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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Beliefs and values form an important part of our lives. One constantly encounters ethical issues as a consequence of normal daily living. While values form an integral part of our lives, their place in the counseling process has been a subject of great debate.

Historically, many counselors took refuge in the comforting notion that the counselor's values could and should be kept out of the counseling relationship. In line with this posture of neutrality, psychologists urged their colleagues to "become aware of their values" in order to avoid any possibility of deliberate or unconscious indoctrination of the client. Rogers' (1951) "nondirective" approach to counseling was prompted by his belief that clients possess all the resources required to achieve the fullest possible growth from counseling. Rogers' theory gave new impetus and a reasonable framework to those supporting counselor neutrality. The counselor, in the Rogerian framework, acted solely as a catalyst to client growth, supposedly offering no direction in terms of values or morals.

In the late '50's and early '60's, however, the realization began to surface that the counselor's own values could not be kept out of the counseling relationship (Williamson, 1958; Patterson, 1958; Buhler, 1962). Since values, particularly those of a moral nature (DeGrazia, 1952; Lowe, 1976) seemed to be significantly involved in the problems that clients brought to counseling, researchers and philosophers began to consider the
possibility that the counselor's own morals and values might inevitably be revealed to some extent.

Some theorists such as Lowe (1976) went as far as to describe the counselor as one who provided the client with a moral meaning and direction for life. Patterson (1959) saw a direct relationship between the counselor's value system and his or her style and theory of counseling. Frank (1961) believed that participants would view counseling as "successful" when the counselor had "persuaded" the client either to change his beliefs or to modify his behavior. Peninsky and Karst (1964) claimed that abundant evidence existed to support the concept they labeled as "convergence", that is the contention that "every counseling interaction is characterized by...a measurable shift in client behavior (and belief) toward that of the therapist" (p. 335). In order for such a shift to occur, counselors were not only revealing values, but also encouraging client change in the direction of those values.

A further value issue of concern to counselors has been the effect of counselor-client value similarity on the perceptions of the counselor as well as on the process and outcome of counseling. There is some evidence (Glad, 1959; Lowe, 1959; Snyder, 1961; Holzman, 1962; Landfield and Nawas, 1964; and Maugen and Edwards, 1976) that client-counselor value similarity may be important in producing both favorable counselor perceptions and successful counseling outcomes.

The claim that counselors exert influence upon client values, that the content of that influence may be quite idiosyncratic to a particular counselor, and that similarity of client-counselor values may have an impact on counseling outcomes opens an entire arena of ethical questions concerning how values are presently communicated and how they should be communicated to clients as well as which values ought to be espoused. Some have
encouraged the counselor to remain neutral and to help the client merely to clarify his/her own values. Buhler (1962) sums up what tends to occur in the case of counselors who claim the "neutral position":

Knowingly or unknowingly, the therapist, conveys to the patient some of his thinking about values. This seems to be the case even in the most nondirective or seemingly purely interpretative approaches. It seems that the therapist conveys to the patient something beyond his understanding of the patient's motivational struggles. He reveals, knowingly or unknowingly, on rare or more frequent occasions his own personal reaction, his point of view or even his position in matters of consequence. (p.3)

The research evidence generally supports Buhler's position that neutrality is more myth than reality. Once the possibility of neutrality is abandoned, the question becomes one of whether or not counselors ought to be explicit about their biases.

Patterson (1959) has suggested that counselors' value orientations should only influence clients implicitly, through the selection of a particular counseling theory and consequently certain techniques, methods and goals. Patterson believes the counselor should refrain from explicit references to his/her own values or explicit attempts to influence. Other counselors tend to express similar opinions (Krassner, 1965, Love, 1976) suggesting that, while counselors should be aware of their value orientations, making those values explicit would be tantamount to imposing those values on the client.

On the other hand, certain counselors advocate a much more open and explicit approach to the communication of values. Samler (1960) says "...values should be subject to explicit examination as criteria of choice, as determinants of behavior" (p. 33). Gorden further suggests explicitness:
Let me suggest that it is all right for counselors to let students know their opinion...however 'moral' their positions may be. Students will otherwise second guess what the counselor thinks and operate accordingly. (p. 362)

Ellis (1962) is quite well-known for being explicit about his intentions to change clients' thinking processes and, in particular, their self-defeating value systems. He is, however, one of the few counselors who, through the use of pre-counseling required reading, boldly announces to the client his particular philosophical and moral presuppositions. Thus, the client is fairly well-aware of the views that Ellis supports and those he flatly discounts before receiving face-to-face counseling.

Even Rogers (1957), at least at one point in his thinking, has advocated explicit value communication in counseling. He stated that:

One cannot engage in psychotherapy without giving operational evidence of an underlying value orientation and view of human nature. It is definitely preferable, in my estimation, that such underlying views should be open and explicit rather than covert and implicit. (p. 199)

In light of the research data which suggests the strong likelihood of considerable counselor influence as well as that suggesting that similarity of client-counselor values may effect counseling outcome, it seems that ethical behavior would require counselors to make explicit those values which pertain to the issues of counseling with any particular client. Since, as Meltzoff and Kornreich (1970) have pointed out, clients tend to become like the counselor they select in regard to values and attitudes, it seems essential that clients should understand their choices fully before committing themselves to counseling. While it might be most appropriate for counselors to express their values on pertinent
issues prior to the commencement of counseling, such a method may not be feasible due to lack of time, an immediate crises, or client reluctance to discuss problems until a relationship is established. Thus, in many cases, it may be more realistic for counselors to present their biases as particular issues come up in the course of counseling. In the author's experience many counselors fail to do this due either to the belief that they can, in fact, remain objective regarding value-laden matters or due to a fear of the client's adverse reaction to counselor explicitness.

The purpose of the present study is to explore the nature of client reactions to explicit as opposed to the more typical implicit counselor communication of values, and to examine the effects of client-counselor value similarity on clients' perceptions of and confidence in the counselor. Reactions will be assessed using the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), which measures perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness; a measure of subjects' expectations concerning the counselor's potential helpfulness for several personal problems; and a measure of subjects' willingness to refer a friend to the counselor and to see the counselor themselves.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The investigation of the relationship between counselors' values and the counseling process has headed in several directions. These can be grouped somewhat loosely into two basic perspectives on the relationship of values to counseling:

(1) Values and Counseling: Theoretical Considerations
(2) Research on Values and Counseling.

The following review will be organized around these two basic categories. Preceding the review is a discussion of the definition of values.

DEFINITION OF VALUES

Before embarking on the main task of reviewing the literature concerned with the effects of values, a brief digression is necessary to consider the definition of values to be employed in the following research.

Various definitions of the term "value" can be found in existing empirical and theoretical literature. Tisdale (1961) has examined the various definitions and grouped them under five general headings: (1) values as needs or need satisfactions, (2) values as predisposing sets, (3) values as preferences, (4) values as intellectual concepts or beliefs and (5) values as a function of situations. After an
extensive analysis of representative positions in each of the five major
groups as well as an examination of supporting research, Tisdale offers
the following summary definition:

Values are inferred motivational constructs associated with
perceived differences in goal-directed behavior and indicated
by the selection of action alternatives within social situa-
tions (p. 169).

Allport (1961) sees values as closely related to both traits and
attitudes. Traits, for Allport, are relatively stable, individual per-
sonality structures which tend to account for the consistency of an
individual's behavior. Attitudes, like traits, are also individual and
tend to indicate a typical way of responding. However, attitudes are
more closely bound to particular stimuli than are traits, and also in-
volve directionality of response (e.g., approach-avoidance, acceptance-
rejection). Values, according to Allport, are like traits in that they
are individual and stable dispositions, and similar to attitudes in that
they act to direct behavior.

For Clyde Kluckhohn, the word value "implies a code of a standard
which has some persistance through time... which organizes a system
of action. Value... places things, acts, ways of behaving, goals of
action on the approval-disapproval continuum" (p. 395). Kluckhohn
offers the following definition:

A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of
an individual... of the desirable which influences the selec-
tion from available modes, means and ends of behavior (p. 395).

According to the above definition, Kluckhohn construes values as jus-
tified preferences (rather than merely desires), which are inferred
instead of being directly observed. Values, as standards of
desirability, are seen as the instigators of behavior choices. According to Kluckhohn, values contain an affective ("desirable"), cognitive ("conception"), and conative ("selection") dimension. Kessel and McBrearty (1967) describe Kluckhohn's conception of values as "both dynamic and behavioral. It is dynamic in its emphasis on desirability and it is behavioral in terms of its emphasis on selective behavior on the basis of desirability" (p. 670). Thus Kluckhohn's definition of value is quite similar to the summary definition given by Tisdale (1961) (Kessel and McBrearty, 1967).

Finally, Milton Rokeach (1970) offers a definition of value often used in the social science literature:

To say that a person 'has a value' is to say that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct or end-states of existence. . . (A value is) a standard or criterion for guiding action, for developing and maintaining attitudes toward relevant objects and situations, for justifying one's own and other's actions and attitudes, for morally judging self and others. . . (p. 160).

Two types of values are implied by the above definition. Rokeach has labeled these instrumental and terminal values. The former have to do with how one ought or ought not to behave. They represent beliefs that particular modes of conduct (honesty, loyalty) are "personally and socially preferable in all situations with respect to all objects" (p. 160). Terminal values are beliefs about the worth or desirability of particular end-states (salvation, a world at peace).

While the above definitions are not identical, they do overlap at several points. Most imply that values can be both implicit or explicit constructs which involve cognitions about objects and emotional
feelings toward these objects. Furthermore, they imply that values tend to direct or guide behavior as it relates to those objects. Thus most of the definitions reviewed imply that the word "values" contains a cognitive, conative and an affective dimension.

The definitions reviewed serve to give the reader some familiarity with what is meant by the term value. However, it is another matter to claim to accurately measure what is stated in any or all of the above definitions. Thus, rather than attempting to measure "value" as defined by the foregoing authors, an effort which has previously met with much criticism (Handy, 1970), the following study will define value operationally. While an operational definition may limit generalizability, it will increase scientific rigor and replicability of the study. For the purposes of the proposed research, "value" will be defined as the paper and pencil response given by Ss to questions on the OSU Attitude Survey. Ss will indicate their values by placing themselves at one of five points on a continuum between strongly agree and strongly disagree regarding a given statement on the attitude survey. Counselor "values" will consist in oral, as opposed to written, agreement or disagreement with statements similar to those found on the OSU Attitude Survey.

VALUES AND COUNSELING: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The importance of values as a basis for counseling as well as for counseling theories has been acknowledged in many books and journal articles. In an early statement, Ginsberg (1950) wrote "concern with values should be acknowledged and its implications for the therapeutic process systematically explored" (p. 475). Rychlak (1968), defending
the notion that psychological theorizing inevitably rests on individually selected values argued that "... at the higher levels of abstraction, choices in point of view rest upon what can only be called a value preference" (p. 458-459). Thus Rychlak argues that, in the final analysis, the theorist is actually basing his/her premises on personal judgments or viewpoints. In other words "... values are the final causes which define the purposes of our theories" (p. 460). Rychlak is thus arguing that theorists make arbitrary decisions, not open to empirical validation, and that these decisions actually lay the groundwork for their theories. As Rychlak sees it, and as can readily be confirmed upon inspection, contrasting value systems often result in conflicting theories, theories which essentially are rooted in personal preference rather than scientific validation.

