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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The major representatives of existing theoretical viewpoints of counseling and psychotherapy recognize the importance of certain conditions of the counseling relationship. Three characteristics of an effective counselor emerge from the divergent theoretical viewpoints: these basic ingredients are accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967).

Mounting research evidence has confirmed the importance of these counselor characteristics. The findings go further by indicating that counselors high in empathy, warmth (positive regard), and genuineness produce positive changes in their clients while counselors low in these attributes produce negative or no changes in their clients (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; Truax and Wargo, 1966).

These core conditions have been given more attention and central importance in some approaches to counseling than in others. Rogers (1957) asserts that accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness are "necessary and sufficient" conditions for client change.

Other dimensions of a counselor besides warmth, empathy, and genuineness are important in the counselor-client relationship. Whether or not a counselor is
perceived as decisive, strong, active, competent, close, shallow, trustworthy, attractive, and expert may have considerable consequences on the efficacy of the counseling relationship. Strong (1968) proposed that counselors who are perceived as trustworthy, attractive, and expert should be more influential with clients than counselors not perceived as such. Several studies have investigated the perceptions of one or more of the three dimensions of trustworthiness, attractiveness, and expertness and its relationship to influence potential (e.g., Dell, 1973; Patton, 1969; Schmidt and Strong, 1971; Spiegel, 1976; Strong and Dixon, 1971; Strong and Schmidt, 1970a, 1970b).

The Problem

Since counseling effectiveness hinges so much on the quality of the relationship between the counselor and the client, basic attributes of the counselor are highly significant (Brammer and Anastrom, 1968). The quality of a relationship is determined from the quality of communication within that relationship. Communication is the means by which the attributes, or dimensions, of a counselor get conveyed to the client. Counseling is a communicative process. The variables in the complexity of this process are primarily dealt with by the counselor and client through verbal and nonverbal communicative means. A counselor, in order to communicate to a client, uses a variety of cues. Verbal cues are often used and they
communicate lexical meaning to the client. While nonverbal cues of communication are less explicit than lexical cues, they affect the client nevertheless.

The question arises as to which cues, or channels, of communication are most salient in a counseling relationship. Since a condition or attribute such as empathy, for example, seems to be of major significance, it becomes important for a counselor to know which specific behaviors of the counselor are conveying empathy to the client. How is the counselor to communicate the relevant personal dimensions that are significant for client change? Does the content of the counselor's statements matter as much as the manner in which the counselor expresses himself? How important are gestures, facial expressions, and the counselor's tone of voice?

An investigation by Strehan and Zytowski (1976) sought to answer these questions. The present study sought to replicate and extend the Strehan and Zytowski study. As in the Strehan and Zytowski study, it seems necessary to examine the relative impact of verbal and nonverbal channels of communication on the perception of counselor qualities.

The present investigation employed the video-tape segment of Carl Rogers from the series, Three Approaches to Psychotherapy (Shostrom, 1965) as in the Strehan and Zytowski study, but it also employed two other video-tape
segments of Carl Rogers from the same counseling session. A further extension of the Strahan and Zytowski study was the addition of the three dependent measures of trustworthy, expert, and attractive to the variables genuine, indecisive, caring, weak, active, incompetent, warm, distant, shallow, and understanding.

The specific purposes of this investigation were:
(1) to replicate the Strahan and Zytowski study which assessed the influences of different modes of communication by Rogers on a number of counseling-relevant dimensions by examining the ratings received from varying communicative channels, namely the visual, vocal(affective qualities of speech), verbal, vocal-verbal, and visual-vocal-verbal channels; the Strahan and Zytowski study also assessed the systematic differences in the ratings when the experimental groups were later exposed to additional information(visual-vocal-lexical cues); (2) to examine the differential effects of the channels of communication on the perception of Carl Rogers in two other portions of the counseling session on a number of counseling-relevant dimensions(genuine, indecisive, caring, weak, active, incompetent, warm, distant, shallow, and understanding); and (3) to explore the differential effects of the various channels, or cues, of communication on the perception of Carl Rogers as being attractive, expert, and trustworthy across sex and across the three film segments.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In counseling as well as psychotherapy, the content of a communication has traditionally been accepted as the principal means for communicating to the client. Strong (1951, 1965) said that counseling may be regarded as "reciprocally verbal behavior, usually between two people" and that verbal communication is the counselor's main means of influencing a client. This acceptance shows up in the counseling literature which devotes a great deal of attention to the verbal channel of communication, almost to the exclusion of nonverbal channels which pervade the counseling relationship; recently, however, nonverbal patterns have been given the beginnings of a systematic empirical foundation (Haase and Tepper, 1972).

Even though until recently few empirical studies have measured the impact of nonverbal cues on the encoding and decoding of verbal messages, psychologists have long considered nonverbal cues to be important in communication in interpersonal interactions (Haase and DiMattia, 1970). In a counseling relationship, the counselor communicates nonverbally through facial expressions and body gestures. It is generally agreed upon that there exists some type of relationship between verbal and nonverbal behavior.
Strong, Taylor, Bratton and Loper (1971) suggest that non-verbal behavior helps to punctuate and monitor interaction, that it confirms verbal content, and that it clarifies the meaning of verbal responses.

In a review of the literature on nonverbal communication in relation to counseling, Gladstein (1974) concludes that the research conducted has produced a confused, complex picture since various researchers and theorists have looked at different aspects of nonverbal communication, different research models and methods were used, and since different populations (both helpers and helpees) were used. It seems apparent that although information about nonverbal behavior is available from the study of communication in counseling, little is known about the relative impact of nonverbal communicative cues to the perception of counselor qualities.

Nonverbal communication channels include kinesic behavior, i.e., gestures and other body movements such as facial expressions, eye movements, and posture; paralanguage, i.e., voice qualities, speech nonfluencies, and such nonlanguage sounds as laughing, yawning and grunting; and proxemics, i.e., the use of personal and social space; and also use of artifacts such as how one dresses (Duncan, 1969). Most research on nonverbal communication has followed one of two broad research strategies in this area: the examination of the structural characteristics of nonverbal
behavior systems or the correlation of external variables with specific nonverbal behaviors (Duncan, 1969). The present investigation is concerned with the latter strategy.

The importance of nonverbal cues in two or more communicative channels in judging interpersonal interactions has recently been emphasized. A study by Levitt (1964) showed that emotions were communicated as effectively with facial expression alone as with a combination of face and voice, and that both of these methods were superior to voice alone. Thus, in a two-channel facial-vocal communication of emotion, the facial component contributes more to the decoding of the message than does the vocal channel. Mehrabian and Ferris (1967) found that judges were more responsive to visual-facial cues than to auditory cues. Zeidel and Mehrabian (1969) demonstrated that the facial channel was generally more effective than the vocal channel for communicating attitudes. Burns and Heier (1973) assessed the relative effectiveness of the vocal and visual channels in influencing observers' judgments of communicative stimuli; it was found that visual cues were more influential as well as more accurate in their designation of a mood state. Thus, the evidence concurred with the previous findings of Levitt, Mehrabian and Ferris, and Zeidel and Mehrabian. These investigations have underlined the point that there is more to human interaction than spoken language.
A review of the literature by Davitz (1964) concerning nonverbal modes of communication reflected his experience of supervising students in a counseling practicum. Davitz began to emphasize "how" something was said instead of "what" was said since this seemed to cause the primary difficulties in communication rather than the content of one's speech. Schefflen (1965), after ten years of studying different methods of psychotherapy, concluded that how the participants looked, sat, moved, and dressed were as important as what they said.

