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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The counseling setting, with the ethical and practical issues accompanying it (such as confidentiality and the individual needs of the client), does not present itself as a readily available setting for experimental manipulation and research. Due to concerns for the welfare of the client and the image of the counselor and counseling, counselors and researchers alike have been reluctant to experiment in such a setting, even in the interest of developing new and better counseling techniques. As a result, the counseling analogue has emerged as a primary method for exploring the myriad of factors impinging on the counselor, the client, and their interaction. This method attempts to circumvent the ethical and practical problems inherent in manipulating counselors, clients, and treatment systems while affording a degree of experimental control unavailable in the actual counseling setting (Gelso, 1979).

Historically, it has been asserted that the price of such control has been paid in terms of limited generalizability to the natural setting (Munley, 1974). In order to maximize this generalizability, efforts have been made to approximate the actual counseling setting as closely as possible in research analogues. Kazdin (1978) has noted eight dimensions for evaluating therapy analogues in terms of generalizability to the natural setting. These are: target problem; the population; the manner of client recruitment; the therapists; the selection set and setting of treatment; the variation of
treatment used; and the assessment procedures used. Heller (1971) questioned the necessity of such a close approximation of actual counseling. He chose instead, to examine the underlying mechanisms of behavioral influence, not necessarily specific to counseling. Strong (1971) however, questioned the relevance of many obtained results because the manipulation of independent variables is often beyond the range found in the natural setting. It seems that the relevance of research relating to counseling phenomena may be increased if these phenomena are actually studied in the context of counseling.

Strong (1971) has gone on to delineate the factors affecting the relevance of analogue results to actual counseling. He maintained that laboratory results may have implications for counseling as a function of "bridging" theories which serve as a link between the research and counseling. Further, laboratory research should fulfill certain "boundary conditions" in order to be directly applicable to counseling. These conditions define counseling as:

(a) a conversation (b) between persons of unequal status (c) of some duration in which one participant (d) is motivated to change and (e) may be psychologically distressed. (p. 106)

In view of these conditions, most counseling analogues apparently have some implications for counseling in terms of their effect on some counseling theory but are often lacking in terms of direct applicability to counseling. Analogue research is particularly lacking as a result of failure to fulfill conditions (d) and (e) above (Munley, 1974).

Cowen (1961) noted similar conditions in his description of a counseling analogue. He referred to the client's role in an
analogue as including a feeling of stress or discomfort or some form of presenting difficulty or need to merit his or her presence in the counseling situation. Munley (1974) has noted that types of analogues seem to vary in their approximation of these conditions.

Lack of need, motivation, and/or presenting difficulty or stress (hereafter referred to collectively as need) in research subjects has been behaviorally evidenced through low subject involvement in the analogue. Ruppel (1979) specifically called for the closer approximation of actual clients in counseling research particularly in terms of subject involvement. As noted above, analogue type seems to have an effect on subject involvement. The client's feelings of understanding the counselor, of being understood and of being able to communicate with the counselor seems to be an essential element in commitment to counseling (involvement) (Mendelsohn and Getler, 1963; Strong, 1968). Heims (1976) found evidence that type of analogue may affect such perceptions of the counselor. On the other hand, Dell and LaCrosse (1978) found that type of analogue may directly affect subject involvement in the counseling process, with or without differential counselor perception. In a comparison of a quasi-counseling analogue with an audiovisual counseling analogue, they found no difference in subjects' ratings of counselors, but did find higher ratings of involvement by subjects in the quasi-counseling group than by those in the audiovisual group.

In the present study, three types of analogues were examined in terms of subjects' perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the interview, and level of subject involvement. These types
are vicarious, indirect and direct participation analogues in which the subjects viewed a videotape, responded to the counselor in the videotape, and talked directly with a counselor, respectively. The vicarious and direct analogues were selected as commonly utilized analogue research methods. The indirect participation analogue is being explored as a variation of the videotaped, vicarious participation analogue which may induce greater subject involvement.

Analogue research allows for the control of many process and outcome variables, including those related to counselor and interview characteristics. The approximation of client need and motivation in research subjects is considerably more difficult. Past researchers have cited difficulties in obtaining such subject need in a research experiment, particularly with volunteer university students as subjects (Heppner and Dixon, 1978; Ruppel, 1979). Given the ethical problems (and possible therapeutic dangers) inherent in the manipulation of actual clients for counseling research, this lack of need in research subjects is difficult to circumvent through the use of clients who are presumably in need. One alternative is to measure the levels of perceived need or difficulty already present in research subjects. Both objective and subjective determinants of need have been used (Heppner and Dixon, 1978; Ruppel, 1979).

An objective determinant of need in this case refers to a measure which provides a rating of need based on external criteria. Heppner and Dixon (1978) utilized an objective, pre-test measure of subjects' perceived need in the area of problem solving skills. This need distinction however, did not produce any significant results.
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A subjective determinant of need in this case refers to a measure through which the subject provides a rating of need based on internal criteria. This may be thought of as need felt by the subject of felt need. Ruppel (1979) attempted to produce high subject need by having his subjects select themselves as having a need in dealing with the problem of procrastination. This subjective method of need determination also did not produce any significant results.

This present study further explored the use of both objective and subjective measures of subject need. A subjective measure of need was used, not in terms of subject self-selection (as used by Ruppel, 1979) but by asking subjects to what extent the problem discussed in the analogue presented a problem for them, both in the present and in the past. An objective measure of need (as used by Heppner and Dixon, 1978) was also utilized, in the form of a pre-test measure of social anxiety.

In summary, the purpose of the present study was to explore analogue approximation of the natural setting in counseling. This approximation was examined in terms of subject involvement in the analogue and subject perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the interview. Subject involvement was explored as a function of analogue type and subject need as determined by objective and subjective measures. Subject perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the interview were assessed with a variety of measures. The Counselor Rating Form measures perceptions of counselor attractiveness, expertness and trustworthiness. The Interview Rating Scale measures the comfort level or climate of the interview. Other
measures included expectations of counselor helpfulness with specific problems, subject willingness to refer himself or others to see this or any counselor, and subject identification with the client.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The two general areas encompassed within this present study are types of counseling analogues and subject involvement in research analogues. Consequently, this review of literature will discuss research and theories in terms of these categories.

