
9—extremely effective
APPENDIX G. SPIEGEL EFFECTIVENESS SCALE

Below are 16 statements that refer to the counselor you heard in the tape. Indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the statements by putting a circle around one answer for each statement. There are seven possible answers for each item.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Moderately disagree
3. Slightly disagree
4. Neither agree nor disagree
5. Slightly agree
6. Moderately agree
7. Strongly agree

Do not spend too much time on any one item. Please do not omit any items.

1. The counselor seemed to understand the way the client really felt.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

2. I felt like the client was being put on the spot too much during the counseling session.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

3. The counselor seemed like a warm person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

4. The counselor gave the client reason to want to return for more sessions.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

5. The counselor seemed to look down on the client.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

6. The counselor seemed to confuse the client.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

7. The counselor seemed genuinely interested in helping the client.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
8. The counselor talked too much.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

9. The counselor made it easy for the client to talk about difficult things.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

10. The counselor seemed to misunderstand what the client was saying.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

11. I would recommend this counselor to a friend.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

12. If the client had had someone else as his counselor, probably he would have felt freer to discuss his problems.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

13. The counselor seemed to know what to do.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

14. In many ways, the session seemed like a waste of the client's time.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

15. The client probably will benefit from his sessions with the counselor.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

16. This counselor probably would not be very helpful to most students.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree
APPENDIX H. WILLINGNESS TO TALK WITH THE COUNSELOR

If you had a problem that you wanted to discuss with a counselor; how much would you want to talk with the counselor you heard in the tape? Circle the number on the scale below that most closely corresponds to how you feel.

1-I would definitely not want to talk with this counselor.
2
3-I would probably not want to talk with this counselor.
4
5-I would not care whether I talked with this counselor or with another counselor—no preference.
6
7-I would probably want to talk with this counselor.
8
9-I would definitely want to talk with this counselor.
Rate the voice of the counselor in the session you just heard on the following dimensions. Do this in the same manner as that you used for completing the scales on pages 3 and 4.

- admiring
- blaring
- cold
- fast
- harsh
- low-pitched
- personal
- resonant
- slurred
- smooth
- soft
- unpleasant
- tense
- varied

condescending
thin
warm
slow
mellow
high-pitched
business-like
breathy
clipped
jerky
loud
pleasant
relaxed
monotonic
APPENDIX J. ORDER OF MEASURES FOR FORM A AND FORM B

Form A
Willingness to Talk with the Counselor
Counselor Rating Form
Single-Item Expertness
Voice Quality Checklist
Single-Item Effectiveness
Spiegel Effectiveness Scale
Manipulation Check Measures

Form B
Willingness to Talk with the Counselor
Counselor Rating Form
Single-Item Effectiveness
Voice Quality Checklist
Single-Item Expertness
Spiegel Effectiveness Scale
Manipulation Check Measures