Roll (1970), in an investigation of the perception of interviewer trustworthiness by penitentiary inmates, concluded that the manner in which an interviewer said something was a more important variable than what the interviewer actually said. Similarly, Hauer (1970), in a study on the differential effects of interviewer content and manner on perceived trustworthiness, found that manner was a more powerful determinant of an interviewer's perceived trustworthiness than content.

Nobreakian (1970) has demonstrated that proxemic cues (e.g., a closer position, more forward lean, more eye contact, and more direct body orientation) are related to the communication of increased positive evaluative attitudes in interpersonal interactions. A study by Kelly (1972) demonstrated that such findings may be extrapolated to the
counseling setting. The results indicated that the following nonverbal cues are instrumental in the conveyance of positive counselor attitude to the client: closer interaction distances, eye contact, a forward trunk lean, and a face-to-face orientation. The findings by Kelly are consistent with the results of an investigation by Island (1967) in which high-rated counselors were characterized by head support, forward body position, and talking and the low-rated counselors were characterized by head movements, looking away, lower facial movements, and a backward body position.

The relationship between core conditions and nonverbal behaviors has recently been investigated. Hayes (1972) investigated warmth with regard to certain nonverbal behaviors. It was shown that the nonverbal behavioral cues most closely related to warmth had a significant influence on the people with whom they interacted. Smith-Hansen (1977) investigated the effects of movement, arm positions, and leg positions on judged levels of counselor warmth and empathy. It was found that the movement/no movement factor had no significant effect whereas the arms-crossed position was rated the coldest and the least empathic condition, thereby supporting a finding by Spiegel and Machotka (1974). The leg position whereby one of the counselor's legs is crossed over the other leg such that the ankle of the
crossed leg rests on the knee of the other leg was rated the coldest and least empathic leg position.

Even though it is recognized that nonverbal modes of communication play a significant role in the total communication process between the counselor and client, there have been only a few studies (Fretz, 1966; Haase and Tepper, 1972; Shapiro, Foster and Powell, 1968) conducted on the relative contributions of different channels of communication to relationship variables in counseling.

Fretz (1966) found significant correlations between several counselor nonverbal movements and the judgment of empathy by clients. Haase and Tepper (1972) collected empathy ratings of videotaped counseling interactions while manipulating levels of eye contact, trunk lean, body orientation, distance, and verbal empathy. It was demonstrated that maintaining eye contact, a forward trunk lean, close distance, and medium and high verbal empathy would produce significant effects, thereby supporting the findings from previous studies (Island, 1967; Kelly, 1972; Mehrabian, 1970). Furthermore, the nonverbal effects accounted for twice the variability of counselor ratings as compared to the verbal messages. Shapiro, Foster and Powell (1968) found that untrained subjects agreed with trained judges' ratings of counselor genuineness, empathy, and warmth and that facial cues were the discriminating factor leading to
agreement. The reasonably high levels of agreement found within and between groups of judges was suggested by Shapiro et al., as evidence that facilitative attitudes are communicated through nonlinguistic behavior.

Little research has been conducted in the nonverbal area in terms of examining the additive effects of voice qualities, gestures, postures and other nonverbal behaviors. One such research endeavor was the investigation by Strong, Taylor, Bratton and Loper (1971) which examined the extent to which observation of counselor verbal and nonverbal behavior leads to different descriptions of counselors than observation of only counselor verbal behavior. If the descriptions for both conditions were similar, then counselors need not be overly concerned about their nonverbal behavior. However, the results indicated otherwise as the subjects hearing and seeing the counselor as opposed to only hearing them described the counselors more negatively, apparently because some visual cues disrupted their positive stereotype of a counselor. Strong et al. conclude that there is little doubt that a counselor's gestural, postural and other nonverbal movements have an impact on how he is perceived and described by observers.

In the Strong et al. study, counselors who manifested greater frequencies of nonverbal movements in interviews
were rated as higher in perceived attractiveness. A study by LaCrosse (1975) also examined the dimension of attractiveness along with "persuasiveness" (the central component of perceived counselor behavior across the dimensions of expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness). LaCrosse had subjects view "affiliative" counselors, i.e., counselors exhibiting smiles, positive head nods, gestures, 80% eye contact, and a forward body lean, or "unaffiliative" counselors, i.e., counselors manifesting little or no positive head nods and smiles, 40% eye contact, and a 20° reclining angle. It was found that counselors in the affiliative condition were perceived as significantly more attractive and persuasive than counselors in the unaffiliative condition.

LaCrosse and Barak (1976) investigated the dimensions of expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness; different groups of subjects viewed the video-taped interviews of Albert Ellis, Fritz Perls and Carl Rogers—the same counseling interview of Carl Rogers in which three film segments of the session will be used in the present investigation. The results indicated that Rogers was perceived as the least expert and the most attractive, Perls was perceived as slightly more expert and slightly less attractive than Ellis and all three counselors did not differ significantly on the trustworthy dimension. Thus, the
LaCrosse and Barak study examined the effects of combined visual-vocal-lexical cues for three counselors of different theoretical viewpoints. However, the study gives no indication of the relative effects of nonverbal and verbal communicative cues on perceived counselor qualities which the Strahman and Zytowski study investigated for one counselor, namely Carl Rogers.

Results of two investigations (Mehrabian and Ferris, 1967; Mehrabian and Wiener, 1967) indicated that the content, or verbal aspect, of a message had relatively little impact on the listener since the tone in which the word was spoken or the accompanying facial expression had a much greater impact on the listener. In the Mehrabian and Ferris study, facial expressions accounted for approximately one and one-half times as much variance in the communication of an attitude than did the vocal component. In the Mehrabian and Wiener study, the findings indicated that the independent effects of tone were stronger than the independent effects of content and that the variability of inferences about communicator attitude on the basis of information in content and tone combined was mainly contributed by variations in tone alone. Mehrabian and Ferris integrated the findings of these two investigations and suggested that the "combined effects of simultaneous verbal, vocal and facial attitude communication is a weighted sum
of their independent effects with the coefficients of .07, .38, and .52, respectively."

The Strahan and Zytwoski study, which the present investigation will replicate, assessed the relative effects of verbal and nonverbal channels of communication on judgments of counselor qualities. In the study, subjects received information of the counseling relationship from either the filtered vocal channel (measuring affective components of speech), the visual channel, the lexical (verbal) channel, the vocal-lexical channel, or the visual-vocal-lexical channel. Ratings among the groups determined which channel was most effective in creating a favorable view of the counselor. Lexical cues were particularly important in creating favorable impressions among female subjects, but results were less clear-cut for males. On the dependent variables of warm, active, incompetent, indecisive, distant, and shallow, females in the lexical group, i.e., the ones who read the transcrip of the counseling segment, rated Rogers more positively than did females in other treatment groups, while females who heard the filtered recording tended to give Rogers more negative ratings than did the other female experimental groups.

The unfavorable ratings given by females in the vocal condition concurred with the findings in the Burns and Reier (1975) study.
No definite pattern emerged for the males in the study. Males who read the typescript were not uniformly favorable to Rogers across the dimensions of perceived counselor qualities and males were less uniformly negative to Rogers in the vocal (filtered speech) condition than were the females in this group.

When the experimental groups were later exposed to visual-vocal-lexical cues in their natural combination, the subjects rated Rogers as significantly warmer and less distant than they had earlier on the basis of limited information. Further information, however, did not always lead to more favorable ratings. Strahan and Zytowski suggested that the total impression of a counselor's behavior is not simply the summation of partial information received from different communicative channels; rather, impressions received from different sources "may interact in such a way that some have less of an impact in combination with others than they might have had singly."