Counseling Analogues

Two major types of counseling analogues have received attention in the literature. In terms of Munley's (1974) classification scheme these are, the audiovisual analogue in which the subjects view a videotape of a counselor-client interaction (e.g. Barak and Dell, 1977; Kaul and Schmidt, 1971) and the quasi-counseling interview, in which subjects take part in a simulated counseling interview (e.g. Dell, 1973; Strong and Dixon, 1971). These are referred to in the present study as vicarious participation and direct participation, respectively.

The audiovisual analogue has been criticized by Munley (1974) in terms of Strong's (1971) criteria of approximation to an actual counseling setting, as lacking in duration, degree of subject participation, motivation to change, and psychological distress. The quasi-counseling interview has also been criticized in terms of approximating an actual counseling setting, albeit somewhat more mildly, but nevertheless as also lacking in degree of subject psychological distress, motivation to seek counseling and motivation to change. Counseling analogues have been noted to cover a continuum
of subject participation ranging from no interaction in the analogue (vicarious participation) to actual subject involvement in quasi-counseling (Helms, 1976; Zytowski, 1966).

These theoretical considerations and criticisms of counseling analogues have stimulated some comparisons of different types of analogues. Helms (1976) had 85 male and female undergraduates either take part in a quasi-counseling interview or listen to an audiotape of a counseling interaction (vicarious participation). She compared subjects' attraction to the counselor, self-reported and physiological anxiety and susceptibility to persuasion. The results indicated that subjects in the quasi-counseling interview evaluated the counselor more positively than did subjects who listened to an audiotape of the same interview. An explanation offered for these results was that subjects in the quasi-counseling interview may have exaggerated the counselor’s attractiveness to justify their own participation. This study may also be criticized in that it presented subjects in the vicarious participation group with audio- as opposed to video-taped stimuli, so that there was a greater degree of difference between the two analogues than just subject participation.

Carrying this line of research a bit further, Dell and LaCrosse (1978) conducted a comparative study of audiovisual versus quasi-counseling analogues. They investigated differences in perceptions of counselors among subjects who engaged in a quasi-counseling interview or who observed that interview via a one-way mirror or on closed circuit television. Counselors of three levels of experience were used and the forty-two subjects in each condition were divided
among these counselors. While interviewees ratings of involvement were significantly greater than those of either group of observers, the "observational vantage point" seemed unimportant in terms of subjects' relative ratings of counselors' expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. These results are inconsistent with those found by Helms (1976). The fact that audiovisual as opposed to audio analogues were used could account for the observers ratings being more similar to those in the quasi-counseling analogue. Differences in ratings might also be accounted for as a result of differences in dependent measures used or by the fact that Helms' study centered on a personal problem orientation which was avoided by Dell and LaCrosse. Differences notwithstanding, the inconsistent results of these two studies suggest the need for further research in this area.

Subject Involvement

The finding of higher ratings of subject involvement in quasi-counseling analogues than in audiovisual analogues by Dell and LaCrosse (1978) is another area which merits further study. While differential involvement ratings did not foster differential perceptions of the counselor, this factor may take on greater importance when examining process or outcome variables as opposed to counselor characteristics. Hovland, Janis, and Kelly, (1953) and Frank (1961) have supported this notion. They discuss the power of actively participating in an ongoing communication or activity in terms of arguing conviction and attitude change. Active participation, such as espousing a viewpoint different from your own or playing a role (as opposed to observing
one) has been shown to foster attitude change and strengthen convictions (Frank, 1961; Hovland, Janis and Kelly, 1953).

On a line of thought more specific to counseling, Strong (1968) in a discussion of factors affecting the interpersonal influence process of counseling, asserts that recipient (client/subject) involvement may affect interpersonal influence on opinion change. He notes the intrinsic importance, the personal significance and the amount of physical or psychological effort required by a process, as affecting an individual's involvement in the process. Few studies have been done in this area, but evidence does exist to support this viewpoint. Zimbardo (1960) studied the effects of involvement by varying the consequences of subjects' opinions. He asked women to read a short case history of a juvenile delinquent and to give their opinion of the locus of blame for the youth's crimes. High involvement was induced by telling the women that their opinions revealed their personalities and social values. In the low involvement condition the women were told that "although they should read the case study carefully, they should not expect too much from it." It was too short and unrepresentative, and previous results had shown that their reactions would reveal nothing about their personalities or social values. Results were significantly increased by involvement.

Cohen (1959) manipulated involvement by varying the subjects' perceptions of effort necessary to understand a persuasive communication. Thirty-six undergraduates read a statement arguing that placing juvenile delinquents in foster homes would decrease delinquency. The students filled out an opinion questionnaire containing
the target question three weeks prior to, and immediately after reading the statement. High involvement was induced for one half of the students by telling them that the communication was difficult and required much effort to understand. The other students were told that the passage was relatively simple and was easy to understand. Students were also classified into high and low groups according to the discrepancy of their initial opinion from the advocated opinion.

Cohen found a significant interaction between effort (or involve-
ment) and discrepancy. In the high effort condition, students with high initial discrepancy changed their opinions more than students with low initial discrepancy; in the low effort condition, students with low initial discrepancy changed their opinions more than those with high initial discrepancy. Overall, high discrepancy students changed more than low discrepancy students.