London (1964) reiterates Rychlak's contentions in the following:

... Social philosophies of psychotherapeutic systems are almost exclusively moral doctrines, either suggesting how individuals ought to live to optimize society or waiving the obligations of individuals to social orders unworthy of their efforts... (p. 26).

Glad (1959) has described counseling theory as "... essentially a value system. Such a value system becomes a basis for describing the interviewer's referential, inferential, valuing and interpretive operations and for describing the client's adjustment in both ineffectiveness and adequacy terms" (p. 231). Thus, counselors' values may effect their views concerning what is healthy and unhealthy and adjusted or maladjusted behavior as well as their theoretical approach.

Glad (1959) and Lowe (1976) further argue that there exist irreconcilable differences between the values underlying diverse
theoretical approaches. Thus the values frameworks from which different counselors operate cannot simply be reduced to one homogeneous whole. Rogers (1963), who at one time had expressed the view that therapists were basically in agreement concerning their ideas and concepts but were using different labels (Patterson, 1973), wrote in 1963 that he felt counselors "differ at the most basic level of personal experiences". Patterson (1973), after discussing six counseling theories, concluded that "it would seem to be difficult to find a common philosophy, or even a single common concept, among the points of view covered in this book. Concepts relating to the nature of man and the nature of emotional disturbances vary considerably" (p. 523).

Evidence of the striking diversity among counseling theorists can be seen in even a cursory examination of their theories. For example, some theorists have described humans as determined by their environment and manipulated by rewards and punishments, others see individuals as controlled by internal drives for sensual pleasure and power, and still others view people as capable of making choices and free to do so, and as having the potential to self-actualize given the proper conditions. Furthermore, the basic nature of human beings has been viewed by different theorists as selfish, sinful, mechanistic, positive and self-actualizing, and genetically predisposed to irrationality. The goals of various theorists also represent quite diverse and, at times, conflicting objectives. Some theorists speak of curing a disease, others of unlearning maladaptive and learning adaptive habits. Still others are concerned with facilitating self-actualization, persuading the client to live according to the counselor's ideas of what
constitutes rational living, or giving the client some, albeit arbitrary, meaning or purpose in life. Finally, some advocate adjustment, others individualism and some acceptance of certain theological propositions.

Various writers have attempted to systematize the diversity expressed above by dividing counseling theories into different value orientations. Glad (1959) describes four families of counseling, each with its own value orientation: the psychoanalytic, the interpersonal psychiatric, the dynamic-relationship approach and the phenomenological approach. Lowe (1959) describes four different value orientations: naturalism, which is epitomized by B.F. Skinner's behaviorism; culturalism, which emphasizes "adjustment" and loyalty to societal values; humanism, which advocates belief in the self-sufficiency of man to control his own destiny and to realize his inherent potentialities through rational thought processes and finally, theism, where belief is in a personal God before whom men and women stand in need of redemption. Buhler (1962) describes four basic tendencies in life which she relates to counseling goals. Three of these, need satisfaction, adaptation and expansive creativity are similar to Lowe's value orientations.

The basic point of these writers is clear. They wish to demonstrate that "the purpose or goal of therapy is an expression of one's personal value orientation" (p. 43, Lowe, 1976). The categories also serve to emphasize the irreconcilable differences between adherents of each belief system. Says Lowe (1959) "... one value orientation tends to exclude all others".
The implications of the above discussion are basically three-fold:

(1) Counselors tend to bring goals, theories and techniques into the counseling room which are a product of and reflect their personal value systems.

(2) The value system to which the clients are exposed depends largely upon the counselor they see.

(3) The counselor that a client sees is likely to express, verbally or nonverbally, values which will be irreconcilable with those expressed by some other counselors whom the client might have chosen.

RESEARCH ON VALUES AND COUNSELING

Despite repeated calls for research on values (Ehrlich and Wiener, 1961; Krassner, 1962; 1965; Meehl, 1959) and a large body of theoretical literature concerned with this problem, there is still a lack of investigations concerning the communication and the effects of values in counseling. While lack of instruments, technical difficulties and confusion about the meaning of change in values have hampered research, Ehrlich and Wiener (1961) point out a far more difficult problem. They state that "... above all, the frequent reluctance on the part of the individual therapist to admit that his values enter into the therapeutic relation has tended to discourage empirical work in the area" (p. 365).

Kessel and McBrearty (1967) have provided the most recent review of the literature concerned with values and counseling. Generally they see research on values as fitting into one of two categories: (a) research dealing with the counselor's communication of values to the client and the effect of this communication on outcome and (b)
research dealing with client-counselor value similarity and its effect on outcome. The following review will utilize essentially the same categories adding the related area of research concerned with counseling as a social influence process.

**Counselor Value Communication**

Research has tended to substantiate the belief that counselors do influence clients without necessarily attempting to do so or being aware of the influence produced. Wolff (1954) surveyed opinions of a variety of counselors to discover if they thought their value systems influenced the form of client change. Wolff concluded that counselors believe that theoretical value systems tend to be adopted in successful treatment.

One of the first attempts to examine the variables involved in counseling-related attitude and value change was conducted by Rosenthal (1955). He followed 12 clients, ranging in age from 18-46 years, who had from three weeks to one year of treatment. Early in counseling, clients and counselors were administered a test of moral values in regard to sex, aggression and response to authority as well as the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. Testing was repeated at the time of the clients' termination. Rosenthal found that clients rated as improved by independent judges had also tended to modify their system of moral values in the direction of their counselors' values. Furthermore, those clients rated as unimproved tended to express values unlike those of their counselors'. Interestingly, Rosenthal found change only on the moral values and not on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey scale. He hypothesized that this was due to the fact that moral issues
were thought to be commonly involved in clients' conflicts whereas more
general values as expressed on the AVL were not.

Rosenthal's results must be considered as merely suggestive due to
several criticisms which have been leveled against his investigation
(Meltzoff and Kornreich, 1970). Criticisms include the fact that changes
in moral attitude were small in magnitude even though significant;
that no information was given about the nature of the clients' or coun-
selors' values; that there was no indication of differentiation in value
shifts in the content areas of sex, aggression, and authority; and
finally, that the small number of subjects, as well as the fact that
only two were rated as more than moderately improved, restricts gen-
eralization of the results. Nevertheless, Rosenthal's study laid the
groundwork for future empirical investigations.

Farloff, Goldstein and Iflund (1960) had independent observers
record the topics discussed during treatment by two schizophrenic
patients. Following each treatment hour, both clients and counselors
separately rank-ordered the topics discussed from most to least impor-
tant. After seven months of counseling, clients were asked to pre-
dict the counselors' rank-order. After approximately eight months of
treatment, both clients' rankings became more similar to the counse-
lors'; however, the client rated as "improved" was found to be signif-
ically closer to his counselor's values than the client who was unim-
proved. The authors concluded that, while counselors may not speci-
ically aim to influence, clients do adopt counselors' ideas concern-
ing what is important and therapeutically-relevant discussion matter.
Farson (1961) obtained results that somewhat contradicted the findings reported above. His subjects were 18 clients and six counselors at the University of Chicago. Clients completed Q sorts of 100 self-referent statements prior to counseling, at termination, and at a six month follow-up, describing their present and ideal selves. Clients' self-descriptions did not come to resemble their own therapists' self-descriptions to any greater degree than they came to resemble the self-description of therapists in general. Kessel and McBrearty (1967) have suggested that the contradiction in results may in part be due to the fact that Farson's counselors were client-centered while Rosenthal's were psychiatric residents likely to be analytically oriented. More importantly, however, it must be noted that change in values, particularly moral values concerning specific issues, may be quite different from introjection of the counselor's self-description.

Recent studies seem to confirm the original findings of Rosenthal. Holzman (1962) found that in an outpatient population, for clients similar in life situation to their therapist (assessed using variables of age, education, occupation, intelligence, religion and race) improvement in social adaptation (ability to carry out life functions as an adult in society) after seven months was significantly associated with increased similarity of clients' values to those of their counselors. The results were not significant, however, for an inpatient population.

Nawas and Landfield (1963) investigated the hypothesis that improvement in counseling is contingent upon client adoption of the counselor's personal frame of reference. The subjects consisted of
20 clients at the university counseling center who had been rated by three experienced judges as falling into the categories of either "most" or "least" improved. Results were not significant in terms of relating improvement and internalization of the therapist's frame of reference. However, the authors suggested that there may be important differences between the concept of "frames of reference" and specific values or attitudes. In a follow-up study (Landfield and Nawas, 1964) with the same group of therapists and 16 additional clients, the results indicated that improvement is accompanied by a shift in the present self of the client toward the therapist's ideas as described within the client's language dimension. Eighty percent of the most improved shifted toward the therapist's ideal in contrast to 72 percent of the least improved shifting away from the therapist's ideal.

Welkowitz, Cohen and Ortmeyer (1967) investigated the proposition found in balance theory (Heider, 1958) that there is movement toward similarity or equilibrium in the social interaction during counseling. Using the Ways to Live Scale (Morris, 1956) and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) (Strong, 1943), Welkowitz et al. found that: (1) value similarity between counselors and their own clients was greater than the value similarity between counselors and random not-own clients, (2) that value similarity tended to increase as a function of length of time in treatment and (3) that the degree to which the client acquired the counselor's attitudes was significantly associated with the degree to which she or he was judged improved by the counselor. Although the results of this experiment are certainly important, the relevance of the Morris WTL and SVIB is open to some questions.
Conclusions must be restricted at this time to those values tapped by these instruments. However, the fact that patients do move closer to the position of their own counselors rather than simply acquiring a set of "universal counselor values" suggests "... the specific influence that comes about in unique dyadic relationships" (Meltzoff and Kornreich, 1970, p. 469). Others (Burdock, Cheek, and Zubin, 1960; Morris, Eiduson, and O'Donovan, 1960) have also found that clients cannot be separated from counselors on the basis of the values to which they ascribe. Thus, according to Beutler (1971), "the value change phenomenon cannot be explained as simply the patient's acquisition of more rational and less deviant attitudes" (p. 363).

Hill (1969) also found that therapist values and goals tended to be adopted by clients. He found that, when counselors consistently worked toward some specific goal, clients' satisfaction was related more to whether or not the counselors' goals were achieved than it was to the achievement of the clients' own goals.

Assessing values using a 75-item Q-sort based on Kluckhohn's (Kluckhohn and Strodtebeck, 1961) classification of value orientations, Petoney (1966) found that there was a general tendency for the values of clients to resemble the values of client-centered therapists as counseling proceeded. Furthermore, he concluded that, after counseling, clients tend to express values in terms corresponding more closely to those of the counselor than was the case prior to counseling. Truax (1968) supported Petoney's findings that client-centered counselors do influence their clients. Truax analyzed excerpts from recordings of 30 clients participating in group counseling with four different counselors.
He found that clients receiving high levels of counselor reinforcement for self-exploration displayed a greater degree of self-exploration than those receiving low levels of reinforcement.