Although recent research has shown the importance of nonverbal behavior in interpersonal communication, the findings of the Strahan and Zytowski study point out that what the counselor says still has much to do with the way he is being perceived. However, the generalizability of the results of the study are unknown. It is not known if
a counselor, who may behave differently in other portions of a counseling session, will be given similar ratings in different portions of the session. What is known is that a counselor may vary in his use of verbal and non-verbal cues and in how these cues communicate counseling relevant dimensions. Thus, further research seems warranted along these lines.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Subjects for the study were undergraduate students selected from introductory psychology classes at The Ohio State University who received course credit for participating in the experiment. There was a total of 244 subjects, 113 males and 131 females. Equal numbers of males and females were desired for each of the experimental conditions, but this was not possible as some students did not show up at the time they had volunteered to be subjects. The experimental conditions consisted of five channels of communication for each of the three film segments. The experimental conditions were subdivided into male and female groups.

Stimulus Material

The stimuli for the study were prepared from three different film segments of a counseling interview given by Carl Rogers from the series, Three Approaches to Psychotherapy (Shestrom, 1965). Each film segment was 5-minutes in length. One 5-minute segment of Carl Rogers consisted of the last five minutes of the interview; it is the same segment that was used in the Strahan and Zytowski (1976)
investigation and this segment has been cited by Meador
(Meador and Rogers, 1973) as a typical example of the
client-centered approach.

The other two 5-minute segments of the Carl Rogers
counseling interview were randomly chosen by 2 graduate
students who were not familiar with the Carl Rogers film.
Each graduate student randomly selected the starting point,
in terms of minutes into the counseling interview, for the
other two 5-minute film segments. The starting points
were selected from two zones, one zone beginning at minute
5 and ending at minute 10 and the other zone beginning at
minute 15 and ending at minute 20. Minute 8 was selected
as the starting point for the first film segment and
minute 18 was selected as the starting point for the
second film segment. Hence, the other segments of the
filmed interview consisted of the 0-13 minute segment
and the 18-23 minute segment.

The following modifications of the film segments were
employed in order to provide for 5 different communication
channels:

For the vocal channel, subjects heard a tape recording
of the soundtrack (from a 5-minute film segment) that had
been subjected to band-pass filtering of all frequencies
above 500 Hz. This process has been used by Starkweather
(1956) and Strehar and Zytowski (1976) in order to eliminate
the lexical, or semantic, meaning while retaining the vocal and presumably the affective components of the speech.

For the visual channel, subjects were presented the film only, without hearing the soundtrack.

For the lexical channel, subjects read a typescript of the soundtrack. The typescripts are included in Appendix A.

For the vocal-lexical channel, subjects heard an unfiltered tape recording of the soundtrack.

For the visual-vocal-lexical channel, subjects were presented the film segment intact, thereby receiving a combination of visual, vocal, and lexical cues.

Dependent Variables

After being exposed to a 5-minute counseling segment, subjects evaluated the counselor, Carl Rogers, on the following 10 dimensions, of which 8 of them were chosen by Strahan and Zytowski as representative of the Counselor Effectiveness Scale (Ivey, 1971). The Counselor Effectiveness Scale was shown by Ivey to possess high inter-rater reliability. Following the Strahan and Zytowski study, the genuine and caring dimensions were added in accordance with the writings of Truax and Carkhuff (1967) and Meador and Rogers (1973).
The items were:

- not at all genuine—very genuine
- decisive—indecisive
- not at all caring—very caring
- strong—weak
- passive—active
- competent—inept
- not at all warm—very warm
- close—distant
- deep—shallow
- not at all understanding—very understanding

Each pair of descriptions were presented as shown on a 1-99 scale, with 50 implied as a point of intermediateness.

The subjects also evaluated the counselor on the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), an instrument employed in previous research (Barak and Lacrosse, 1975) and slightly modified by LaCrosse and Barak (1976). The CRF is a questionnaire containing 36 bipolar semantic-differential items on a 7-point scale; the CRF measures the dimensions of expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Each of these dimensions is assessed by 12 items and the items are randomly distributed throughout the list. The complete list of the items for both rating forms may be found in Appendix B.

Procedure

Five groups, one for each channel of communication were formed for each of the three respective film segments.
In addition, the groups were divided according to sex, making a total of thirty experimental groups. The experimental conditions were run individually and the groups were assigned at random to the experimental conditions. Subjects were told that the purpose of the study was to assess the relative importance of visual, vocal, and lexical cues on the perception of a counselor (not identified by name) and that they will rate a counselor on a number of dimensions after being exposed to a segment of a counseling interview. The experimenter asked the subjects if they had any questions concerning their task in the experiment.

For the lexical or "written" group, the subjects were instructed that they will have 10 minutes to read the typescript of the interview, and that once finished with it, they are not to return to the typescript. Since the subjects in the other four presentation conditions had no written stimuli, the experimenter explained to them that they will view and/or hear a 5-minute segment of a counseling interview.

After subjects were given the appropriate stimulus material, they were asked to rate the counselor on two different scales. They were told that one scale consists of 10 dimensions which will be rated on a 1-99 scale and that the other scale is a 7-point bipolar adjective scale.
containing 30 item pairs. They were also asked to use the 1-99 scale to reflect the confidence they felt in the ratings they had just made. Following the rating tasks, all groups but the visual-vocal-lexical group viewed the segment of the film intact and again made ratings for the dependent variables. Each experimental group completed their task in approximately 30 minutes.

Statistical Analyses

The present study employed a MANOVA for the factors communication channel, film segment, and sex. MANOVA was performed on the initial ratings of the dependent variables, including the ratings of confidence. In this fashion, the study was able to test for significant cues of communication effects, significant interview segment effects, significant sex effects, and significant interaction effects.

Another MANOVA was performed on the final ratings (which were made after the experimental groups viewed the film segment intact) in order to examine if any differences generated by the treatment manipulations persisted when the limited-input groups received the additional stimuli.

In addition, a MANOVA investigated how initial perceptions, i.e., the initial ratings, compared with those based on additional information, i.e., the final ratings.
Hypotheses

The study tested the hypothesis that similar ratings of the counselor would be found across the film segments of the same counseling interview; the present investigation expected similar findings as were found in the Strehan and Zytowski study for that Carl Rogers counseling segment. Thus, it was expected that the general results of the Strehan and Zytowski study would be replicated and extended into other segments of the counseling interview. In other words, it was hypothesized that the relative impact of communicative cues on the perception of counselor qualities would be consistent within the same interview. The study posited no specific hypotheses with regard to the differential effects of the communication channels for the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Comparisons of Means

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the initial ratings of the thirteen dependent variables and the ratings of confidence. Communication channel, film segment, sex, Communication channel × Film segment interaction, Communication channel × Sex interaction, Film segment × Sex interaction, and the Communication channel × Film segment × Sex interaction were the effects investigated.