Lewis (1979), conducted a study of the impact of implicit vs.
explicit counselor value statements and of counselor-client similarity on perceptions of the counselor and effect of the counseling rela-
tionship. One-hundred-fifty female subjects listened to an audio-
tape of a simulated counselor-client interaction with fifteen subjects hearing each treatment combination. At three points during the coun-
seling excerpt, the tape was stopped and the subjects were asked to respond to the counselor as if they were the client. Subject responses were solicited in order to increase subject involvement in the inter-
view. This would seem to increase subject involvement by increasing the psychological effort required of the subject. It appears pos-
sible that this type of analogue participation, particularly with a
videotaped interaction to provide both verbal and non-verbal stimuli, could elicit even more subject involvement than a quasi-counseling analogue. The psychological effort required to take the place of the client could exceed that required to simply talk with a counselor, especially with low subject involvement. In the present study, this type of analogue was referred to as "indirect participation."

Zimbardo discussed an unpublished study by Brehm and Lipsher in which they "manipulated involvement using issues which varied in the degree to which the subjects were concerned with them. They found that the amount of opinion change in the direction of the communicator was greater for issues of high concern than for issues of low concern" (Zimbardo, 1960). Henninger and Dixon (1978) explored the effect of subjects perceived need and interviewer role on subjects' opinions and behaviors. Ninety female undergraduate subjects were divided into high and low need groups on the basis of their self rating of satisfaction with their problem-solving skills as ascertained with a pre-test satisfaction measure. Subjects were subsequently interviewed about their problem-solving skills by an interviewer in either an expert or inexpert role. During the interview three separate attempts were made by the interviewer to alter the subjects ratings of her problem-solving skills as well as two extra-interview behaviors. Following the interview the subjects responded to two inventories of problem-solving skills, rates the interviewer on a counselor rating form, and were given the opportunity to engage in two extra-interview self-help activities. Perceived interviewer expertness did influence subjects to
engage in certain self-help behaviors and resulted in the intended opinion changes. Differential subject need however, did not affect the interviewers ability to influence the subjects. The method of determination of subject need, (i.e. self reported satisfaction or dissatisfaction with problem-solving skills) may not have been an adequate determinant of actual subject need in this case, particularly with regard to motivation and investment.

Ruppel (1979) encountered similar difficulties in a study of the effects of interviewer trustworthiness and consequence of influence attempt with counselor referent or expert power base on client resistance. He presented an audiovisual analogue of a counselor-client interaction about problems with procrastination to one-hundred-thirty-four subjects. In an effort to produce high subject concern or need, these subjects selected themselves as having a need in dealing with the problem of procrastination. He failed however, to obtain behavioral compliance in his subjects and attributed this to inadequate need or motivation on the part of his subjects. Even though subjects were self-selected for felt need, the overall mean of self ratings of problem severity by participants was 3.55 on a seven point scale from mild (1) to severe (7).

Both of these issues, type of analogue and subject involvement play a part in the approximation of an actual counseling setting, and therefore in the generalizability of counseling analogue research to the actual counseling setting. Differential perceptions of or reactions to the counselor or the interview which may result because of
analogue type may yield differential results. Differential subject involvement in the analogue because of analogue type or level of subject need may also yield differential results. Thus, these issues merit further empirical and theoretical exploration. Perhaps a matching of type of analogue and level of subject need can be determined to provide the optimal approximation of the natural counseling setting - with the greatest generalizability and the least effort for experimenters and risk for subjects.
CHAPTER III  
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present study is to compare the effects of vicarious participation, indirect participation, and direct participation methods of counseling analogue research. Comparisons are made in terms of reactions to and perceptions of the counselor and the interview, and the subjects involvement in the analogue. This study also investigated the use of subjective and objective measures of subject need, and the relationship between subject need and subject involvement in the analogue.

Overview

In the vicarious participation analogue, subjects viewed a videotaped roleplay of a counselor-client interaction, vicariously participating in the interaction through identification with the client. In the indirect participation analogue the same videotape was stopped following five selected counselor statements, in order to allow the subject to respond to the counselor "as if he were the client". Writing his response on the paper provided, the subject indirectly participated in the analogue. In the direct participation analogue, the subject actually participated in the analogue, taking the role of the client in a counseling interview roleplay. This roleplay was structured to follow the format of the videotaped roleplay, allowing for variations and deviations according to the individual subjects in the interview.

A three (analogue type) x two (high & low subject need) design
was used. This design was examined in three ways; once for the objective need determination, and once for each of the subjective need measures. There were twenty subjects for each analogue type; the distributions between high and low need varied with each measure as shown in Table 1. The same sixty subjects were used for each need measure.

Subjects' perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the counseling analogue were assessed using the Counselor Rating Form (Barak and Lacrosse, 1975) which measures perceptions of counselor attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertise; and the Interview Rating Scale, which measures the "climate" of the counseling interview. Perceptions and reactions were also assessed through the subjects' expectations of the counselor's helpfulness for fifteen different problem areas. A measure of the subjects' willingness to see this counselor or any counselor for similar or general problems, or to refer others to see this counselor was also completed. Finally, a measure of subject identification with the client was completed. A simple, direct question about the extent of the subjects' perceived involvement in the analogue was used to measure that factor. The Social Avoidance and Distress scale (SAD) (Watson and Friend, 1969) was used as an objective measure of subject need in the area of social anxiety. Direct questions of the extent to which social anxiety is was a problem for the subjects in the present and the past was used as a subjective measure of this factor.

Subjects

Sixty male volunteers from introductory psychology courses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Participation</th>
<th>Vicarious Participation</th>
<th>Indirect Participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at the Ohio State University served as subjects for this study. They received course credit for their participation.

No effort was made to control for the age of these subjects and they ranged from 18 to 31 years of age. The mean age was 20.2 and the median age was 19.7. Educational level ranged from first to fourth year of college. The mean was 1.75 and the median was 1.55 years.

Subjects were assigned randomly to treatment conditions with the constraint that there were an equal number of subjects in each analogue condition.

Counselor, Client, and Interview

The counselor in both the videotape and the interview was a second year, male graduate student in counseling psychology. The client in the videotaped roleplay was a fourth year, male graduate student in counseling psychology. No script was used for the videotaped roleplay, although the subject matter was discussed by the participants and a general outline was agreed upon.