In an unpublished dissertation, Spink (1972) used the Rokeach Rank Ordering Value Scale (Rokeach, 1968) to assess value change in counseling and the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1965) and counselor judgment to assess improvement in counseling. Clients completed both the RROVS and POI upon admission and at termination. Spink found a significant positive correlation between terminal value change and improvement as judged by the counselor. Furthermore, clients' values became significantly more like those of their counselors.

In another dissertation study, Kaufmann (1973) had 50 counselors and 50 clients complete the Value-Attitude Systems Semantic Differential of 70 items. Items came from five other values inventories. Kaufmann found that the longer the treatment, the more convergence of client-counselor values occurred, particularly on Rokeach's (1968) instrumental values (values pertaining to modes of conduct).

Beutler (1971) used ten couples as subjects in an investigation of attitude similarity in marriage counseling. He measured attitudes both pre- and post-counseling on five issues: (a) sexual relationships outside marriage, (b) masturbation, (c) obedience to legal authority, (d) parent-child authority relationship and (e) acceptance of hostile and aggressive impulses. Contrary to previous research with individual counseling, improvement was associated with attitudinal convergence of partners, not with increased client-counselor similarity. However, a significant trend was noted for clients to acquire their counselors'
attitudes during treatment regardless of whether they improved or not.

Finally, one study has investigated the form in which values are conveyed to the client. Using Rescher's (1969) concepts of value subscription and value ascription, Gill (1976) used an analogue study to investigate the effects of manner of communication on attraction to the counselor, change in client values, and general perception of the interviewer. In the value subscription condition the taped interviewer made a personal commitment to the values of independence and exploration at the end of a counseling interview. In the value ascription condition, the counselor noted the importance of these two values but ascribed them to a prestigious mental health reference group. In a control condition, the interviewer summarized the interview but made no value references. It was hypothesized that value subscription and ascription would be more effective in enhancing viewer attraction to the interviewer, influencing the viewer to change her attitudes and in creating a more positive perception of the counselor than the control condition. Results failed to confirm any of the hypotheses. Value communication style had no significant effect on the dependent variables. Unfortunately, however, the study suffered from several severe limitations. The instrument used to measure attitude change was developed by the researcher and its reliability and validity are open to question. Furthermore, there was no check on subject awareness of the manipulation of the independent variables or style of value communication. The styles, as operationalized, may have been too similar or at least too subtly different to create more than a minimal effect. A third problem was the use of the values of
self-exploration and independence. The values may have been too general and too homogeneously subscribed to by the population used to create client awareness of the values reference by the counselor. Finally, the results of this experiment are confounded by the fact that several value issues, such as premarital sex and abortion were raised by the taped client and may have influenced the subject's ratings. No attempt was made to control for the confounding effects of implicit counselor value statements on these issues.

In summary, it appears that research generally supports the notion that clients tend to acquire the values of their counselors. Moreover, improvement is often associated with a client-counselor value convergence. Meltzoff and Kornreich (1970) suggest that "... therapists are not interchangeable, since the one whom the patient selects to model himself upon will have considerable bearing upon what the patient becomes" (p. 472). However, conclusions and generalizations are severely limited due to the use of different instruments in the measurement of values, consistently small sample sizes and an array of improvement criteria. More exhaustive studies of values shifts are needed. Improvement must be assessed against objective external outcome measures, and experience, original value position, sex of counselor and sex of client must be controlled. Finally, there is a need to further study the process of value communication. Only one study has examined effects of style of communication on the counselor-client relationship.
Counseling as a Social Influence Process

An additional perspective providing support for the contention that counselors do influence clients is derived from a social psychological base. According to Goldstein and Simonson (1971), "one of the most frequently replicated social-psychological findings is the manner in which interpersonal attraction increases receptivity to influence" (p. 162). One of the early experiments supporting the above effects was conducted by Back (1951). Attraction was manipulated through a pre-experiment induction procedure in which Ss were led to believe they would or would not be highly attracted to a partner. Influence was measured in terms of changes from a preliminary story to a final story which were in the direction of the Ss's partner's story. Influence was significantly greater in the high attractive condition.

Sapolsky (1960) conducted two verbal conditioning studies, in which he manipulated attractiveness first by experimental induction and second by natural pairing. In the first study, Sapolsky found that Ss in the attractive condition evidenced significantly more conditioning than Ss in the unattractive condition. In the second study, each S was paired with three compatible and three incompatible Ss based on the FIRO-B scale. Again, experimenters were able, through reinforcement, to induce an increased level of conditioning in Ss whose FIRO-B scale profile was compatible with their own. Incompatible Ss did not give evidence of influence during the acquisition phase of the experiment.

Strong (1968) has facilitated extrapolation of opinion-change research to counseling by defining counseling as an interpersonal influence process in which the counselor attempts to influence the client
to attain the goals of counseling. Based on cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), Strong hypothesized that counselors' attempts to influence their clients' behavior and attitudes would create dissonance. Applying research in social psychology, Strong postulated that if counselors were perceived as expert, attractive and trustworthy, it would decrease the likelihood of dissonance being reduced by discrediting the counselor. Furthermore, by increasing client involvement in counseling, the counselor could also reduce the chances that the client would reduce dissonance by discrediting the issue. Thus, Strong's two-stage model of counseling suggests that counselors first enhance their perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness as well as client involvement and then proceed to use their influence power to persuade clients to reduce dissonance by changing their beliefs or behaviors.

In an extension of the above theory, Strong and Matross (1973) examined the change processes operating in counseling. Counselors' social power was hypothesized to result from a correspondence between clients' needs and perceived counselor resources. Five types of counselor power bases were postulated: expert, referent, legitimate, informational and ecological. Forces working against client change were identified as resistance and opposition. Strong and Matross argued that changes occurring in counseling were a combined function of the strength of the power base and the operation of resistance and opposition.

Since the publication of Strong's (1968) review, numerous studies have explored the effects of enhancing counselor traits on counselors' ability to influence clients. The following is not an exhaustive
review, but rather an indication of the inferences which can be drawn from this body of research concerning counselor influence.

Three studies have measured the effects of perceived expertness, manipulated through the use of introductions, on counselor influence. In general, it appears that counselors are able to influence subjects regardless of attributed status or experience.

Greenberg (1969) investigated the effects of an experienced versus inexperienced as well as cold versus warm introduction. Counselors structured as warm—experienced were significantly more successful in influencing Ss than the cold—inexperienced group. However, all counselors, regardless of introduction were effective in influencing Ss's opinions. Sprafkin (1970) found similar results. His subjects made changes advocated by counselors regardless of whether the counselor was introduced as a college junior or a Ph.D. with national recognition. However, Binderman, Fretz, Scott and Abrams (1972) report somewhat conflicting results. A counselor identified as either a Ph.D. or a practicum student gave Ss test results in which the amount and direction of discrepancy from Ss self-estimates on certain traits were also manipulated. While change in self-report was primarily affected by increasing discrepancy in the negative direction, the professional counselor affected more change in self-report for all Ss receiving highly discrepant reports than the novice. Strong and Schmidt (1970) manipulated counselor expert and inexpert behavior as well as introduction to investigate the effect of counselor behavior on influence. While expert behavior produced significant opinion change only when reinforced by an expert introduction, some attitude change occurred in all conditions.
Four studies have investigated the effects of manipulated attractiveness on counselor influence ability. Both Patton (1969) and Schmidt and Strong (1971) found neither attractive and unattractive introduction or behavior produced differential influence. However, Schmidt and Strong did find that subjects interviewed by the counselor in an attractive role were less aware of the attempt to influence them than were unattractive role subjects. The authors suggest that such unnoticed influence may culminate over the long run in a greater effect than obvious attempts to influence. If clients resist obvious influence attempts, then unattractive interviewers are likely to generate, in time, greater resistance to their suggestions and opinions (Schmidt and Strong, 1971). While successfully manipulating counselor attractiveness, Sell (1974) found no relationship between observed influence and attractiveness. However, in contrast to the above results, Hoffman and Spencer (1977) found that counselors receiving the most favorable ratings on the BLRI also exerted the greatest influence on subjects' extra-interview behavior. It appears, though, that similarity of counselor self-disclosure rather than attractiveness was responsible for both the enhanced ratings of the counselor as well as the behavioral changes, due to the fact that on a specific attractiveness measure there were no differences between Ss who changed their behavior and those who did not. The results for attractiveness appear to stand in direct contrast to those from investigations in social psychology which have found consistently reliable relationships between attraction and influence.

The effects of counselor trustworthiness and of client involvement on counselor influence have failed to receive any research attention.
In the case of trustworthiness, this appears to be due mainly to difficulty in eliciting differential perceptions of the variable which seems to be inherent to the social role of the counselor (Strong, 1968).

Three studies have investigated the combined effects of expertness and attractiveness on counselor influence. Strong and Dixon (1971) ran two studies to determine whether expertness and attractiveness combined additively or whether expertness tended to mask attractiveness in defining the interviewer's influence power. The results of the first study disconfirmed the hypothesis that together attractiveness and expertness would provide for more influence power than expertness alone. However, the results of the second experiment supported the masking effect: expert interviewers' attractiveness had no effect on their influence power, while inexpert interviewers' attractiveness determined the amount of influence they could wield. An additional important finding was that the influence of the unattractive/expert deteriorated in a one-week follow-up testing.

Two studies have investigated the effects of expert and referent power bases on counselor influence. Dell (1973) crossed expert and referent bases with expert- and referent-based counselor influence attempts. While expert and referent power bases were not differentially effective in exerting influence, Dell did find a trend suggesting that congruence between power base and influence attempt produces greater compliance than incongruity. These results suggest a more complex interaction between attractiveness and expertness than the simple masking effect of Strong and Dixon. Finally, Merluzzi, Merluzzi and Kaul (1977) found that black эксперт and white/referent interviewers were most
influential in precipitating both attitude and behavior change in all-white Ss. This study suggests that the differential effects of attractiveness and expertness may be mediated by other variables.

In summary, it appears that, at least in an initial interview, counselors have considerable influence on clients. Studies of the effect of both expertness and attractiveness suggest that regardless of their behavior or introduction, counselors were consistently able to produce opinion change in Ss. It seems appropriate to conclude that some degree of persuasive power may be inherent to the social role of the counselor. However, since all of the above research has dealt with the initial interview, questions still remain as to the nature and extent of influence in later sessions. Awareness of influence, a notion mentioned by Schmidt and Strong (1971), may be an important determinant of the interviewer's influence power and the extent of compliance by clients during the course of treatment. Awareness of influence attempts on the part of the client deserves more research attention both from an ethical and practical viewpoint.

Similarity of Client and Counselor Values

Six studies have directly investigated client-counselor value similarity. Two have investigated the effects of similarity on outcome and four have related similarity to client perception of the counselor.