Based on Olson's (1976) review of the statistical literature concerning the power and robustness of the most promising test statistics, the Pillai test statistic was used. There was an overall significance for the factors, communication channel, $F(16, 816) = 2.33, p < .001$, and film segment, $F(28, 108) = 2.92, p < .001$. There were no overall significant sex effect nor any significant interaction effects. Following significant overall MANOVAs, the separate univariate ANOVAs of the dependent variables were examined. Following the significant ANOVAs, Newman-Keuls' pair-wise comparisons were employed, using the harmonic mean modification (Winer, 1967). Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations for the thirty subject groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Film Segment #1</th>
<th>Film Segment #2</th>
<th>Film Segment #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n=10)</td>
<td>Female (n=9)</td>
<td>Male (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genuine</strong></td>
<td>55.8 (25.9)</td>
<td>67.0 (26.3)</td>
<td>57.8 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indecisive</strong></td>
<td>37.6 (26.2)</td>
<td>37.4 (17.1)</td>
<td>36.2 (18.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caring</strong></td>
<td>70.5 (27.1)</td>
<td>73.1 (20.1)</td>
<td>68.4 (21.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td>31.8 (26.4)</td>
<td>29.3 (16.6)</td>
<td>37.0 (22.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td>54.7 (29.9)</td>
<td>56.1 (25.6)</td>
<td>56.6 (31.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incompetent</strong></td>
<td>41.3 (28.5)</td>
<td>28.0 (12.3)</td>
<td>29.1 (21.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warm</strong></td>
<td>55.9 (32.4)</td>
<td>66.0 (21.5)</td>
<td>65.2 (25.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distant</strong></td>
<td>47.8 (35.9)</td>
<td>29.9 (10.0)</td>
<td>38.5 (22.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shallow</strong></td>
<td>45.5 (30.4)</td>
<td>36.4 (17.0)</td>
<td>43.0 (18.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td>65.3 (25.9)</td>
<td>70.0 (11.3)</td>
<td>62.5 (21.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attractive</strong></td>
<td>55.2 (17.9)</td>
<td>41.5 (12.8)</td>
<td>53.3 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert</strong></td>
<td>61.4 (11.2)</td>
<td>68.6 (9.1)</td>
<td>63.3 (9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustworthy</strong></td>
<td>68.3 (12.3)</td>
<td>68.9 (12.7)</td>
<td>61.0 (8.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td>52.9 (26.5)</td>
<td>75.8 (18.1)</td>
<td>52.0 (22.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocal</th>
<th>Film Segment #1</th>
<th>Film Segment #2</th>
<th>Film Segment #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n=6)</td>
<td>Male (n=6)</td>
<td>Male (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecisive</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=9)</td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td>59.7 (21.5)</td>
<td>61.9 (20.6)</td>
<td>67.4 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecisive</td>
<td>51.5 (27.6)</td>
<td>39.1 (20.6)</td>
<td>42.0 (35.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>61.2 (34.2)</td>
<td>60.1 (38.1)</td>
<td>67.3 (34.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>27.2 (27.6)</td>
<td>27.0 (37.4)</td>
<td>56.5 (32.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>0.0 (21.8)</td>
<td>0.5 (21.8)</td>
<td>0.4 (20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>39.0 (26.4)</td>
<td>35.6 (11.1)</td>
<td>56.1 (25.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>0.7 (18.1)</td>
<td>0.7 (22.7)</td>
<td>0.5 (19.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>0.9 (20.4)</td>
<td>1.7 (21.2)</td>
<td>5.5 (23.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow</td>
<td>39.2 (10.9)</td>
<td>55.6 (10.5)</td>
<td>49.4 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>61.8 (29.9)</td>
<td>63.9 (22.2)</td>
<td>50.9 (30.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>56.7 (39.1)</td>
<td>51.7 (17.2)</td>
<td>46.6 (13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>63.2 (15.6)</td>
<td>65.3 (12.9)</td>
<td>50.0 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>60.5 (14.2)</td>
<td>61.3 (9.5)</td>
<td>51.0 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>44.5 (21.1)</td>
<td>74.6 (11.7)</td>
<td>49.6 (14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>30.5 (21.1)</td>
<td>27.5 (14.7)</td>
<td>32.5 (21.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocal-Lexical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n=5)</td>
<td>Female (n=7)</td>
<td>Male (n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genuine</strong></td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.0)</td>
<td>(20.4)</td>
<td>(21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indecisive</strong></td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.6)</td>
<td>(20.9)</td>
<td>(20.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caring</strong></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25.2)</td>
<td>(21.5)</td>
<td>(29.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23.8)</td>
<td>(21.5)</td>
<td>(29.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26.8)</td>
<td>(28.1)</td>
<td>(36.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incompetent</strong></td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.9)</td>
<td>(22.9)</td>
<td>(28.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warm</strong></td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.6)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distant</strong></td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.4)</td>
<td>(23.9)</td>
<td>(25.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shallow</strong></td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.4)</td>
<td>(29.2)</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.2)</td>
<td>(13.6)</td>
<td>(27.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attractive</strong></td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.0)</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
<td>(12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert</strong></td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.6)</td>
<td>(16.9)</td>
<td>(16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustworthy</strong></td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.6)</td>
<td>(14.4)</td>
<td>(13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratings</strong></td>
<td>(15.6)</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(17.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual-Vocal-Lexical</strong></td>
<td><strong>Film Segment #1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Film Segment #2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Film Segment #3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19.4)</td>
<td>(20.4)</td>
<td>(20.9)</td>
<td>(15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecisiveness</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18.9)</td>
<td>(16.5)</td>
<td>(20.9)</td>
<td>(12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caringness</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.8)</td>
<td>(29.6)</td>
<td>(25.4)</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.5)</td>
<td>(33.1)</td>
<td>(17.7)</td>
<td>(26.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(21.2)</td>
<td>(23.1)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.2)</td>
<td>(13.9)</td>
<td>(10.9)</td>
<td>(25.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctness</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17.5)</td>
<td>(19.9)</td>
<td>(15.7)</td>
<td>(19.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallowness</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.2)</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(38.6)</td>
<td>(17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.1)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(17.6)</td>
<td>(27.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.9)</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
<td>(7.9)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.2)</td>
<td>(13.1)</td>
<td>(11.3)</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(13.2)</td>
<td>(10.9)</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21.2)</td>
<td>(41.5)</td>
<td>(13.4)</td>
<td>(25.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An examination of the ANOVAs for the communication channel factor found treatment effects for five of the dependent variables and the ratings of confidence. Communication channel effects were found for the variables, indecisive, active, incompetent, expert, and trustworthy.

For the variable indecisive, $F(1, 21) = 3.85, p < .01$, subjects in the visual channel rated Rogers as less indecisive than did the vocal-lexical ($p < .01$) group. For the variable active, $F(1, 21) = 3.12, p < .05$, subjects in the rated Rogers as more active than did the subjects in the visual-vocal-lexical ($p < .05$) group. For the variable incompetent, $F(1, 21) = 2.56, p < .05$, subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as less incompetent than did subjects in the other groups, although there were no significant differences between any of the groups.

For the variable expert, $F(1, 21) = 6.23, p < .001$, subjects in the visual and visual-vocal-lexical conditions rated Rogers as more expert than did subjects in the vocal, lexical, and vocal-lexical (all at $p < .05$) conditions. For the variable trustworthy, $F(1, 21) = 4.51, p < .01$, subjects in the visual condition rated Rogers as more trustworthy than did subjects in the vocal ($p < .05$) group and the subjects in the visual-vocal-lexical group rated Rogers as more trustworthy than did subjects in the vocal, lexical, and vocal-lexical conditions ($p < .05$). In general, then, subjects
in the visual group tended to rate Rogers more favorably than the other groups.

For the confidence ratings, $F(1, 21) = 9.55$, $p < .001$, subjects in the vocal and visual conditions were less confident in their ratings than were subjects in the lexical ($p < .01$), vocal-lexical ($p < .01$), and visual-vocal-lexical ($p < .05$) conditions.