A twenty minute videotape was made in which the counselor and the client discuss the client’s anxiety involving interpersonal relationships (social anxiety). This problem was chosen because it is an issue typically faced by many college students and therefore one with which the subject population may identify easily.

Procedure

Subjects were scheduled for participation in a study of ways of evaluating counselors and counseling in counseling research. Subjects in the direct participation analogue were scheduled individually, while subjects in the vicarious and indirect partici-
pation analogues were scheduled in groups of up to five individuals. Subjects were greeted by the experimenter and followed along as he read aloud the Instructions to participants (Appendix A) which included an explanation of the purpose of the study and asked their cooperation as part of the research team. Each subject then filled out a short Subject Data Form (Appendix B) and the Social Anxiety and Distress scale (SAD, Appendix C). Completion of the SAD at this point in the study helped familiarize the subjects with the problem of social anxiety to be discussed in the analogue. The interview or videotape (as appropriate) was then explained to the subjects (Appendix D) and they took part in that segment of the study. After viewing the videotape or taking part in the interview, the subjects then filled out the Counselor Rating Form (CRF, Appendix E), the Interview Rating Scale (IRS, Appendix F), the Help with Specific Problems scale (HSP, Appendix G), and the referral, involvement and subjective need measures (Appendix H). Finally, subjects were debriefed (Appendix I) and dismissed.

Assessment of Need

The Social Avoidance and Distress scale was administered to the subjects before they participated in the study in order to acquaint them with the concept of social anxiety and to assess each subject's level of social anxiety as an objective determinant of need. Watson and Friend (1969) developed the scale to assess the concept of social anxiety. Twenty eight items were selected by rational analysis from a much larger pool to detect social anxiety as evidenced by subject distress and avoidance. Experimental studies showed that people high
in SAD tended to avoid social interactions, preferred to work alone, reported that they talked less, were more worried, and less confident about social relationships but were more likely to appear for appointments.

During post-testing subjects answered two items which served as the subjective need measure. On a five point scale ranging from "very much" (1) to "not at all" (5) subjects indicated the extent to which the problem of social anxiety was/is a problem for them in the past and in the present.

Dependent Measures

Following participation in the counseling analogue, subjects filled out the Counselor Rating Form. Barak and LaCrosse (1975) developed the CRF to measure perceptions of counselor attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness. Eighty three adjectives were rated as indicative of the three attribute dimensions by four judges who were familiar with the constructs. Thirty-six adjectives that reached an interjudge agreement of 75% were selected. Twelve represented each of the three dimensions. Seven-point bipolar scales (using the thirty-six adjectives and their opposites) were constructed and two-hundred-two subjects ratings were elicited. Factor analysis of these ratings indicated that for two out of the three therapists, items representing expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness separated into three factors. In a subsequent study, LaCrosse and Barak (1975) found inter-item reliability coefficients of .87, .85, and .90 for expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness respectively. They also found a moderate level of intercorrelation between the three dimensions.
though an analysis of variance revealed that the CRF distinguished both within and between counselors. The thirty-six scales, twelve for each dimension, were presented in alphabetical order.

Subjects also filled out the Interview Rating Scale. This instrument assesses the subjects' reaction to the comfort level of the interview. In a subsequent reliability analysis, this scale produced a Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of .92, and showed high inter-item reliability.

Subjects rated the counselor on the Help with Specific Problems scale as well. This scale is a measure of the degree of confidence they would place in the counselor's effectiveness in dealing with each of fifteen specific problems chosen on the basis of relevance to a college population as used in previous research (Cash, Begler, McCown, & Weise, 1976; Cash & Keller, 1978; Lewis & Walsh, 1978; Lewis, 1979) and provide indices of counseling expectancies.

Finally, subjects filled out a measure of subject involvement on a five-point Likert type scale, a measure of identification with the client in the analogue on a four-point scale, and a group of referral measures on a five-point Likert type scale, including willingness to see this or any counselor themselves for a similar or general problem, and a willingness to refer a friend or an acquaintance to see this counselor.

Hypotheses

The following expectations are held:
1. A significant main effect for perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the interview across analogue types (non-directional).
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2. A significant main effect for type of analogue.
   a. Subjects in the direct participation analogue will rate higher levels of involvement than subjects in the indirect and vicarious participation analogues.
   b. Subjects in the indirect participation analogue will rate higher levels of involvement than subjects in the vicarious participation analogue.

3. A significant main effect for subject need.
   Subjects in the high need groups will rate higher levels of involvement than subjects in the low need groups.

4. A significant subject need (high/low) x analogue type interaction.
   a. Subjects in the high need group will rate themselves as more involved in the direct participation analogue than in the indirect and vicarious participation analogues.
   b. Subjects in the low need group will rate themselves as more involved in the indirect participation analogue than in the direct or vicarious participation analogues.

Analysis

A univariate analysis of variance was performed on the variables of subject need and analogue type to assure that random distribution of subjects in both high and low need groups had occurred across analogue types. Chronbach's Alpha coefficient was computed for the CRF scales, the IRS, and the SAD to check the reliability of these measures.

Independent variables were analogue type (direct, indirect, and vicarious participation), and subject need (high and low) measured
objectively (SAD) and subjectively (past and present). Dependent variables included perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the interview as measured by the CRF, the IRS, the HSP, the willingness to refer and see measures and subject identification with the client. The final dependent variable was subjects' ratings of involvement in the analogue.

Means, standard deviations, and univariate F's were computed for all dependent variables across analogue type, and for ratings of involvement across levels of subject need. Multivariate analyses of variance were also computed to determine significant interactions of levels of involvement across levels of subject need and analogue type.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

In this chapter the means, standard deviations and F-test results will be presented for the support or non-support of the hypotheses stated earlier. The results of the univariate analysis of variance performed to ascertain random distribution of subjects across groups for the independent variable of subject need will also be reported. Reliability checks for the CRF, the IRS, and the SAD are also included.