Both Cook (1966) and Holzman (1962) investigated the effects of similarity on outcome. Using the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values to determine client-counselor similarity, Cook (1966) found that a medium degree of similarity produced more positive change in the client's response to concepts of self than either high or low similarity. As
mentioned in a previous section, Holzman (1962) found that similarity between a client's and counselor's life situation in terms of such factors as race, education, occupation, and religion as well as similarity in values significantly enhanced client's ability to carry out life function.

Landfield and Nawas (1964) found evidence to support the hypothesis that, to be effective, the counselor must share a certain degree of commonality of perspective with the client. On client language dimensions, agreement with the counselor on important role constructs was achieved in 72% of the most improved clients but only in 39% of the least improved. Kessel (1967) conducted a counseling analogue study in which he attempted to determine the effect of manipulated client-counselor values similarity on interpersonal influence. Kessel found that dissimilarity of values reduced interpersonal attraction although similarity did not necessarily increase it. Furthermore, Ss in the dissimilar group were significantly less desirous of having their interviewer as a counselor than Ss in the other groups. However, while value dissimilarity decreased the Ss attraction to the counselor, it did not reduce the interviewer's ability to influence the Ss verbal behavior.

Haugen and Edwards (1976) investigated the effects of similar religious values on clients' perceptions of counselors in a counseling analogue. They found a positive correlation between subjects' perceptions that the counselor shared their religious convictions and a measure of attraction and willingness to meet with the counselor.

Investigating the determinants of relationship-centered satisfaction, Tessler (1975) led 96 female subjects to believe that their
interviewer in a counseling role-play situation had marked the Morris (1956) Ways to Live Scale in a similar or dissimilar manner to their own. Relationship-centered satisfaction (the client's sense of closeness to the counselor) was measured by seven items derived from prior research (Polansky and Kounin, 1956). Tessler found a significant main effect for value similarity. Subjects reported experiencing significantly greater relationship-centered satisfaction when they were led to expect that they would have much in common with the counselor than when they were led to expect they would have little in common with him.

Finally, Gill (1976) found that subjects' similarity-dissimilarity to counselors on the values of independence and self-exploration had no significant effect on attraction to the counselor or change in values. However, it is difficult to draw conclusions from this study since Gill failed to obtain a genuine value "dissimilar" group due to the fact that the subject population responded homogeneously to the value dimensions. Furthermore, as indicated earlier, it is likely that Ss failed to detect the counselor's advocacy of the values investigated.

While the research is sparse, it appears that at least a moderate level of value similarity may be conducive to positive client perceptions of the counselor as well as to client improvement in counseling. However, client-counselor value dissimilarity may have more important and potent effects than does similarity. Generally, those clients who do not share counselor values tend to be rated as less improved than clients whose initial or terminal values approximate those of the counselor. Researchers have suggested that initial value similarity may be an important variable in determining which clients will adopt their
counselor's values and which will not. Buhler (1962) has suggested that, if the initial value positions of the client and counselor are too discrepant, the client may react negatively to counselor communications, thus aborting the counselor's influence attempts. Sufficient value dissimilarity may even lead to client changes in a direction opposite that advocated by the counselor.

Some research has supported the potential impact of initial value dissimilarity between the client and counselor. For example, Rosenbaum (1956) related the lack of improvement among a group of highly religious clients to the gross disparity of values between these clients and their counselors. Glad (1959) suggested that religious clients may show a lack of improvement due to a lack of enough shared beliefs with their counselors to make meaningful communication possible. Synder (1961), in an indepth study of 20 counseling cases, correlated his clients' adherence to his own idealistic and altruistic values with his ranking of rapport in the counseling relationship. He concluded that the clients with whom he had the best relationship were also those who, to a great extent, shared his values. Again, Synder's results support Glad's beliefs that client-counselor value dissimilarity may adversely influence the quality of the counseling relationship.

A few studies which have investigated client-counselor similarity (not value similarity) in relation to outcome have some bearing on the present discussion and will be noted briefly. Axelrod (1952) used the Rorschach to measure client-counselor similarity and found that similarity of thought processes was positively related to counselor ratings of clients as improved versus unimproved. Tuma and Gustad (1957)
concluded that similarity of clients and counselors as measured by the California Psychological Inventory was associated with improvement in client self-knowledge.

Both Gerler (1958) and Carson and Heine (1962), using the Ewing Personal Rating Form and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory respectively, found a curvilinear relationship between similarity and outcome as assessed by counselor ratings of clients. A medium degree of client-counselor similarity was found to be most conducive to favorable outcome.

Mendelssohn and Geller (1963) measured counselor-client similarity using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and concluded that counselor-client similarity in cognitive-perceptive orientation results in greater involvement in the counselor process as reflected by the number of sessions the client attends. A later replication (Mendelsohn, 1966) supported the above findings.

Sapolsky (1965) and Gassner (1970) used the FIRO-B scale to manipulate client-counselor compatibility. Sapolsky found that compatibility was moderately related \( r = .45 \) to outcome as rated by supervising psychiatrists. Gassner, however, found no differences in improvement among high, low and unmatched groups.

In many ways, the studies above lack comparability. Diversity of populations, types and length of counseling, designs, measures of similarity and outcome criteria make it difficult to draw solid conclusions. However, as Kessel and McBrearty (1967) conclude, client-counselor similarity does appear to have some effect on outcome. Furthermore, there is some indication that dissimilarity as well as a very high degree of
similarity may have negative effects. On the basis of the research they reviewed on value similarity, Kessel and McBrearty (1967) concluded that "... when therapist and patient are highly dissimilar, therapist-patient interpersonal attraction is reduced as is effective communication and the therapist's ability to influence the patient" (p. 680). Their conclusions still appear to be accurate, in light of more recent research.

At this point it appears appropriate to briefly mention two further bodies of research which are pertinent to the issue of counselor-client similarity. In the first place, some of the research in social psychology bears directly on the issue of value similarity-dissimilarity.

Byrne (1971) has attempted to demonstrate that the more similar an individual is, in terms of opinions, attitudes, interests and personality traits, to a perceiver, the more the perceiver will be attracted to that individual. In several investigations, Byrne and his associates have found attraction to be a function of similarity with regard to such variables as economic status (Byrne, Clore and Worcel, 1966), personality traits (Byrne, Griffitt and Stefaniak, 1967) and attitudes (Byrne and Clore, 1966). Much of Byrne's research on attraction has been conducted using attitude statements as stimulus material. In an investigation designed to determine whether or not stimulus mode would effect the relationship between attitude similarity and attraction, Byrne and Clore (1966) presented subjects with tape recorded, mimeographed and video-taped attitude statements. Stimulus mode had no effect on the consistently positive relationship between similarity and attraction.
The relevance of Byrne's research on attitude similarity to value similarity is apparent from a statement made by Byrne and Clore (1966). They stated that "the major portion of attraction research has utilized similarity and dissimilarity of attitudes, opinions, beliefs, and values as the stimulus" (pp. 659-660).

Finally, research based on Strong's (1968) assertions that clients' perceptions of counselor attractiveness are dependent upon perceived "similarity to, compatibility with and liking for..." the counselor has also tended to support the relationship between client-counselor similarity and attraction to the counselor. Schmidt and Strong (1971), Sell (1974) and Patton (1969) all successfully manipulated client attraction to the counselor using either counselor behavior or introductions. However, Goldstein and colleagues (Goldstein, 1971) were unable to consistently produce attraction by manipulating similarity. It appears that the effects of similarity on attraction are not as robust and unequivocal in the counseling literature as they have been in the social psychology laboratory.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to compare the effects of an implicit versus an explicit counselor statement of values on subjects' perceptions of the counselor, their willingness to see the counselor for counseling and their expectations of the counselor's helpfulness for several personal problems. Explicit value communication was considered to be a direct statement by a counselor concerning her opinions or beliefs. Values were considered to be conveyed implicitly through goals, methods, philosophical framework, or through counselor attempts to influence the client. In the present study, the explicit value statement was a forthright comment by the counselor about her stand on premarital sex, while the implicit value statement was contained in an influential counselor summary statement.

The study also investigated the effects of client-counselor value similarity on perceptions of the counselor, willingness to see her for personal problems, and expectations of the counselor's helpfulness in particular areas.

Subjects

One-hundred and fifty females in introductory psychology courses at The Ohio State University volunteered as subjects and were given course credit for their participation. No effort was made to control for the age of respondents. The students signed up for times according to their
availability and treatments were assigned to time slots independently by the experimenter. The only consideration used in assigning treatments was that the total number of subjects in each of the 10 cells should be equal at the conclusion of the experiment.

Counselor

The counselor was a fourth year graduate student in counseling psychology with two years experience in an applied setting.

Client

The client was a second year graduate student in counseling psychology.

Design and Experimental Manipulations

A standard script (Appendix A) was prepared in which a female counselor and a female client discussed the client's decision concerning whether or not to engage in sexual intercourse with her boyfriend. The problem of premarital sex was chosen because it is an issue typically encountered by college females and thus one with which undergraduate subjects could easily identify, and also one on which opinion tends to be divided in a college population.

In the "explicit" condition, in answer to the client's inquiry, the counselor explained that she was either in favor (pro condition) or opposed (con condition) to the idea of premarital sexual relationships. In the "implicit" condition the direct value statement was deleted. However, toward the end of the counseling excerpt, the counselor attempted to influence the client in either a pro or a con direction, thus constituting the implicit statement of the counselor's values. The influence attempt also appeared in the "explicit" tape and was consistent
with the initial value position taken by the counselor. A minimal influence tape contained neither the "explicit" nor the "implicit" value reference.

One master audiotape was constructed which contained both the explicit and implicit influence attempts made in the pro condition. Explicit and implicit influence attempts for the con condition were recorded separately. The master tape was then edited and duplicated to produce five separate tapes: for explicit-pro condition the master tape was used as recorded; for the explicit-con condition the pro influence attempt as well as the explicit-pro value statement were deleted and replaced with the implicit-con influence attempt and explicit-con value statement; for the implicit-pro condition the explicit value statement was deleted; both the explicit-pro value statement and implicit-pro influence attempt were deleted in the implicit-con condition and the implicit-con influence attempt was added. Finally, the minimal influence tape was constructed by deleting both the implicit-pro and explicit-pro statements and adding a brief reflective statement.

In summary, then, the design included 10 groups with 15 subjects/group. Four groups heard an explicit value statement followed by an influence attempt. Four heard only an implicit value statement conveyed through a counselor influence attempt. Within each condition (explicit, implicit) half the subjects heard a counselor express a pro attitude toward premarital sex and half heard a con attitude. Subjects were also divided according to their own positions as assessed by their responses to the "OSU Attitude Survey". Half those hearing the pro counselor and half those hearing the con counselor agreed with the expressed values
and half did not. Fifteen pro and fifteen con subjects listened to a
minimal influence tape containing neither the implicit nor the explicit
value reference. This group was compared to the experimental groups in
order to determine whether or not both experimental groups evidenced
awareness of the value statements. The diagram below illustrates the
experimental design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit</th>
<th>Explicit</th>
<th>M.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro Ss</td>
<td>Con Ss</td>
<td>Pro Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

Subjects were scheduled in groups of two to twelve to participate
in the "Counselor Evaluation Study". Upon arrival on the day of the ex-
periment, subjects were greeted by the experimenter who handed each
subject a booklet containing instructions and rating forms. Before
proceeding further, subjects were asked to complete the "OSU Attitude
Survey" (Appendix B) attached to the front of their booklets. This sur-
vvey consisted of a variety of questions concerning students' attitudes
toward dating, marriage, dorm life, drugs, etc. as well as premarital
sexual intercourse. Since some students had filled out the same attitude
survey on the first day of class the following instructions were read:

The OSU Attitude Survey is a standard attitude survey which
some of you may have seen or completed in your Psychology 100
classes. At that time your name and/or phone number may have
been requested on the survey. However, for the purposes of
this experiment your answers are to be completely confidential
and anonymous. Any questions? Please fill out the survey.