An examination of the ANOVAs for the film segment factor found treatment effects for five of the dependent variables. Film segment effects were found for the variables caring, warm, distant, understanding, and attractive.

For the variable caring, $F(2, 21) = 3.40$, $p < .05$, subjects in the third film segment, the last five minutes of the interview, rated Rogers as more caring than did subjects in the first segment ($p < .05$). For the variable warm, $F(2, 21) = 4.19$, $p < .001$, subjects in the third segment rated Rogers as more warm than did subjects in the first ($p < .01$) and second ($p < .05$) film segment groups. For the variable distant, $F(2, 21) = 8.10$, $p < .01$, subjects in the third segment rated Rogers as less distant than did subjects in the first ($p < .05$) and second ($p < .05$) film segments. For the variable understanding, $F(2, 21) = 5.89$, $p < .01$, subjects in the third segment rated Rogers as more understanding than did subjects in the first ($p < .01$) and second film segments ($p < .01$). Similarly, for the variable attractive, $F(2, 21) = $
$p < .01$, subjects in the third segment rated Rogers as more attractive than did subjects in the other two film segment conditions ($p < .01$). In general, a clear-cut pattern was revealed in which the third film segment (last five minutes of the interview) elicited more favorable ratings than did the other two film segments.

A MANOVA was also performed on the final ratings of the dependent variables, those made after viewing the film segment intact. There was an overall significance for the factors, communication channel, $F(2, 371) = 1.52$, $p < .05$, and film segment, $F(2, 371) = 1.84$, $p < .01$. An examination of the ANOVAs for the communication channel factor found a treatment effect for the dependent variable active, $F(3, 169) = 3.06$, $p < .05$. An examination of the ANOVAs for the film segment factor found treatment effects for the variables, warm, $F(2, 169) = 4.89$, $p < .001$, distant, $F(2, 169) = 9.28$, $p < .001$, shallow, $F(2, 169) = 1.87$, $p < .05$, understanding, $F(2, 169) = 5.57$, $p < .01$, and attractive, $F(2, 169) = 6.87$, $p < .001$. Thus, the differences generated by the treatment manipulations, in particular, the film segment differences, did persist when the limited-input groups received all stimuli information.

**Initial-Final Mean Shifts**

A MANOVA was also performed in order to investigate how initial perceptions compared with those based on added information. In this way, the initial and final ratings
of the dependent variables were tested for mean shifts. There was an overall significance for the communication channel factor, $F(1.2,174)=2.83$, $p<.001$, and for the Communication channel $X$ Film segment interaction, $F(1,900)=1.29$, $p<.05$. An examination of the ANOVAs for the communication channel factor found "shift" effects for the dependent variables, genuine, indecisive, caring, weak, active, warm, distant, understanding, attractive, expert, trustworthy, and for the ratings of confidence. Following the significant effects, Newman-Keuls' pair-wise comparisons were employed. An examination of the ANOVAs for the Communication channel $X$ Film segment interaction found interaction effects for the variables, caring, warm, distant, and attractive. Following the significant interaction effects, Scheffe's nonpair-wise comparisons were employed.

At the $p<.05$ significance level, subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as less genuine, more indecisive, weaker, less active, less understanding, and less expert when exposed to additional information than did subjects in the vocal, vocal-lexical, and lexical groups when exposed to the additional communicative cues. For the variable warm, subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as less warm when exposed to the additional information than did subjects in the vocal ($p<.05$) group. The interpretation here was qualified by a Communication channel $X$
Film segment interaction effect in which the subjects in the visual condition of only the first and second film segment groups rated Rogers as less warm after viewing the film segments intact than did the subjects in the other channel x segment groups (p<.05).

For the variable distant, subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as more distant than did the subjects in the vocal (p<.01) and lexical (p<.05) groups and the subjects in the vocal-lexical group rated Rogers as more distant than subjects in the vocal (p<.05) group when exposed to the additional information. There were also interaction effects in which subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as more distant than the other communicative channels (p<.05) for the first film segment and the subjects in the vocal group rated Rogers as less distant than the other groups (p<.05) for the third film segment.

For the variable attractive, subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as less attractive than did the subjects in the vocal (p<.05) group after receiving the additional information. The interpretation here was qualified by an interaction effect in which the subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as less attractive than the other groups (p<.05) but only for the first film segment.

For the variable trustworthy, subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as less trustworthy when exposed to the
additional stimuli than did the subjects in the vocal (p<.01) and vocal-lexical (p<.05) groups. Also, the subjects in the lexical group rated Rogers as less trustworthy than did the subjects in the vocal (p<.05) group after receiving the additional stimuli.

For the variable caring, although there were no significant differences between the respective communication channels, subjects in the visual group rated Rogers as less caring than did subjects in the other groups when exposed to the additional information. There was, however, a significant channel×segment interaction effect in which the subjects in the visual condition who viewed the first film segment rated Rogers as less caring when exposed to the additional information than did subjects in the other groups.

In short, the visual group generally rated Rogers less favorably than did the other groups when exposed to the additional stimuli. Furthermore, where there was an interaction effect, subjects in the visual condition, in particular, rated Rogers as less favorably for the first film segment. The groups that gave Rogers more favorable ratings when exposed to the additional communicative cues were the vocal and vocal-lexical groups.

For the confidence ratings, subjects in the visual and vocal groups were more confident of their ratings than
were the subjects in the lexical (p < .01) and vocal-lexical (p < .01) groups after receiving the additional stimuli.

Correlational Analysis

Correlations (adjusted for the effects of sex, communication, and film stem condition) were examined in order to determine the extent of redundancy among the thirteen dependent variables. The results revealed two major groupings among the dependent measures. One major grouping consisted of positive characteristics, i.e., the variables, genuine, caring, warm, understanding, expert, attractive, and trustworthy. The other major set of related variables consisted of the more negative variables of indecisive, weak, incompetent, distant, and shallow. The variable active did not highly correlate with either of these major groupings.

Although the correlations among these variables within the two major groupings were significant due to the large sample size (N = 204), there were some differences in magnitude of correlation among the variables within a major grouping. For instance, the variables, weak, incompetent, and shallow were more highly intercorrelated with each other (correlations ranging from .52 to .61) than they were with the variables, indecisive and distant. Moreover, the variables, indecisive and distant did not correlate as highly with each other as did the variables, weak,
incompetent, and shallow. In contrast, the variables within the other major grouping (genuine, caring, warm, understanding, attractive, expert, and trustworthy) all had substantial correlations with each other (correlations ranging from .47 to .79). With regards to the variables, attractive, expert, and trustworthy, trustworthy was more intercorrelated with the variables, attractive and expert ($r = .73$ and $r = .79$, respectively) than was attractive correlated with expert ($r = .57$).
The results of the investigation failed to support the hypotheses. It was hypothesized that the general results of the Strahan and Zytowski (1976) study would be replicated and extended into other segments of the counseling interview. Not only did the results fail to support the expectation that similar ratings would be found across the three film segments but the results also did not replicate the Strahan and Zytowski findings. Thus, the relative impact of communicative cues on the judgments of counselor qualities was not consistent within the same interview.

The present study found different results concerning the relative impact of communicative cues from the Strahan and Zytowski investigation. To briefly recapitulate, Strahan and Zytowski found that lexical cues were important in creating favorable impressions among female subjects. Strahan and Zytowski also found that female subjects in the vocal group (the filtered recording condition) tended to give Rogers unfavorable ratings. The results were less clear-cut for males.