Assessment of Need and Distribution Check

Subjects scoring greater than or equal to 2.5 (on a scale of 1 to 5) on the Social Avoidance and Distress scale were considered to be in the high need group for the objective measure of need. Subjects scoring less than or equal to 2.0 (on a scale of 1 to 5) on the subjective need measures were considered to be in the high need groups. These divisions were determined based on the distribution of obtained scores. Cutoffs were chosen which provided high and low need groups which were as close to one-half of the total group as possible.

A subject's standing in terms of both objective and subjective measures of need was determined after his assignment to a particular analogue type. There was therefore, no assurance that a random and relatively equal distribution of need groups across analogue types had occurred. In order to support the validity of subsequent analyses, analysis of variance were performed to ascertain that such a distribution had indeed occurred. The results of these ANOVA indicate
that the distribution was random and relatively equal. Non-
significant F's were obtained for the SAD (F=2.16, p>.12), for
the past subjective measure (F=.326, p>.72), and for the present
subjective measure (F=1.31, p>.28). The means and standard devia-
tions for each need measure appear in Table 2.

**Instrument Reliability Checks**

Chronbach’s Alpha coefficient was computed for each scale of the
CRF, attractiveness (alpha=.79), trustworthiness (alpha=.89), and
expertness (alpha=.91); for the IRS (alpha=.92); and the SAD (alpha=.89).
These coefficients indicate that all are highly reliable instruments.

**Dependent Measures: An Overview**

It was expected that there would be significant differences
in perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the interview
among analogue types. With few exceptions, this expectation was
not supported by the results of a univariate analysis of variance
for the CRF, the IRS, the HSP, and the referral measures.

On the measure of subject involvement, a significant main
effect for type of analogue and for subject need, as well as a
significant analogue x need interaction were hypothesized. A
univariate analysis of variance yielded significant results in
support of these main effects. The interaction effect however,
was not supported by the results of a multivariate analysis of
variance.

**Counselor Rating Form**

The means, standard deviations, and univariate F-tests for
the subjects ratings of the counselor on the CRF are presented
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Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations and Univariate F Tests
Distribution Check for Need Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Participation</th>
<th>Vicarious Participation</th>
<th>Indirect Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: SAD 1 (Low) to 5 (High)
PAST & PRESENT 1 (High) to 5 (Low)
in Table 3. The ratings of counselor attractiveness and trustworthiness showed no significant differences between analogue types (p>05). A significant F was found on the dimension of counselor expertise (p<.01). Upon examination of the means and standard deviations for this dimension, it is clear that the counselor was rated significantly more expert in the direct participation analogue than in the indirect or vicarious participation analogues. The means for the latter two were very similar and the mean for the former is greater than these.

Interview Rating Scale and Help with Specific Problems

Both the IRS and the JSP failed to provide support for the hypothesis of significant differences among analogue types for perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the interview. A univariate analysis of variance indicates no significant differences (p>05). The means, standard deviations and univariate F-tests for these instruments are presented in Table 3.

Referral Measures and Subject Identification with Client

Table 3 also presents the means, standard deviations, and univariate F-tests for the six items in the referral measures and the item on the subject identification with the client. Significant F’s and support for the hypothesis were found for only two items - the willingness of the subject seeing this counselor for a similar problem (F=3.56, p<04), and the willingness of the subject seeing this counselor for any problem (F=4.25, p<02). The remaining items were non-significant and do not support the hypothesis of differences in perceptions of the reactions to the counselor and the interview among analogue types.
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Table 3  
Means Standards Deviations and Univariate F Tests  
Dependent Measures  
Perceptions of and Reactions to Counselor and Interview  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Direct Participation</th>
<th>Vicarious Participation</th>
<th>Indirect Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF Attractiveness</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Rating Scale</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with Specific Problems</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Willingness to See This counselor:  
- for a similar problem: 1.5 .69 2.3 1.26 2.4 1.43 3.556 .035  
- for any problem: 2.35 .67 2.9 1.14 3.16 1.04 4.248 .019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Direct Participation</th>
<th>Vicarious Participation</th>
<th>Indirect Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to see Any counselor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for a similar problem</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for any problem</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to refer friend to see this counselor</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to refer an acquaintance to see this counselor</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with client</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranges:
- CRF 1 (Negative) to 2 (Positive)
- IRS 1 (Positive) to 5 (Negative)
- HSP 1 (Negative) to 6 (Positive)
- Referral measures 1 (Positive) to 5 (Negative)
- Identification 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very much)
Involvement

The hypothesis of a significant difference in levels of rated involvement between analogue types was supported ($F=7.28, p<.002$). Examination of the means and standard deviations which are presented in Table 4, indicate that the direct participation analogue resulted in significantly higher ratings of subject involvement than did the indirect and vicarious participation analogues, as hypothesized. There appears however, to be no significant differences between ratings of involvement for the indirect and vicarious participation analogues.

The hypothesis of a significant difference in levels of subject rated involvement between high and low need groups was not supported for the groups determined by the objective need measure. This hypothesis was supported however, for the groups determined by the two subjective need measures. There was no significant difference in the ratings of subject involvement between the high and low need groups as differentiated by the SAD ($F=2.12, p>.65$). There was a significant difference in the ratings of subject involvement between the high and low need groups as differentiated by the past and present subjective measures ($F=7.85, p<.007; F=10.16, p<.003$, respectively). For both subjective need measures, the high need group rated significantly greater involvement than did the low need group. Means, standard deviations, and univariate F-tests for both objective and subjective need measures are reported in Table 5.
### TABLE 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate F Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement x Analogue Type</th>
<th>Direct Participation</th>
<th>Vicarious Participation</th>
<th>Indirect Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 1 (very involved) to 5 (not at all)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Need</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Need</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>.0069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>10.165</td>
<td>.0023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 1 (very involved) to 5 (not at all)
The hypothesized interaction between subject need and analogue type for ratings of subject involvement was not supported by a multivariate analysis of variance. The resulting F values are reported in Table 6. An examination of the means and standard deviations presented in Table 7 indicates that level of subject need did not significantly alter the level of rated involvement among analogue types. Involvement was greatest in the direct participation analogue, regardless of level of need.
**TABLE 6**

Multivariate F Tests
Involvement x Analogue Type x Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analogue</td>
<td>5.031</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogue</td>
<td>9.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogue</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1.490</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Participation</td>
<td>Vicarious Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 1 (Very much) to 5 (Not at all)
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

In this chapter the results presented in chapter four will be discussed. The results relevant to the support or non-support of the hypotheses will be explained and their implications will be explored. The limitations of this study, as well as indications for future research will also be discussed.