After subjects had filled out the survey, the experimenter explained
the purpose of the study and described the interview the subjects would
hear. Subjects followed silently as the experimenter read the instructions aloud (see Appendix C). At this time subjects were told that at three points during the counseling excerpt the tape would be stopped and they would be asked to respond to the counselor as if they were the client. Subject responses were solicited in order to ensure that the subjects were attending to the tape and also to increase their involvement in the interview.

After listening to one of the five tapes, subjects were asked to complete two evaluative questionnaires, as well as a form containing the manipulation checks. Following their evaluation of the counselor, subjects were given a form asking to what extent they were able to identify with the client as well as requesting reactions and comments about the research and the counselor (see Appendix D). On the basis of these comments, three subjects were eliminated from the study because they evidenced strong suspicions about the cover story and the experimental manipulations. Finally, subjects were debriefed. The debriefing information appears in Appendix E.

Dependent Measures

Pretest. The "OSU Attitude Survey" (Appendix B) was administered before subjects heard the taped counseling session. The survey consisted of a variety of questions concerning students' values and attitudes in a number of areas. Responses to the item "In general it is best to wait until after marriage to engage in sexual intercourse" were used to divide subjects into the pro and con groups. Subjects responding to the item with either "strongly agree" or "agree" were considered the "con" group. Subjects responding with "disagree" or "strongly disagree" were considered the "pro" group. Subjects responding with "undecided" were eliminated.
Post-tests. The Counselor Rating Form (Appendix F) was used to assess subjects' perceptions of the counselor. The CRF (Barak and LaCrosse, 1975) contains 36 seven-point bi-polar items, 12 each for the measurement of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, as proposed by Strong (1968). Four judges familiar with the constructs selected adjectives indicative of each dimension as defined by previous research (Strong and Dixon, 1971; Strong and Schmidt, 1970). The possible range of scores for each dimension varies from a minimum of 12 to a maximum of 84. LaCrosse and Barak (1976) have reported reliability coefficients of .87 for expertness, .85 for attractiveness and .91 for trustworthiness (Barak and LaCrosse, 1977; Barak and Dell, 1977; LaCrosse and Barak, 1975). Correlations between the CRF and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory have been shown to be significant for client and observer ratings (LaCrosse, 1977). Nine out of twelve correlations were significant for clients and eight out of twelve for observer's ratings, suggesting the possibility of a strong common factor between the CRF and BLRI of perceived counselor behavior (LaCrosse, 1977).

An instrument entitled the "Counseling Reaction Questionnaire" (Appendix G) was used to assess the success of the experimental manipulations. Two items were summed to assess subjects' awareness of the influence attempt in both conditions (implicit and explicit):

- The counselor seemed to be trying to change the client's views.  
  (Influence, Item #19)
- I think the counselor attempted to influence the client's thinking.  
  (Influence, Item # 9)

The items used to assess the success of the explicit versus implicit manipulation included:
The counselor directly stated her values and opinions. (Explicit, Item #5)
The counselor seemed to imply but did not directly state her values and opinions. (Implicit, Item #15)

The following two items were summed in order to assess the success of the manipulation of value similarity:

I felt the counselor shared many of the same attitudes and values that I have. (Agree value, Item #11)
I tended to agree with the counselor when she expressed her opinions. (Agree Value, Item #22)

The subject's confidence that she could identify the counselors' views on premarital sex was assessed by the following item:

I do not know what this counselor believes about premarital sex. (Know, Item #13)

Finally, the subject's ability to identify the counselor's viewpoint was assessed by the following item:

The counselor believes that generally it is best to wait until one is married to have sexual intercourse. (View Sex, Item #3)

Also included on the CRQ were the following items which assessed the subject's willingness to refer a friend to the taped counselor and her willingness to see the counselor herself, should she encounter personal problems:

I would be willing to refer a friend to this counselor. (Item #25)
Should I encounter personal problems myself, I would be willing to see this counselor. (Item #26)

The above items were imbedded in a 26-item 5-point likert scale which included filler items pertaining to counselor self-management skills, taken from the Interviewer Reaction Questionnaire used by Hageseth (1974).

Finally, subjects reported, on a six-point likert scale, the degree of confidence they would place in the counselor's effectiveness with each of 15 specific personal problems chosen on the basis of relevance.
to a college population. These items have been used in previous research (Cash, Beasley, McCown, and Peise, 1975; Cash and Kehr, 1978; Lewis and Walsh, 1978) and provide indices of counseling outcome expectations.

Hypotheses

In order to check the validity of the manipulation of the independent variables the following hypotheses were proposed.

1. A significant main effect for counselor communication style (explicit/implicit).
   a. Subjects in the explicit condition will rate the counselor as direct and forthright about her opinions significantly more often than subjects in the implicit conditions.
   b. Subjects in the implicit conditions will rate the counselor as implicit, as assessed by the CPO, significantly more often than those in the explicit conditions.
   c. Subjects in the explicit conditions will evidence greater knowledge of the counselor's views than subjects in the implicit conditions.

2. A significant counselor (pro/con) x subject (pro/con) interaction.
   a. Pro subjects will report agreeing with the pro counselor's values significantly more often than con subjects will.
   b. Con subjects will report significantly more agreement with the con counselor than will pro subjects.

3. A significant three-way interaction (subject pro/con x counselor pro/con x implicit/explicit communication style).
a. Pro subjects in the pro-counselor explicit group will report greater agreement with counselor values than pro subjects in the pro-counselor implicit group.

b. Con subjects in the con-counselor explicit group will report greater agreement with the counselor's values than con subjects in the implicit con-counselor group.

4. A significant main effect for the four experimental groups versus the minimal influence groups.

   a. Subjects in the experimental groups will rate the counselor as attempting to influence the client significantly more often than subjects in the minimal influence groups.

   b. Subjects in the experimental groups will report significantly more knowledge of the counselor's values than subjects in the minimal influence groups.

Although there is limited data to suggest directional hypotheses with regard to client-counselor value similarity, the data from Byrne (1971), Hauzen and Edwards (1976) and Vessel (1967) as well as Strong's (1968) proposals suggested the following hypotheses.

5. A significant subject position x counselor position interaction.

   a. Subjects will tend to rate the counselor more positively on the CRP when they hold similar values to the counselor.

   b. Subjects will tend to express significantly greater willingness to see the counselor when they hold values similar to the counselor.

   c. Subjects will tend to express significantly greater confidence in the counselor's potential helpfulness when they agree with her expressed values.
Based upon Schmidt and Strong (1971),

d. Subjects who see themselves as holding values similar to those of the counselor will display less awareness of the counselor's influence attempt than subjects who disagree with the counselor's values.

The following nondirectional hypotheses were proposed.

6. A significant main effect for counselor communication style across the dependent measures.

7. A significant three-way interaction (subject position x counselor position x explicit-explicit) across the dependent measures.

a. Pro subjects in the explicit counselor-pro group will rate the counselor in a significantly different manner from pro subjects in the explicit counselor-con group across all dependent measures.

b. Con subjects in the explicit counselor-con group will rate the counselor in a significantly different manner from con subjects in the explicit counselor-pro group across all dependent measures.

Analysis

Independent variables included counselor position (pro or con), subject position (pro or con) and explicit, implicit and minimal influence styles of value communication. Dependent measures were perceptions of the counselor as rated on the CRF, counseling outcome expectancies as assessed by the counseling problems, and willingness to refer a friend and to see the counselor oneself, reported on the CPO. Means and standard deviations were computed for each of the scales on the dependent
measures. Further, all hypotheses were tested across all groups using multivariate analysis of variance. A univariate analysis of each variable on all dependent measures indicated significant differences between groups on single variables. Any significant interaction effects on single variables were also indicated. Post-hoc tests were done using Dunn's Bonferroni to take a closer look at significant variables.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter will include a presentation of the means and standard deviations for the manipulation checks as well as for the ratings of each counselor on all dependent variables. Also included are the results of the multivariate analysis of variance performed using Dunn's Bonferroni-t test to determine significant group differences.

Manipulation Checks

In order to ascertain the validity of the manipulation of the independent variables, multivariate analysis of variance was performed on subjects' ratings of the counselor as assessed by preselected questions on the CRQ. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance indicate that the experimental manipulations were successful. Highly significant multivariate F's were obtained for the main effect of counselor value communication style (implicit vs. explicit) ($F = 153.7$, $p < .001$), counselor position (pro vs. con) ($F = 31.6$, $p < .001$), the interaction between subject position (pro/con) and counselor position (pro/con) ($F = 8.6$, $p < .001$), the four experimental groups vs. the minimal influence group ($F = 31.9$, $p < .001$), the three-way interaction of counselor position x counselor communication style x subject position ($F = 2.47$, $p < .03$) and the interaction between counselor style and counselor position ($F = 12.6$, $p < .001$).
The multivariate F for the main effect of subject position was not significant, indicating that, as intended, there were no consistent differences between the pro and con subjects groups (F = 0.98, p > .05). The multivariate F for the interaction of subject position and counselor style was also nonsignificant (F = 1.26, p > .05).

The means, standard deviations and univariate tests of significance for the manipulation checks appear in Tables 1 and 2 respectively. In the univariate analysis of the manipulation checks, the main effect of counselor communication style was found to be significant on the dimensions of influence (p < .001), implicit value statement (p < .01), explicit value statement (p < .001), knowledge of the counselor's values (p < .001), and report of the counselor's viewpoint (p < .001). The explicit counselor was thus seen as exerting significantly more influence and as significantly more direct about her values than the implicit counselor. Subjects hearing the explicit counselor were more confident that the counselor was not implying her values but rather stating them in a straightforward manner; while Ss hearing the implicit counselor were undecided about whether or not the counselor was implying values. Subjects hearing the explicit counselor were also significantly more confident that they knew her views regarding pre-marital sex than those hearing the implicit counselor.