The results of the present investigation, however, demonstrated that visual cues were important in creating favorable impressions. Both male and female subjects,
who viewed a film segment without the sound, rated Rogers as more positive on five of the dependent measures. These five dependent measures, indecisive, active, incompetent, expert, and trustworthy, were all the dependent variables in which the communication channel exerted a significant effect upon the ratings. This finding suggests that such nonverbal cues as bodily gestures, facial expressions, posture are definitely important in the perception of counselor qualities.

Such a finding lends added significance to the findings of previous studies (Pretz, 1966; Haase and Tepper, 1972; Isalander, 1967; Kelly, 1972; Mehrabian, 1970; Smith-Hanes, 1977) dealing with kinesic and/or proxemic behavior. The visual-vocal-lexical channel also led to favorable ratings for only two of the dependent variables, expert and trustworthy. It seems that the addition of visual cues to vocal and lexical cues led to a more favorable impression with regard to the expert and trustworthy counseling dimensions. This again underlines the importance of a counselor's kinesic and proxemic behavior. Thus, the type of communicative cues received—visual, vocal, lexical, vocal-lexical, or total visual-vocal-lexical—appeared to lead to varying opinions of the same counselor.

The results revealed that for all five of the dependent variables, caring, warm, distant, understanding, attractive,
in which the film segment exerted a significant effect, Rogers was rated more favorably in the third film segment (the last five minutes of the interview) than in the other two film segments. There was a consistent pattern in which Rogers was rated more favorably as the counseling interview progressed toward its termination. Furthermore, there was more of a difference between the second and third film segments than between the first and second segments. The favorable ratings given Rogers in the last five minutes of the interview are not surprising when viewed in light of Mador's statement (Mador and Rogers, 1973) that this segment is an example of Rogers at his best, a demonstration of the facilitative conditions of the client-centered approach that promote psychological growth.

The significant film segment effect suggests that a counselor may behave differently, verbally and nonverbally, in different portions of a counseling interview. One cannot generalize the results of a study, or the behavior of a counselor, from part of a counseling interview to the overall session. Such a finding has implications for the training of counselors. Deficiencies and proficiencies of counselors-in-training may vary across portions of the counseling session. For example, a future counselor may be less empathic in the beginning of an interview than when terminating an interview, or vice-versa. It would
then be imperative for supervisors and trainees to work on overcoming these deficiencies by concentrating their efforts into the areas where considerable improvement may be achieved.

The strength of the film segment effect is underlined by the MANOVA performed on the final ratings, i.e., the ratings made after viewing the film intact. Unlike the Strahan and Zytowski study, the present investigation found a significant communication channel effect and it also found a significant film segment effect. An examination of the separate univariate ANOVAs revealed a communication channel effect for only one variable, active, whereas the different film segments had a significant effect on five variables, warm, distant, shallow, understanding, and attractive. This implies that the communication channels were losing their effect while the different film segments were still exerting a strong effect on the perception of counselor qualities. This argument makes intuitive sense since all groups' final ratings were based on a total combination of visual, vocal, and lexical cues and the film segment groups were still based on their each respective segment. Thus, the differences generated by the different film segments persisted when the limited-input groups received all stimuli information.

For the confidence ratings, the results revealed that
the vocal (filtered speech) and visual conditions produced lower confidence ratings than the lexical, vocal-lexical, and visual-vocal-lexical conditions. One would intuitively expect such a finding since the vocal and visual cues are vaguer and more ambiguous than the lexical cues or the lexical cues in combination with other cues. Moreover, one would expect that additional stimuli (two or three cues as opposed to one) would increase the confidence ratings. The Strahan and Zytowski study, however, reported a somewhat different finding in that only females in the vocal condition had lower confidence ratings.

The MANOVA performed on the mean shifts revealed that additional information had interesting effects upon subjects' ratings, particularly for the visual condition. In general, subjects in the visual group rated Rogers less favorably, i.e., less genuine, less warm, more indecisive, weaker, less active, more distant, less understanding, less attractive, less expert, when exposed to the additional information. The subjects in the visual group gave unfavorable ratings particularly for the first film segment after exposure to the total combination of visual-vocal-lexical cues for the variables, caring, warm, distant, and attractive.

The groups that tended to give Rogers more favorable ratings when exposed to additional communicative cues were
the vocal and vocal-lexical groups. For the vocal group, the addition of visual and lexical cues, and for the vocal-lexical group, the addition of visual cues produced more favorable ratings than the ratings based on partial information. This does not suggest that additional information produces more positive ratings, as evidenced by the visual group viewing Rogers more unfavorably when exposed to the additional cues. Here the addition of sound and semantic content apparently lessened the positive impact of the visual cues. It appears that sometimes cues from one information source may elicit more positive reaction than cues from combined sources. As Strehen and Zutowski point out, the whole, in such cases, may sometimes be less than one of its parts.

Such comparisons of initial and final ratings suggest that the total impression of counselor qualities is not simply the summation of impressions received from different communicative sources. Apparently, impressions received from different communicative cues may interact with each other in a complex fashion. For instance, some communicative cues may have less impact in combination with other cues than they might have had singly. The communication of verbal and nonverbal cues in counseling is indeed a complex process.

Apparently, visual cues play a large role in the
perception of counselor qualities. The present study demonstrated that visual cues have more of an impact than other cues and more of an impact than cues in combination with each other. The results of the MANOVA performed on the initial-final mean shifts, coupled with the results of the MANOVA performed on the initial ratings, help support Mehrabian and Ferris' (1967) suggestion. On the basis of findings from two investigations (Mehrabian and Ferris, 1967; Mehrabian and Wiener, 1967), Mehrabian and Ferris suggested that the relative impact of vocal, visual, and content cues were as follows: 

\[ \text{ATotal} = 0.07 \text{Verbal} + 0.38 \text{Vocal} + 0.55 \text{Facial} \].

The present study enables one to generalize Mehrabian's equation to the counseling situation, particularly the facial component, a visual cue. The Strahen and Zytowski study, on the other hand, suggested that what the counselor says still plays a major role with the way a counselor is perceived since in their study, lexical cues were important in creating impressions.

An area of agreement between the present investigation and the Strahen and Zytowski study is the correlational analysis of the dependent variables. In both investigations, the variables, genuine, caring, warm, and understanding were highly correlated with each other as were the variables weak and incompetent. The correlations
between the variables, attractive, expert, and trustworthy, in which trustworthy was more correlated with the variables attractive and expert than was attractive correlated with expert, are in agreement with the Barak and LaCrosse (1975) study. Any comparison between the present investigation and the Strahan and Zytowski study must take into account a methodological difference between the two studies. In the present study, the relative impact of the communicative cues was based on three different film segments whereas in the Strahan and Zytowski study, the results were based on one of those film segments.

Limitations, Implications for Future Research

The investigation of the differential impact of communicative cues is considerably hampered when the same cues from the same counselor lead to varying opinions from one study to another. An investigation of this question is further complicated by the fact, as demonstrated in the present study, that different film segments of the same counseling interview lead to varying opinions of the counselor.

Generalizations of the results of this study is difficult. Would other counselors be given similar ratings? Do other counselors give different impressions in different portions of a counseling interview? What impact do
theoretical approaches have? Clearly, counselors vary widely in their use of communicative cues. Furthermore, a single counselor may vary on verbal and nonverbal characteristics within the same interview. Generalization is even more uncertain when findings cannot be replicated. There is clearly a need for further research along these lines. The relative impact of communicative cues in counseling appears to be a more complex proposition than some research in interpersonal communication would suggest.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The purpose of the present study was to replicate and extend the Strehan and Zytowski (1976) study which investigated the relative impact of visual, vocal, and lexical cues on judgments of counselor qualities. Male and female undergraduates rated Carl Rogers on a number of counseling-relevant dimensions. Experimental treatment groups received information via the visual, vocal, lexical, vocal-lexical, or the natural visual-vocal-lexical communication channel for one of three different film segments taken from the same counseling session.