In accord with the findings of Helms (1976), significant differences were expected in perceptions of and reactions to the counselor and the interview across analogue types. There are inconsistencies in the results which are relevant to this hypothesis. The results of this study partially replicate the findings of Deli and LaCrosse (1978). Nine of the twelve items used to measure these factors produced non-significant results. Three items however, did produce significant results. The CRF expertness scale, and the measures of willingness to see this counselor for a similar problem and for any problem all yielded results which were significantly more positive for the counselor in the direct participation analogue than in the indirect or vicarious participation analogues. These results support the findings of Helms (1976). An alternative explanation for these latter results however, parallels that offered by Helms (1976). It is possible that subjects elevated or exaggerated the counselor's expertness and their willingness to see him, in order to justify talking with this counselor in the first place.

Given this explanation, and the large proportion of non-significant
items, these results seem to disconfirm this hypothesis.

While the hypothesis of significant differences in perceptions and reactions across analogue types was not supported, the hypothesis of significant differences in subject involvement across analogue types was supported. It was expected that actually participating in an ongoing interaction would generate higher levels of involvement than observing a videotaped interaction. It was therefore predicted that subjects in the direct participation analogue would indicate higher levels of involvement than subjects in the indirect and vicarious participation analogues. The results of this study support this prediction and once again partially replicate the findings of Dell and LaCrosse (1978).

The concept of an indirect participation analogue was based on work by Lewis (1979) in which this format was utilized as a means of fostering greater involvement in research subjects. It was predicted that subjects in the indirect participation analogue would indicate higher levels of involvement than subjects in the vicarious participation analogue. The results of this study do not support this hypothesis. Mean ratings of involvement in indirect and vicarious participation analogues were almost identical. One possible explanation for these results is based on the possible distinction between physical and psychological effort and involvement. It was hypothesized that an indirect participation analogue would foster subject involvement as a result of the psychological effort required to put oneself in the place of the client in order to respond to the counselor. It is possible that involvement as a function of
of analogue type, (and as measured in this study) is a measure of physical as opposed to psychological involvement in an activity. Given that both indirect and vicarious participation analogues involve watching a videotape and the direct participation analogue involves active participation, this may suggest an explanation for the similar ratings of involvement for the indirect and vicarious participation analogues.

Subject involvement was also examined as a function of subject need, as determined through both objective and subjective measures. It was hypothesized that subjects in the high need groups would indicate higher levels of involvement than would subjects in the low need groups. It was further expected that this hypothesis would hold true for both the objective and subjective need measures. This was however, not the case. There was no significant difference in ratings of involvement between high and low need groups as distinguished by the objective measure (the measure based on external criteria). As was the case with Heppner and Nixon (1978), an objective determinant is apparently an insufficient indicator of subject need. This may be attributable, at least in part, to a tendency for the subjects to answer in a socially desirable manner. In fact, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is the positive pole, there was no score on the SAD above 3.16.

The results of this study do support this hypothesis in terms of the subjective need measure (the measure based on internal criteria). For the high and low need groups as determined by the subjective measures, there were significantly greater levels of involvement.
in the high need subjects than in the low need subjects. This is the case for both the past and the present subjective measures. This subjective need measure simply entails the subject's identification of a feeling of difficulty in a particular, pertinent area. As such, this criteria has no component of physical effort or involvement. It seems that the concept of subject need as used herein functions as an indicator of subject psychological effort and involvement.

A distinction between this subjective measure of need and the one utilized by Ruppel (1979) is that this measure does not require subjects to identify themselves as needing help in an area, but rather, asks them to indicate the degree to which they have experienced difficulties similar to the one in question. This may be a less threatening and "safer" identification for subjects to make. Also, because subjects are not identifying themselves as needing help in an area, this method may circumvent some of the ethical and practical dilemmas of dealing with subjects "in need", by merely measuring an already existing situation, rather than asking subjects to deal with their problems.

A significant subject need x analogue type interaction was hypothesized. It was expected that subjects with high need would become more involved in the ongoing interaction of the direct participation analogue while low need subjects would become more involved through the psychological effort required in the indirect participation analogue. The results of this study do not support this hypothesis, and there were no significant interaction effects. Given the fact that the concept of psychological effort in the indirect participation
analogue was not supported in this study, these results are not surprising. Both high and low need subjects were most involved in the direct participation analogue, with no significant differences between the indirect and vicarious analogues. Upon looking at the cell means however, a possible trend begins to emerge. For the subjects in the high need groups (as determined by the subjective need measures) the levels of involvement for the indirect participation analogue is slightly greater than for the vicarious participation analogue. On the other hand, for the low need groups, the levels of involvement for the vicarious participation analogue is slightly greater than for the indirect participation analogue. It seems possible that the indirect participation analogue may require a degree of effort that only the high need groups involved enough to be willing to expend. This may be an indication of a trend worthy of further exploration.

Limitations

Given the fact that this was a study of analogue research methods, it seems that this is one instance in which the limitations of analogue research need not apply. There are however, still some potential limitations to generalizability.

The problem used as a focus of the counseling situations in these analogues was of a personal nature, as was the problem used by Dell and LaCrosse (1978). Helms (1976) however, did find differential counselor perception among analogue types while utilizing a problem of a more general, non-personal nature. It seems possible that a
personal problem orientation induces the subject to focus on the problem rather than the counselor. Generalizations to problems of a broader nature may need to be explored further.