Univariate F tests for the main effect of counselor position (pro/con) were significant for the dimensions of explicit value statement (p < .049) and report of the counselor's viewpoint (p < .001). Subjects in the explicit groups tended to rate the con counselor as slightly less explicit (\( \bar{X} = 4.36 \)) than the pro counselor (\( \bar{X} = 4.47 \)),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Subjects Pro Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Pro Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Pro Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Con Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>5.067</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>1.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree Value</td>
<td>8.067</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>6.667</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Sex</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations for Manipulation Checks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Minimal Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>4.867</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree Value</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>2.028</td>
<td>7.733</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>5.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>2.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>4.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Sex</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>2.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 (Continued)
Table 2

Univariate F Tests for Manipulation Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>MI(G4)</th>
<th>MIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>16.6***</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>1.845</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>4.217*</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree Value</td>
<td>2.225</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>50.007***</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>11.126***</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>3.204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>7.055**</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>4.438*</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.552</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>827.851***</td>
<td>3.937*</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>169.398***</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>306.974***</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>56.704***</td>
<td>4.142*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Sex</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>13.191***</td>
<td>158.526***</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>67.772***</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- S = subject pro-con effect
- E = communication style effect (Implicit-Explicit)
- C = counselor pro-con effect
- MI = 4 experimental groups versus minimal influence group

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
while the implicit pro counselor was rated slightly less ($\bar{X} = 1.67$) nonexplicit than the con counselor ($\bar{X} = 1.4$). Since ratings for both counselors were in the intended direction the slight differences were relatively meaningless. Subjects listening to the "con" counselor agreed significantly more often that she believed it best to wait until after marriage for sexual intercourse than subjects hearing the "pro" counselor, again indicating the success of the manipulation of counselor position.

Univariate F-tests performed on the interaction between subject position and counselor position turned up two significant F-tests on the dimensions of subjects' agreement with the counselor's values ($p < .001$) and of implicit communication ($p < .037$). In the univariate analysis of the interaction between counselor communication style and counselor position, the dimension of subject report of counselor viewpoint ($p < .001$) was significant. In the three-way interaction there was a significant univariate $F$ on the dimension of subject agreement with counselor values ($p < .001$).

In the univariate analysis of the experimental group vs. the minimal influence groups, significant $F$'s were found on the dimensions of counselor influence ($p < .042$), counselor explicitness ($p < .001$) and Ss' knowledge of counselor values ($p < .001$). When combined, all experimental groups saw the counselor as significantly more influential and explicit than did the minimal influence groups and were significantly more confident than the minimal influence groups that they knew the counselor's stand on premarital sex. In the interaction of subject position with the experimental groups vs. minimal influence,
the univariate $F$ for subjects' knowledge of the counselor's stand on
premarital sex was significant ($p < .044$). Pro-control subjects
appeared to be more confident than con-control subjects that they
did not know the counselor's position although both means indicated
lack of knowledge ($\bar{X}_\text{con} = 3.7$, $\bar{X}_\text{pro} = 4.4$).

In summary, it appears that subjects generally viewed the counselor
as intended with subjects in the explicit condition rating the counselor
as direct about her opinions significantly more often than subjects in
the implicit condition. The significant main effect for counselor posi-
tion on the viewpoint dimension also indicates that subjects in both
explicit and implicit groups identified the counselor's value position
as intended, although subjects in the implicit groups were less confi-
dent about the counselor's views than those in the explicit groups.
Furthermore, the significant interaction between subject and counselor
position on the dimension of value agreement indicates that, as ex-
pected, subjects who reported "pro" attitudes toward sexual inter-
course on the OSU Attitude Survey, saw their values as similar to the
"pro" counselor, while $S$s with "con" attitudes reported sharing the
values of the "con" counselor.

To take a closer look at the above findings, Dunn's Bonferroni
t test was used in a secondary analysis. All interesting contrasts
were analyzed for significant interactions. Table 3 conveys the
results of the post-hoc analysis for the manipulation checks. All
post hoc tests were conducted with $\alpha_{EW}$ set at .05 unless otherwise
specified.
Table 3

Summary of Comparisons for Manipulation Checks

**Subject Position x Counselor Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Value</th>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>Pp</th>
<th>Cc</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Cp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.367</td>
<td>7.233</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implicit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>Pp</th>
<th>Cc</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>Cp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>2.434</td>
<td>2.633</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>2.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In all tables of post-hoc comparisons groups underlined by a common line do not differ significantly; groups not underlined by a common line do differ significantly ($p < .05$). The equation for the Bonferroni $t$ statistic used in the comparisons was:

$$
d = t' D_{EW} C, \text{df}_{\text{error}} \sqrt{\text{MS}_{\text{error}} \frac{c_{j}^2}{n_j} + \ldots + \frac{c_{j}^2}{n_j}}$

where:

$D_{EW} = \text{experimentwise error} = .05$ (unless otherwise stated)

$C = \text{number of comparisons made}$

$\text{df}_{\text{error}} = \text{degrees of freedom for error}$

$P = \text{counselor pro}$

$p = \text{subject pro}$

$C = \text{counselor con}$

$c = \text{subject con}$
Table 3 (Continued)

Experimental Groups versus Minimal Influence Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>3.766</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit</th>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>4.367</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know</th>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>4.033</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>4.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$E$ = explicit communication style

$I$ = implicit communication style

$P$ = counselor pro position

$C$ = counselor con position

$MI$ = minimal influence group
Table 3 (Continued)

**Counselor Style x Counselor Position**

**View Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>2.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Counselor Style x Counselor Position x Subject Position**

**Agree Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>IPp</th>
<th>ICc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.067</td>
<td>7.733</td>
<td>6.667</td>
<td>6.733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.867</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$E =$ explicit communication style

$I =$ implicit communication style

$P =$ counselor pro

$C =$ counselor con

$p =$ subject pro

$c =$ subject con
In the secondary analysis of the subject position x counselor position interaction, significant differences ($p_{FW} < .05$) were found between the Counselor-Pro-Subject-Pro group ($\bar{x} = 7.367$) and the Counselor-Pro-Subject-Con group ($\bar{x} = 5.734$) as well as between the Counselor-Con-Subject-Con ($\bar{x} = 7.233$) and Counselor-Con-Subject-Pro ($\bar{x} = 5.334$) group on the dimension of subject agreement with counselor values. Thus, subjects in both pro and con groups reported that they agreed with counselors manipulated pro and con respectively, as intended. None of the post-hoc tests were significant for the interaction of subject position x counselor position on the dimension of implied values. However, the interaction was caused by the tendency for subjects who agreed with the counselor to evidence greater awareness of the implied value statement than Ss who disagreed with the counselor.

Secondary analysis performed on the factor of four groups vs. minimal influence yielded several significant effects ($p_{FW} < .05$). On the dimension of influence, subjects saw the explicit counselor ($\bar{x} = 4.7$) as significantly more influential than the minimal influence counselor ($\bar{x} = 3.6$). However, subjects viewing the implicit counselor ($\bar{x} = 3.64$) did not differ significantly from minimal influence groups in ratings of counselor influence. On the dimension of counselor explicitness, again Ss in explicit groups ($\bar{x} = 4.417$) differed significantly from the minimal influence group ($\bar{x} = 1.5$) while Ss in the implicit groups ($\bar{x} = 1.517$) did not, indicating that, as intended, only the explicit group saw the counselor as forthright about her values. Again only the explicit groups ($\bar{x} = 1.55$) differed significantly from the minimal influence groups ($\bar{x} = 4.067$) on the dimension of knowing
the counselor values. Neither the minimal influence Ss nor Ss in the implicit group ($\bar{X} = 4.116$) felt they knew where the counselor stood on the issue of premarital sex.

Secondary analysis of the interaction between counselor communication style and counselor position on the dimension of the counselor's viewpoint yielded large significant differences ($p_{EM} < .05$) between the Counselor-Con and Counselor-Pro groups when the counselor was explicit ($\bar{X}_{con} = 4.5$, $\bar{X}_{pro} = 1.634$) and only a slightly significant difference when the counselor was implicit ($\bar{X}_{con} = 2.867$, $\bar{X}_{pro} = 2.267$). Thus, when the counselor was explicit, subjects were well aware of her view on the issue of premarital sex. However, when the counselor implied her values, while subjects still tended to get a correct perception of her stand, they were much less confident about their ratings.

Finally, secondary analysis of the three-way interaction on the dimension of agree value yielded significant differences ($p_{EM} < .05$) between the explicit-agreed group ($\bar{X} = 7.9$) and the explicit-disagreed group ($\bar{X} = 5.3$), the implicit-agreed group ($\bar{X} = 6.7$) and the implicit-disagreed group ($\bar{X} = 5.767$) and between the explicit-agreed and implicit-agreed groups. These results indicate that in both explicit and implicit conditions subjects reported agreeing with counselors manipulated similar significantly more often than with counselors manipulated dissimilar. In addition, the effect of agreement was most pronounced when the counselor was explicit.

**Dependent Variables**

A significant main effect for the explicit-implicit dimension, a significant two-way interaction between counselor position and subject
position (Counselor pro-con x Subject pro-con) and a significant three-way interaction (Counselor pro-con x Implicit-explicit x Subject pro-con) were hypothesized. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance however failed to support these hypotheses. Significant multivariate F's were obtained for the main effect of counselor position (F = 1.75, p < .031) and for the interaction of subject position and counselor communication style (Subject pro-con x implicit-explicit) (F = 1.715, p < .037). The remainder of the multivariate F's were nonsignificant.

Counselor Rating Form

The means, standard deviations and univariate F's for subjects' ratings of the counselor on the CRF appear in Tables 4 and 5 respectively. In the univariate analysis, a significant subject pro-con effect was found for both trust (p < .023) and attraction (p < .005). On both trait dimensions, except in the case of the explicit-pro counselor, con subjects tended to give higher ratings to the counselor than the pro subjects. The three-way interaction between counselor position, subject position, and counselor communication style was significant for both the attraction (p < .027) and trust (p < .019) dimensions. A significant univariate F was found on the dimension of trust for the factor of experimental groups vs. minimal influence group (p < .018). Trends toward a similar difference between experimental and minimal influence groups were found for both expertness (p < .086) and attractiveness (p < .099) in the univariate analysis.