The results failed to support the hypothesis that the general results of the Strehan and Zytowski study would be replicated and extended into other segments of the counseling interview. The relative impact of communicative cues on the judgments of counselor qualities was not consistent within the same counseling interview. Rogers was rated most favorably in the third film segment, the last five minutes of the interview, than in the other two film segments on the dimensions of caring, warm, distant, understanding and attractive.

Visual cues seemed particularly important in creating
favorable impressions on the dimensions of indecisive, active, incompetent, expert, and trustworthy. When experimental groups were later exposed to visual-vocal-lexical cues in combination, the subjects in the vocal and vocal-lexical groups gave Rogers more favorable ratings whereas the subjects in the visual group rated Rogers less favorably when exposed to the additional cues. Results suggest that the relative impact of communicative cues in counseling is a complex process.
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Gloria: Either I want to become perfect in my standards or not have that need anymore.

Counselor: Or, I guess I hear it a little differently—that what you want is to seem perfect, what it means, it's a matter of great importance to you to be a good mother and you want to seem to be a good mother even though some of your actual feelings differ from that. . . . Does that catch it or not?

Gloria: That isn't what I'm saying. No, that isn't what I feel. I want to approve of me always but my actions won't let me. I want to approve of me. . . . I, I think...

Counselor: I realize... . . . Let me understand that. You sound as though your actions are outside of you. You want to approve of you but what you do, somehow, won't let you approve of yourself.

Gloria: Right, like I feel can I approve of myself, regarding, for example, my sex life? This is the big thing. If I really fell in love with a man and I respected him and adored him, I don't think I'll feel so guilty about going to bed with him and I don't think I'll have to make up any excuses to the children because they can see my natural caring for him. But when I have the physical desire and I'll say, "Oh, why not" and I want to anyway, then I feel guilty afterwards. I hate faking the kids; I don't like looking at myself and I rarely enjoy it.

Counselor: N-n-n.

Gloria: This is what I mean. If the circumstances would be different, I don't think I'll feel so guilty because I'd feel right about it.

Counselor: Yeah, I guess I hear you saying it. If what I was doing in going to bed with a man was real genuine and full of love and respect and so on, I wouldn't feel guilty in relation to myself. I really would be comfortable with the situation.

Gloria: That's how I feel, yes. I know that sounds like I want a perfect situation but that is how I feel. And in the meantime, I can't stop these desires. I've tried that also. I've tried saying, "Oh, I don't like myself when I do that so I won't do it anymore." But then I resent the children; I think why shouldn't they stop me about doing what I want and it's really not that bad.

Counselor: But I guess I heard you saying that it isn't only the children but you don't like it as well as when it really isn't...

Gloria: I'm sure that's it, probably more so than I'm aware of but I only notice it when I pick it up in the children, then I can also notice it in myself.
Counselor: M-hm. And somehow, sometimes you kind of feel like blazing them for the feeling you have. I mean, why should they cut you off from a normal sex life.

Gloria: Well, a sex life, I could say not normal because there's something about me that says that it's not very healthy to just go into sex because you feel physically attractive or something or a physical need. Something tells me that that's not quite right anyway.

Counselor: M-hm, M-hm. So that you feel, at times, that you are acting in ways that are not in accord with your own inner standards.

Gloria: Right. Right.

Counselor: M-hm. But then you were also saying a minute ago that you can't help that.

Gloria: I wish I could. It's it and I can't. Now I feel like I can't control myself as well as I could before for a specific reason. Now, I just let go and there's too many things that I do wrong that I have to feel guilty for and I sure don't like that. I want you, very much, to give me a direct answer and I'm going to ask it and I don't expect a direct answer. I want to know, 'Do you feel that the most important thing, to me, is to be open and honest? and if I can be open and honest with my children, do you feel that it can harm them?' If, for example, I can say to Penny, 'I fell bad lying to you Penny and I want to tell you the truth now.' And if I tell her the truth and she's upset and she's shocked at me, do you think that can bother her more? I want to get rid of my guilt and that'll help me but I don't want to put them on her.

Counselor: That's right.

Gloria: Do you feel that can hurt her?

Counselor: That's a real concern. I guess, I'm sure this will sound evasive to you, but it seems to me that perhaps the person you are not being fully honest with is you, because I was very much struck by the fact that you were saying, 'If I feel all right about what I've done, whether it's going to bed with a man or what, if I really feel all right about it, then I don't have any concern about what I would tell Pam or my relationship with her.'

Gloria: Right. All right. Now I hear what you are saying. Then all right, then I want to work on accepting me then. I want to work on feeling all right about it. That makes sense. Because then that will come natural and then I won't have to worry about Pam. But when things seem so wrong for me and I have a impulse to do such, how can I accept that?

Counselor: What you would like to do is to feel more accepting towards yourself...
Counselor: I guess that's what I meant when I said that life is risky—
it's to take the responsibility for being the person you
would like to be with her is a hell of a responsibility.

Gloria: It is.

Counselor: A very frightening one.

Gloria: And you know, I look at it two ways. I'd like to see myself
as being so honest with the kids and really being proud of
myself so that no matter what I told them or no matter how bad
they might think I was, I was honest.

Counselor: M-hm.

Gloria: And down deep, it will be a much more wholesome relationship.
And yet you know, I get jealous of, like when they are with
their daddy, I feel that he's more loved; he's not quite as
real. He's not quite as honest but nevertheless they see a
sweet picture of their dad—you know, he's all goodness and
nice. And I'm envious of that too.

Counselor: M-hm.

Gloria: I want them to see me just as sweet as they see him. And yet,
I know that he is not quite as real with them.

Counselor: M-hm.

Gloria: So, it seems like I've got to swap times for the other.

Counselor: M-hm.

Gloria: And I know that this is really what I want the most. I miss
some of that glory.

Counselor: You sort of feel, I want them to have just a nice a picture
of me as they have of their dad and if his is a little
phony, then maybe mine will have to be too.

Gloria: I think that it's putting it a little too strongly.

Counselor: That's close. That is what I mean. And I know she can't
have that picture of me if I was honest. Besides, I do feel
that I'm a little more ornery than their dad anyway, so I'm
more likely to do more things that they disapprove of.

Counselor: M-hm. Sounds as though you find it quite hard to believe
that they would really love you if they knew you.

Gloria: That's right. You know, that's exactly it. Before thereby,
I would have definitely chosen the other area, I'm going to
get respect from them, no matter what, even if I have to lie.

Counselor: I see.
Gloria: Right now, I know that that's not true. And I'm not positive that they will truly accept me.

Counselor: Mm-hmm.

Gloria: Something tells me that they will but I'm not positive. I want reassurance. I keep wanting those things.

Counselor: Mm-hmm. Now, you are in kind of a no-man's land of probably shifting from one class to another but boy, you'd sure like somebody to say, 'That's right, you go ahead and do it.'

Gloria: Yeah, that's why I get encouragement from somebody I read in a book that I respect and admire—that this is the right thing no matter what—that honesty will win out. That keeps giving me confidence—by gosh, I'm right.

Counselor: It's so damn hard to really choose something on your own, isn't it?

Gloria: Which makes me feel immature—I don't like this in me, I mean. I wish I was mature enough to make decisions and stick by them. But I need somebody to help me on, somebody to push me.