The personal nature of the problem utilized may also have contributed to the success of the subjective need measure. In terms of increasing subject identification with the issue. The problem focused on by Ruppel (1979) was of a more general nature. Again, the possibility for generalization needs to be explored.

This study focused specifically on same sex, male, counselor-subject/client pairs. The introduction of female, same sex pairs or of cross sex pairs may also alter the results and therefore presents another potential limitation of this study.

Indications for Future Research

This study points out the value of subject need in terms of its relationship to increased subject involvement in counseling analogue research, and increased approximation of the natural setting. Subjective measures of need appear to provide a more valuable indication of subject need than do objective measures. The concept of "felt" need (as opposed to objective need) still merits further exploration.

It seems difficult to argue the fact that the degree of need felt by an individual is a relative concept. How then, can we measure felt need? At what degree of felt need does an individual shift from being an involved research subject to being an actual client? It would seem that type of analogue used and degree of subject need might interact to answer the latter question. The trend hinted at
in the results of the interaction analysis may point toward an optimal matching of subject need and analogue type to provide an ethically safe, yet valid approximation of the actual counseling setting in counseling research. High need and direct participation may both produce the greatest involvement and the closest approximation, however, they also may create an ethically dangerous situation by inducing subjects to be clients. Direct participation analogues are also the most costly in terms of time, money, and manpower.

Factors affecting the distinction between physical and psychological (emotional) involvement (if indeed one exists) may also be further explored and may prove useful in achieving the optimal matching referred to above.

Finally, in an effort to determine the optimal approximation of the natural (or actual) counseling setting in research, future research may compare the results obtained with various analogue types and subject need groups, with those obtained from actual clients in counseling or even recently terminated clients.
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APPENDIX A
INSTRUCTIONS

Much counseling research is done using imitations of actual counseling situations. In this study you will be working as a member of the research team to examine different methods used to simulate an actual counseling interview. After observing or participating in one of several types of simulated counseling interviews you will be asked to evaluate both the counselor and the interview. Your evaluations will be used to examine and compare the different counseling research methods. All your answers will be kept confidential. There is no deception of any kind in this study, you are participating as a member of the research team. Please be as honest and open as possible in your evaluations.

The problem to be discussed in the following interview is "social anxiety"—anxiety experienced by the client about interacting with other people in a variety of situations. In order to make your evaluations even more valuable, some information about you, as subjects, will be collected. This includes some general background information about you and your reactions to some statements about social anxiety. These statements will help acquaint you with the problem to be discussed in the interview and will also provide a measure of how you feel about this issue. Your answers will not be used to evaluate you and will not be connected with you in any way. They will be used to help evaluate the research method. Again—please be as honest and open as possible in responding to the statements. Please take a few minutes to fill out the surveys now.

You will find a subject number on top of your Subject Data Sheet. Please be sure to put this number on everything you fill out.
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SUBJECT DATA SHEET

Subject Number: _______

Age: _______

Sex: _______

College/Major: _______________________

Year in School: Fr. So. Jr. Sr. Other ____________

Have you ever been involved in counseling or psychotherapy? YES NO

If YES, check one: ______ High School guidance counselor

________ University Counseling Center

________ Community agency

________ Private practitioner

________ Other
Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you feel that each of the following statements are true (or untrue) of you. Place your response in the blank spaces at the left of each statement. Use the following scale in response to each item.

1 - very true of me
2 - slightly true of me
3 - neutral; unsure
4 - slightly untrue of me
5 - very untrue of me

1. I feel relaxed even in unfamiliar social situations.
2. I try to avoid situations which force me to be very sociable.
3. It is easy for me to relax when I am with strangers.
4. I have no particular desire to avoid people.
5. I often find social occasions upsetting.
6. I usually feel calm and comfortable at social occasions.
7. I am usually at ease when talking to someone of the opposite sex.
8. I try to avoid talking to people unless I know them well.
9. If the chance comes to meet new people, I often take it.
10. I often feel nervous or tense in casual get-togethers in which both sexes are present.
11. I am usually nervous with people unless I know them well.
12. I usually feel relaxed when I am with a group of people.
13. I often want to get away from people.
14. I usually feel uncomfortable when I am with a group of people I don't know.
15. I usually feel relaxed when I meet someone of the first time.
16. Being introduced to people makes me tense and nervous.
17. Even though a room is full of strangers, I may enter it anyway.
18. I would avoid walking up and joining a large group of people.

19. When my superiors want to talk with me, I talk willingly.

20. I often feel on edge when I am with a group of people.

21. I tend to withdraw from people.

22. I don't mind talking to people at parties or social gatherings.

23. I am seldom at ease in a large group of people.

24. I often think up excuses in order to avoid social engagements.

25. I sometimes take the responsibility for introducing people to one another.

26. I try to avoid formal social occasions.

27. I usually go to whatever social engagements I have.

28. I find it easy to relax with other people.

1 - very true of me
2 - slightly true of me
3 - neutral; unsure
4 - slightly untrue of me
5 - very untrue of me
You will now have a chance to participate in a brief, simulated counseling interview. In this interview, play the role of a client who is bothered by anxiety in social situations (such as the situations in the survey you just filled out). Please be as real as possible, using as much of yourself as you are comfortable doing to help you with the role play. The interview will last about 15 - 20 minutes. Everything you discuss will remain confidential. Remember, you are not being evaluated, but we are working to evaluate this research method. Afterwards you will be asked to fill out several rating forms about your reactions to the counselor and the interview. Any Questions?