Post-hoc analysis using Dunn's Bonferroni t test (Table 6) revealed significant group differences (p_{EM} < .05) for the three-way interaction on the trust dimension. Explicit groups in which the
### Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations
CKF and Willingness to See and Refer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects Pro</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Minimal Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to refer friend (25)</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>3.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to see counselor (26)</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>2.867</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Explicit Co. Pro</td>
<td>Explicit Co. Con</td>
<td>Implicit Co. Pro</td>
<td>Implicit Co. Con</td>
<td>Minimal Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T

| Trustworthiness   | 70.133           | 14.594           | 76.533           | 7.936            | 72.467            | 4.897             |
|                   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 74.267            | 8.956             |
|                   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 70.200            | 10.923            |
| Attractiveness    | 67.733           | 15.462           | 72.000           | 7.191            | 66.333            | 4.938             |
|                   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 69.267            | 6.519             |
|                   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 64.400            | 13.442            |
| Expertness        | 68.800           | 12.428           | 71.733           | 7.526            | 70.200            | 6.527             |
|                   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 71.200            | 11.515            |
|                   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 67.000            | 11.161            |
| Willingness       | 3.533            | 0.915            | 3.800            | 0.561            | 3.733             | 0.458             |
| to refer friend   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 4.067             | 0.384             |
|                   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 3.400             | 0.986             |
| Willingness       | 3.267            | 1.100            | 3.600            | 0.828            | 3.533             | 0.640             |
| to see counselor  |                  |                  |                  |                  | 4.000             | 0.926             |
|                   |                  |                  |                  |                  | 3.200             | 1.014             |
### Table 5

Univariate F Tests

CRF and Willingness to See and Refer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>MIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>5.320 *</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>5.662 *</td>
<td>5.756 *</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>8.124 **</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>3.685</td>
<td>4.975 *</td>
<td>2.984</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to refer friend</td>
<td>6.132 *</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>1.652</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>1.652</td>
<td>2.129</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to see counselor</td>
<td>9.041 **</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>5.159 *</td>
<td>5.159 *</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- S = subject pro-con effect
- E = communication style effect (Implicit-Explicit)
- C = counselor pro-con effects
- M1 = 4 experimental groups versus minimal influence group

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Table 6
Summary of Comparisons for the CRF

Counselor Position x Subject Position x Communication Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>ECp</th>
<th>IPp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>76.533</td>
<td>74.267</td>
<td>73.933</td>
<td>73.533</td>
<td>72.467</td>
<td>70.133</td>
<td>67.400</td>
<td>65.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attraction ($\alpha_{EW} = .10$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>ECp</th>
<th>IPc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>72.000</td>
<td>69.267</td>
<td>69.133</td>
<td>67.733</td>
<td>66.333</td>
<td>66.267</td>
<td>59.933</td>
<td>57.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental Groups versus Minimal Influence Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>72.033</td>
<td>71.967</td>
<td>69.000</td>
<td>73.900</td>
<td>66.334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = explicit communication style
I = implicit communication style
P = pro counselor
C = con counselor
p = pro subject
c = con subject
MI = minimal influence
subject and counselor held similar values differed from explicit groups in which they did not, indicating that Ss tend to report more trust in counselors when they agree with the counselor's directly stated values than when they do not. Similar results were obtained on the attractiveness dimension. Pro and con counselors who agreed with subjects and were explicit about their values received significantly higher ($F_{EX} < .10$) attraction ratings than explicit con counselors who disagreed with subjects. In the post-hoc analysis of experimental groups vs. minimal influence group for the dimension of trust, there were no significant contrasts. The significant univariate $F$ was caused by the generally higher rating on trust received by the experimental groups ($\bar{X} = 71.725$) than by the minimal influence group ($\bar{X} = 66.334$).

Willingness to See the Counselor and to Refer a Friend

Means, standard deviations and univariate tests of significance for subjects' willingness to see the counselor and to refer a friend appear in Tables 4 and 5 respectively. In the univariate analysis, the main effect for subjects was significant for both willingness to see the counselor ($p < .003$) and willingness to refer a friend ($p < .014$). In both cases, in the implicit conditions only, con subjects gave higher ratings to both counselors than pro subjects. In the explicit condition, Ss gave higher ratings to counselors they agreed with. On the dimension of Ss' own willingness to see the counselor there were two significant interactions: subject position x implicit-explicit ($p < .025$) and subject position x counselor position ($p < .025$).

Post hoc analysis, using Dunn's Bonferroni $t$, was used to look at interesting contrasts on the interactions and on main effects for
dimensions with no interactions (Table 7). For the main effect of subject position on the dimension of willingness to refer a friend, in the implicit condition, con subjects gave significantly higher ($r_{EW} < .10$) ratings to the implicit-con and explicit-con counselors than did pro subjects. However, pro subjects gave significantly higher ratings to the explicit-pro counselor than to the explicit-con counselor. In the subject x counselor style interaction, when the counselor was explicit about her values, there were no differences between pro and con subjects with regard to willingness to see the counselor. However, in the implicit condition, pro Ss were significantly less willing to see the counselor than were con Ss ($r_{EW} < .05$).

In the counselor pro-con x subject pro-con interaction Ss reported greater willingness to see the counselor when they agree with her than when they did not. The only difference that reached significance ($r_{EW} < .05$) on the post-hoc analysis was that between the Ss-con-counselor-con group ($\bar{X} = 3.8$) and the Ss pro-counselor-con group ($\bar{X} = 2.867$). Con subjects were significantly more willing to see the "con" counselor than were "pro" Ss.

Confidence in Counselor to Help with Problems

The means, standard deviations and univariate tests of significance for the 15 problems appear in Tables 8 and 9 respectively. In the univariate analysis of counselor problems the test of main effect for counselor communication style was not significant for any dimension, indicating that counselor's style of value communication did not differentially affect Ss' ratings of confidence in the counselor's ability to help with certain problems. The test of the main effect
Table 7

Summary of Comparisons for Willingness to Refer a Friend and to See a Counselor

Willingness to Refer a Friend

Main Effect - Subject Position ($\alpha_{EM} = .10$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>ECp</th>
<th>IPp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.733</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>3.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Willingness to see the Counselor

Subject Position x Communication Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>Ec</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.433</td>
<td>2.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Position x Counselor Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.398</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>2.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = explicit communication style
I = implicit communication style
P = pro counselor
C = con counselor
p = pro subject
c = con subject
### Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations

Counseling Problems and Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Minimal Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anxiety</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>4.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol problem</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>3.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual functioning</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>3.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>4.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts w/parents</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>4.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating difficulties</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>3.133</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>4.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career choice</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>3.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>3.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug addiction</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>3.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.56
Table 8 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Minimal Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority feelings</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>3.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test anxiety</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>4.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble studying</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>4.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>2.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anxiety</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>4.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol problem</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>4.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual functioning</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>1.521</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.890</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>4.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts w/parents</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>4.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech anxiety</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating difficulties</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>4.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects Con
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Explicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Pro</th>
<th>Implicit Co. Con</th>
<th>Minimal Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career choice</td>
<td>3.867</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>4.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>3.867</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>3.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug addiction</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority feelings</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>4.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test anxiety</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>4.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties making friends</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>4.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble studying</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>4.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Univariate F Tests

Counseling Problems and Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>MIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anxiety</td>
<td>4.072*</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>5.422*</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol problem</td>
<td>9.631**</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2.276</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness</td>
<td>3.005</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>5.612*</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual functioning</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>4.440*</td>
<td>1.886</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>4.823*</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>2.835</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts with parents</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech anxiety</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating difficulties</td>
<td>7.183**</td>
<td>13.239***</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>3.181</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career choice</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>2.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>3.665</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug addiction</td>
<td>4.985*</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>7.962**</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>MIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority feelings</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>3.009</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>4.887*</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test anxiety</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>1.589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties making friends</td>
<td>2.361</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>1.975</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble studying</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>3.613</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>3.036</td>
<td>2.213</td>
<td>1.626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>2.554</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- S = subject pro-con effect
- E = communication style effect (Implicit-Explicit)
- C = counselor pro-con effects
- MI = \( ^{h} \) experimental groups versus minimal influence group

\* \( p < .05 \)
\** \( p < .01 \)
\*** \( p < .001 \)
of subject position was found to be significant for the dimensions of anxiety \( (p < .046) \), alcohol problem \( (p < .002) \), depression \( (p < .03) \), dating \( (p < .008) \) and drugs \( (p < .027) \). Subjects in the "con" group expressed significantly more confidence in counselors' ability to deal with problems concerning general anxiety, alcohol, depression, dating and drugs than did \( Ss \) in the "pro" group, particularly when the counselor was implicit. The main effect of counselor position was found to be significant for the dimension of dating \( (p < .002) \). \( Ss \) expressed more confidence in the counselors who either stated or implied "pro" values than those holding the "con" values for help with dating problems.

A significant counselor position \( \times \) implicit-explicit interaction for shyness \( (p < .019) \) and a significant three-way interaction for sexual functioning \( (p < .037) \) were also found in the univariate analysis. Further, \( Ss \) rated the experimental groups significantly different from the minimal influence groups on the variables of anxiety \( (p < .021) \), drugs \( (p < .005) \) and inferiority feelings \( (p < .03) \).

Post-hoc tests were performed on main effects for dimensions on which no interaction effects were present and on all interactions (Table 10). Dunn's Bonferroni \( t \) test was used to analyze interesting contrasts. Main effects were found for subject position on the dimensions of general anxiety, alcohol problem, depression, dating, and drugs. A main effect for counselor position was found on the dating dimension. On the anxiety dimension, subjects in the con group gave significantly higher \( (p_{DW} < .10) \) ratings to the implicit pro
Table 10
Summary of Comparisons for Counseling Problems

Main Effect - Subject Position

General Anxiety (at EW = .10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>ECp</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>IPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Alcohol Problem (at EW = .10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>ECp</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>IPP</th>
<th>ICp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>IPP</th>
<th>ECp</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>ICp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = explicit communication style
i = implicit communication style
P = pro counselor
C = con counselor
p = pro subject
c = con subject
MI = minimal influence group
Table 10 (Continued)

### Dating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>IPp</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>ECp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>3.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drugs ($\alpha_{EW} = .10$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>IPp</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>ECp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>3.420</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Main Effect – Counselor Position

### Dating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>EPc</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>IPp</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>ECp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>3.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Counselor Position x Communication Style

### Shyness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.634</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>4.166</td>
<td>3.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication Style x Counselor Position x Subject Position

### Sexual Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ECc</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>IPc</th>
<th>IPp</th>
<th>ICp</th>
<th>EPp</th>
<th>ICc</th>
<th>ECp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.633</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>4.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.900</td>
<td>3.434</td>
<td>3.757</td>
<td>2.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inferiority Feelings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>4.634</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>3.934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
counselor than did pro subjects. For alcohol problem, significant differences (p_{EW} < .10) appeared between the con subjects' ratings of the explicit counselor and the pro subjects' ratings of the implicit counselor. For depression, con subjects expressed significantly greater (p_{EW} < .05) confidence in the con counselor than did pro subjects. Con subjects also expressed greater confidence in the explicit-con counselor than pro subjects expressed in the explicit pro counselor (p_{EW} < .05). On the problem of dating, all pro subjects expressed significantly (p_{EW} < .05) greater confidence in the implicit and explicit pro-counselors than they did in the explicit con counselor. Explicit con subjects, however, had significantly more (p_{EW} < .05) confidence in the con counselor than the pro subjects did. For a drug problem, con subjects again expressed significantly greater (p_{EW} < .05) confidence in the explicit-con counselor than did pro subjects.

Post-hoc analysis of the interactions provided the following results. On the dimension of shyness no significant group differences were found. However, the significant interaction was caused by the tendency for the pro counselor to be rated more favorably when she was explicit about her values and for the con counselor to be rated more favorably in the implicit condition. On the dimension of sexual functioning significant differences (p_{EW} < .05) were found between ratings of the explicit counselor's helpfulness when the subjects agreed with her (\bar{X} = 4.34) versus when they disagreed with her stated values (\bar{X} = 3.4). No significant differences were found in the implicit-agreed (\bar{X} = 3.65) versus implicit-disagreed conditions (\bar{X} = 3.9).
Thus, on the dimension of sexual functioning, when counselors stated their values explicitly, Ss expressed more confidence in the counselor's ability to help when they agreed with her.