Counselor: Mmm. So, that you can't ever approach yourself for that and feel, why if I was anybody, or if I was grown up, I'd be mature enough to decide things like this for myself.

Gloria: Right. Right. And take more risks, I wish I'd take more risks. I wish that I can just go ahead and be this end say, however the kids grow up, I've done my best. I did not constantly have to have this conflict. I'd like to say in later years, that no matter what you asked me kids, at least I told them the truth; you may not have liked it but it's been the truth. That someday I can admire.

Counselor: Mmm.

Gloria: I disagree with people that lie. I hate it. So, you can see what a double-bind I am in. I hate myself if I'm bad but I also hate myself if I lie. So, it's accepting—I want to become more accepting.

Counselor: I guess judging from your tone of voice, you sound as though you hate yourself more when you lie than when you do in terms of things you disagree of.

Gloria: I do. I do. Because this is what really bothered me. This is what happened with Penny about a month ago. And it keeps coming in my mind. I don't know if I should go back and talk to her about it, or wait, she may even forgotten what she asked me. But...

Counselor: The point is you haven't forgotten.
Gloria: No, I haven't. And I'm like least to tell her that I remembered lying—I'm sorry I lied and it's been driving me bugs because I did. I feel now that that's solved and I didn't even solved the thing but I feel relieved.


Gloria: I--I to feel like you've been saying to me--you are not giving me advice, but I feel like you are saying, "You really know what pattern you wanna follow, Gloria, and go ahead and follow it." I sort of feel a backing up from you.

Counselor: I guess the way I sense it is, you've been telling me that you know what you want to do, and yes, I do believe in backing up people in what they want to do. It's just a little different slant from the way it seems to me.

Gloria: Are you telling me...

Counselor: 'Cause you see, one thing that concerns me is--it's no damn good--your doing something that you haven't really chosen to do. That's why I'm trying to help you find out what your own inner choices are.

Gloria: But then there's also a conflict there because I'm not really positive what I want to do—the lying part, yea—but I'm not positive what I want to do when I go against myself like when I bring a man to the house. I'm not sure I want to do that. I feel guilty afterwards. I must not have really wanted to.

Counselor: Yeah, I'm interested that you say, that you are not sure which way...

Gloria:
Counselor: But you're saying, too, that you know perfectly well the feeling within yourself that occurs when you're really doing something that's right for you.

Gloria: I do--I do. And I also feel that feeling other times and it's right away a clue to me.

Counselor: You can really listen to yourself sometimes and realize, "So, no, this isn't the right feeling--this isn't the way I would feel if I was doing what I really wanted to do."

Gloria: But yet many times I'll do along and do it anyway, and say "Oh well, I'm in the situation now--I'll just remember next time." ... I mention this word a lot in therapy and most therapists grim at me or giggle or something when I say "utopia," but when I do follow a feeling and I feel this good feeling inside me, that's sort of utopia--that's what I mean. That's the way I like to feel, whether it's a bad thing or a good thing. But I feel right about me.

Counselor: I sense that in those utopian moments you really feel kind of whole, you feel "all in one piece."

Gloria: Yeah, yeah. It gives me a choked up feeling when you say that because I don't get that as often as I'd like. I like that whole feeling, that's real precious to me.

Counselor: I expect none of us gets it as often as we'd like, but I really do understand that... that really does touch you, doesn't it?

Gloria: Yeah... And you know what else I was just thinking? I... a dumb thing... all of a sudden while I was talking to you, I thought, "Gee, how nice I can talk to you and I want you to accept me and I respect you. I miss that my father couldn't talk to me like you are." I mean, I'd like to say, "Gee, I'd like you for my father." ... I don't even know why that came to me.

Counselor: You look to me like a pretty nice daughter... . . . But you really do miss the fact that you couldn't be open with your own dad.

Gloria: Yeah, I couldn't be open, but I want to blame it on him, I think I'm more open than he'd allow me. I mean he would never listen to me talk like you are and not disapprove or say, you know, I think of this the other day, why do I always have to be so perfect? I know why--he always wanted me to be perfect. I always had to be better. And... yeah, I miss that.

Counselor: You're just trying like hell to be the girl he wants you to be.
Gloria: Yeah, and at the same time rebelling. Like I almost gloated, writing him a letter the other day and telling him I'm a Waltzes--which I expect him to disapprove of--I go out at nights. And I almost gloated, hitting him back, like now, how do you like me? Yet I really want acceptance and love from him. . . . I mean I know he loves me, but . . .

Counselor: So you slap at him and say, 'This is what I am now, see?' But underneath . . .

Gloria: Yeah, you raised me--how do you like it? But you know what I think I want him to say? 'I knew this was you all along, honey, and I really love you.'

Counselor: I guess you really feel badly that you think there's very little chance he'll say that.

Gloria: So, he won't. And he doesn't hear. I went back home to him about two years ago really wanting to let him know I loved him although I'd been afraid of him. And he doesn't hear me. He just keeps saying things like, 'Honey, you know I love you. You know I've always loved you.' And he doesn't hear.

Counselor: He's never really known you and loved you, and this somehow is what brings the tears inside.

Gloria: I don't know what it is. You know, when I talk about it, it feels more like a great big lump inside. It feels more like a great big lump down there and then I feel cheated.

Counselor: It's much easier to be a little flip because then you don't feel that big lump inside of hurt.

Gloria: And again, that's a hopeless situation. I tried working on it and I feel it's something I just have to accept--my father just isn't the type of man I'd really like. I'd like somebody who's more understanding and caring. He cares, but not in a way that we can communicate.

Counselor: You feel, "Hope, that I'm permanently cheated."

Gloria: Oh, hmm. That's why I like substitutes like . . . I like talking to you and I like men that I can respect--doctors--and I keep sort of maybe underneath feeling that we're real close to you, and it's sort of like a substitute father.

Counselor: I don't feel that's pretending.

Gloria: Well, you're not really my father.

Counselor: No, I mean about the real close business.

Gloria: Well, see, I sort of feel that's pretending too, because I can't expect you to feel very close to me. You don't know me that well.

Counselor: All I can do is what I am feeling, and that is I feel close to you in this moment.
Listed below are several scales that contain word pairs at either end of the scale and a line between the pairs. Please rate the counselor on each of these scales by placing a dot or mark on the following lines where you think it would most appropriately describe the counselor.

not at all genuine | very genuine
not at all decisive | indecisive
not at all caring | very caring
strong | weak
passive | active
incompetent | competent
not at all warm | very warm
close | distant
deep | shallow
not at all understanding | very understanding

How confident were you of these ratings?
not at all confident | very confident
Counselor Rating Form (CRF)

agreeable __________ disagreeable
unalert __________ alert
analytic __________ diffuse
unappreciative __________ appreciative
attractive __________ unattractive
formal __________
cheerful __________ depressed
vague __________ clear
distant __________ close
compatible __________ incompatible
unsure __________ confident
suspicious __________ believable
undependable __________ dependable
indifferent __________ enthusiastic
inexperienced __________ experienced
inexpert __________ expert
unfriendly __________ friendly
honest __________ dishonest
informed __________ ignorent
insightful __________ insightless
stupid __________ intelligent
unlikeable __________ likeable
logical __________ illogical
open __________ closed
prepared __________ unprepared
unreliable __________ reliable
disrespectful __________ respectful
irresponsible __________ responsible
selfless __________ selfish
sincere __________ insincere
skilful __________ unskilful
sociable __________ unsociable
decifull __________ straightforward
trustworthy __________ untrustworthy
genuine __________ phony
warm __________ cold