Please take a few minutes now to think about a situation you can discuss in a simulated interview. It need not be something that is true about you, but may be so if you wish.
You will now view a videotape of a simulated counseling interview. Please listen closely to both the counselor and the client. As you listen, attempt to put yourself in the position of the client - and to react to the counselor as if you are the client. Afterwards you will be asked to fill out several rating forms about your reactions to the counselor and the interview. Once again, please make an effort to put yourself in the client's place. Any Questions?
You will now view a videotape of a simulated counseling interview. Please listen closely to both the counselor and the client. As you listen, attempt to put yourself in the position of the client - and to react to the counselor as if you are the client. At several points during the tape it will be stopped in order to give you a chance to actually respond to the counselor as if you are the client. Please write your responses on the sheet provided. Afterwards you will be asked to fill out several rating forms about your reactions to the counselor and the interview. Once again, please make an effort to put yourself in the client's place. Any Questions?
COUNSELOR RATINGS FORM

Listed below 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 saw 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:

fair _______ X _______ unfair

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:

rough _______ X _______ _______ smooth

OR

rough _______ _______ _______ X _______ smooth

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

active _______ X _______ _______ passive

OR

active _______ _______ X _______ _______ passive

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

hard _______ X _______ soft

Your first impression is the best answer.

PLEASE NOTE: PLACE CHECK MARKS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SPACES.
agreeable     disagreeable
unalert     alert
analytic     diffuse
unappreciative     appreciative
attractive     unattractive
casual     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     ignorant
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
deceitful: straightforward
trustworthy: untrustworthy
genuine: phony
warm: cold
INTERVIEW RATING SCALE

Please respond to the following statements about the counseling interview as honestly as possible. Place an X on the line which best expresses how you feel about the interview at the present time. Use the following scale in responding to each item:

1 - strongly agree
2 - slightly agree
3 - neutral
4 - slightly disagree
5 - strongly disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The counselor creates a feeling of &quot;warmth&quot; in the relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The client feels secure in his relationship with the counselor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The client has confidence in the counselor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The counselor is uncertain of himself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The counselor is artificial in his behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The counselor's tone of voice conveys the ability to share the client's feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The counselor acts as if he had a job to do and didn't care how it was accomplished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The counselor &quot;communicated&quot; the attitude that the client's problem is of real importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The counselor is very patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The counselor is a warm, sincere individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The atmosphere of the interview helps the client to see more of himself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The client feels blocked and frustrated in his attempt to relate to the counselor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The counselor acts cold and distant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The client feels the counselor has a genuine desire to be of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The client feels accepted as an individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The counselor behaves as if the interview is a routine, mechanical process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The client feels a sense of satisfaction from the counseling session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The counselor accepts expression of the client's thoughts and desires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The counselor's techniques are obvious and clumsy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The counselor is restless while talking to the client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The counselor communicates little understanding of the client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The client can talk freely about his innermost feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The counselor's remarks make things clearer for the client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The counselor is a very &quot;human&quot; person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The counselor's tone of voice encourages the client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The counselor understands completely the client's feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The counselor's language is confused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The client is open, honest, and genuine with the counselor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The counselor gives the impression of &quot;feeling at ease&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The client feels more like a &quot;case&quot; than an individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The counselor is a co-worker with the client on a common problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HELP WITH SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

Please read carefully:

We now wish to learn your expectations about how helpful the counselor in the interview would be for particular types of difficulties which people sometimes have. Let's suppose that you sought counseling for a problem you have and that this individual is to be your counselor. How confident (or doubtful) are you that this counselor could help you overcome each of the particular problems listed on the following page? Use the scale below in order to indicate your ratings.

We do realize that your exposure to the counselor has been rather brief and that you will have to rely on your impressions in order to make the ratings. Of course, there are no right or wrong answers, and your answers are held confidentially.

1 - I am very doubtful that this person could help.
2 - I am moderately doubtful that this person could help.
3 - I am slightly doubtful that this person could help.
4 - I am slightly confident that this person could help.
5 - I am moderately confident that this person could help.
6 - I am very confident that this person could help.
1 - I am very doubtful that this person could help.
2 - I am moderately doubtful that this person could help.
3 - I am slightly doubtful that this person could help.
4 - I am slightly confident that this person could help.
5 - I am moderately confident that this person could help.
6 - I am very confident that this person could help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If my problem was:</th>
<th>My impression is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General anxiety or nervousness</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An alcohol problem</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A problem with sexual functioning</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts with parents</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety speaking in front of a group</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in dating</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing a career</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having trouble sleeping</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A drug addiction problem</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of inferiority</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety about taking tests in school</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties making friends</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having trouble studying</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to the following statements based on your reactions to the counselor and the interview. Place an X on the line which best expresses how you presently feel.

To what extent did you feel involved in this counseling interview.

very involved __  __  __  __  __  not at all

I would be willing to talk with this counselor if I had a similar concern.

very willing __  __  __  __  __  not at all

I would be willing to talk with a counselor if I had a similar concern.

very willing __  __  __  __  __  not at all

I would be willing to talk with this counselor about any concern of mine.

very willing __  __  __  __  __  not at all

I would be willing to talk with a counselor about any concern of mine.

very willing __  __  __  __  __  not at all

To what extent were you able to identify with the client:

____ Did not identify with him at all

____ Identified slightly with him

____ Identified moderately with him

____ Identified highly with him

I would refer an acquaintance to see this counselor.

very likely __  __  __  __  __  very unlikely

I would refer a close friend to see this counselor.

very likely __  __  __  __  __  very unlikely
To what extent has the problem discussed in the interview been a concern for you in the past:

very much _____:_____:_____:_____ not at all

To what extent is the problem discussed in the interview currently a concern for you:

very much _____:_____:_____:_____ not at all

Please indicate any reactions to or comments about the counselor, the interview, or the research which you have not yet expressed.
DEBRIEFING

The interview you participated in is one of several methods of simulating counseling situations for research purposes.

The other methods used in this study were (select 2 as appropriate)

- observing a videotaped interview
- observing a videotaped interview with several pauses to allow the subjects to respond as if they were the client.
- participating as a client in a simulated counseling interview.

Evaluations of these different research methods will be examined and compared in order to help us understand how, and how well each method imitates actual counseling. As stated earlier, there was no deception of any kind in this study.

Do you have any questions?

Please do not discuss anything about this study with anyone, in order to protect the validity of the results.