For the dimensions of anxiety, drugs, and inferiority feelings the explicit groups (\( \bar{X} = 4.66, 3.89, 4.62 \) respectively) gave the counselor significantly higher (\( p_{\text{HW}} < .05 \)) ratings than subjects in the minimal influence groups (\( \bar{X} = 4.06, 2.97, 3.93 \) respectively).

Identity

The means, standard deviations and univariate tests of significance for subjects' ability to identify with the taped client appear in Table 5. There were no significant univariate F's on the identity dimension, indicating that there were no significant differences across treatments, subjects or counselors in ability to identify with the client. Subjects tended to report a moderate degree of identification with the client.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this chapter the results detailed in chapter four will be discussed, each hypothesis will be restated and the results relevant to confirmation or disconfirmation will be reported. Implications of the results as well as limitations of the study will be outlined and suggestions for future research will be offered.

Manipulation Checks

Hypothesis I

It was expected that subjects would attribute significantly more explicitness to the explicit than to the implicit counselor. The MANOVA performed on responses to the CRO solidly supports this prediction. Subjects hearing the explicit counselor consistently agreed with the statement, "The counselor directly stated her values and opinions" while those hearing the implicit counselor consistently disagreed with the same statement.

While the explicit manipulation was highly successful, the implicit manipulation was less so. Although subjects in the implicit condition did report significantly more agreement with the statement, "The counselor seemed to imply but did not directly state her values and opinions" than did explicit subjects, examination of the group means indicates that, in actuality, both groups disagreed with the statement but explicit groups
disagreed more vehemently. Thus, it appears that, at least as assessed by the CRQ, the subjects in the implicit group were largely unaware of the counselor's implied value statement. This finding will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

It was also predicted in hypothesis I, that subjects in the explicit groups would evidence greater knowledge of the counselor's values than would implicit group subjects. Again, the MANOVA results support the hypothesis. Subjects in the explicit groups indicated consistent disagreement with the statement, "I do not know what this counselor believes about premarital sex", while implicit subjects consistently agreed with the same statement. This denial of knowledge of the counselor's values on the part of the implicit subjects reemphasizes the fact that the majority of the implicit subjects were unaware of the implicit value statement.

**Hypotheses II & III**

It was hypothesized that subjects who reported pro and con attitudes on the OSU attitude survey would report significantly more agreement with the pro and con counselors, respectively, than they would with the counselor manipulated as dissimilar to themselves. Based on the results of the MANOVA, the subject-counselor value similarity manipulation was quite successful. Upon examination of the group means, however, it appears that the manipulation was a great deal more successful for explicit than for implicit subjects as predicted in hypothesis III. While there was a significant tendency for implicit subjects to report greater agreement with the counselor manipulated as similar than as dissimilar, the differences were much smaller than for explicit subjects. However, it
is somewhat puzzling that, while subjects in the implicit conditions reported that the counselor did not imply her values and that they did not know her views on premarital sex, they still reported greater agreement with the counselor manipulated as similar than as dissimilar. Apparently, although subjects were unable or reluctant to identify the implicit counselor value statement, as such, it nonetheless did influence their feelings of agreement or disagreement with the counselor.

**Hypothesis IV**

It was predicted that all four experimental groups would see the counselor as significantly more influential and express significantly greater knowledge of the counselor's values than subjects in the minimal influence group. Both predictions were supported. However, the post-hoc analysis revealed that the results were due to significant differences between the explicit and minimal influence groups. No significant differences were found between the implicit and minimal influence groups. Again, it appears that the implicit group was largely unaware of the implied value statement.

**Dependent Measures**

**Hypothesis V**

It was expected that subjects would tend to rate the counselor more positively on all the dependent measures when they agreed with the counselor's values. This prediction was based on the findings of Byrne (1971), Haugen and Edwards (1976), Kessel (1967) and Tessler (1975) as well as Strong's (1968) proposals that there is a relationship between similarity and ratings of attraction, willingness to see the counselor and satisfaction with the counseling relationship.
The results of the MANOVA failed to support the prediction of an interaction between subject position and counselor position on the CRF. Similarity of values did not produce consistent differences in ratings for either implicit or explicit groups. However, effects were somewhat more evident for explicit groups causing the three-way interaction discussed under hypothesis VII. The fact that manipulated similarity had little effect on the ratings of implicit subjects is consistent with the fact that these subjects reported only marginal awareness of the counselor's value position.

While the value-similarity/dissimilarity manipulation also failed to effect subjects' willingness to refer a friend to the counselor, it did exert a significant impact upon subjects' own willingness to see the counselor. These results, which are consistent with those of Haugen and Edwards (1976) and Kessel (1967) were evident only for the counselor adhering to the con position. Subjects who agreed with the con counselor expressed willingness to see her should they encounter personal problems, while subjects who disagreed with her stated values were unwilling to see her. A possible explanation for the discrepancy in results evidenced for pro and con counselors may be that the con values were more unexpected in this day of liberal sexual attitudes and thus more aversive to the pro subjects than pro values were to con subjects. It might also be that individuals holding the view that premarital sexual relationships are positive and acceptable might be construed as more tolerant of other views than those maintaining the opposite viewpoint.

The results of the analysis of the fifteen counseling problems generally failed to support the predicted differences in counselor ratings
due to the similarity manipulation. Again, these findings appear to be in accord with the general finding of no difference in the similarity ratings made by the implicit groups. Differences in the ratings of the similar and dissimilar explicit groups will be discussed under hypothesis VII.

Hypothesis VI

It was expected that there would be significant differences in ratings of the counselor made by subjects hearing an explicit versus those hearing an implicit value-communication style. Surprisingly, no such differences were found on any of the dependent measures. While subjects did not evidence much awareness of the implicit statement of values on the CPO, they were highly aware of the explicit statement and thus the lack of significant differences cannot be attributed to failure of the manipulations as in Gill (1976). There was an obvious difference between explicit and implicit groups which subjects did note. Thus, it appears that, while in some instances the content of the value communication (similar or dissimilar) may contribute to differential ratings, the manner of communication does not.

These results are particularly interesting in light of the commonly held stereotype of the counselor as a nondirective, relatively neutral individual fostered by the popularity and widespread familiarity with the Rogerian approach. In fact, while several subjects in the explicit condition made comments such as "I don't think she should have been so open with Sally as to tell her about her own opinions on premarital sex", their questions about the appropriateness of the counselor's statement
did not appear to greatly affect their ratings of the counselor. In view of the demonstrable influence (Meltzoff & Kornreich, 1970) of counselor values and of the potential impact of client-counselor value similarity (Kessel & McBrearty, 1967), these results are also somewhat comforting. It would appear that counselors could be quite open about their values either prior to the establishment of a counseling relationship or during initial sessions without fear of adversely affecting the relationship or the client’s confidence in their potential helpfulness.

**Hypothesis VII**

It was expected that there would be a significant three-way interaction across all the dependent measures. Ratings of the counselor on the Counselor Rating Form tended to support this prediction. Significant three-way interactions were found for the counselor traits of trustworthiness and attractiveness. In both cases, explicit groups in which subjects agreed with the counselor rated her significantly higher than explicit groups in which subjects and counselor disagreed. Apparently, when subjects were confident that they knew the counselor’s values (i.e. when the similarity manipulation was successful), similarity of values was an important determinant of subjects’ perceptions of the counselor. These findings confirm those of Haugen & Edwards (1976), Tessler (1975) and others that perceived similarity of values tends to enhance subjects’ ratings of counselors’ attractiveness. It is also interesting to note that, in this study, similarity had an effect only when it was perceived. While the expressed values of the client and counselor in the implicit condition may have been similar, this similarity failed to cause concomitant changes in the CRF ratings. Only the perceived similarity evident in the explicit groups produced differential ratings.
Also interesting to note is the fact that similarity of values appears to have enhanced perceptions of the counselor's trustworthiness. According to Strong (1968) counselors' perceived trustworthiness is based on their:

...(a) reputation for honesty,...(b)...social role, such as physician, (c) ...sincerity and openness, and (d)...lack of motivation for personal gain. (p. 217)

However, due to the fact that perceived trustworthiness has received little research attention, little is known about the construct or about the cues that subjects use to assess counselors' trustworthiness. The results of this study would appear to indicate that perceived similarity of values may serve as a cue to perceived trustworthiness. It makes some intuitive sense, at least, that individuals would place more trust in a counselor who did not violate their own deeply held moral beliefs than one who did.

In the case of counseling outcome expectancies, there was only one significant three-way interaction. On the dimension of sexual functioning both the pro and con subjects in the explicit groups gave higher ratings to the counselor with whom they agreed. Ratings were significantly higher in the case of the explicit pro-agreed versus the pro-disagreed subjects. The results would seem to support the idea that value similarity may have very specific effects. In other words, subjects reported more confidence in counselors sharing their values on sexual behavior solely for a problem directly concerned with those values. Confidence in the counselor's potential helpfulness with problems unrelated to sexual values was not affected. It may be that differences in other
values might have more global effects than do sexual value differences. On the other hand, subjects may not assume that differences in one area necessarily imply differences in other areas. These results point out the necessity of investigating the effects of values specifically relevant to the issues of counseling rather than concentrating on global value similarity as has occurred in much of the previous research.

Additional Results

Counselor Influence

The significant effect caused by the manipulation of counselor communication style on ratings of counselor influence deserves mention at this point. From the results of the analysis, it would appear that implicit counselors were rated as significantly less influential than explicit counselors. However, an examination of the means indicates that both groups generally felt that the counselor had not attempted to influence the client or to change her views. The implicit group merely exhibited stronger disagreement with the statements about counselor influence than did the explicit groups. These results are interesting in light of responses made by subjects to the final counselor statements in both the pro and con conditions. While responses such as "Yes, it probably will make me feel guilty if I cross the line. Maybe I'd better wait." to the con counselor and "I think you're right. Maybe the line is one value I should cross over. I'm grown now and must do what I want." to the pro counselor, seem to indicate to the author that subjects had heard and were responding to the counselor's influence attempt, these same subjects indicated on the CRQ that the counselor had not attempted
to influence the client. Over two-thirds of the subjects responded in a fashion that would indicate at least some awareness of the counselor influence (see Appendix I for additional examples) and yet failed to attribute any attempt at influence to the counselor. These results would seem to imply that (a) subjects were not consciously aware of the influence and their response to it, (b) subjects did not consider the kind of counselor statement contained at the end of the experimental tapes to be an influential statement, or (c) subjects denied the influence they had witnessed due to the fact that it was incongruent with their expectations of counselor role behavior. The most likely explanation may be (b) above, in which case a better instrument or different method is required to ascertain subject awareness of the counselor's attempts at influence.

**Subject Effect**

Another interesting and unexpected result was the tendency for subjects holding con values to give generally higher ratings to all counselors than subjects holding pro values. One explanation for this effect might be that subjects in the pro group tended to be somewhat older and thus felt more competent to critically judge the counselor. Due to the fact that subject age was not controlled this may have occurred, although it is somewhat unlikely due to the fact the the majority of the subject pool from which the sample was drawn consisted of first quarter freshman.

The effects for subject position are particularly apparent when counselor position is considered. It appears that while subjects in the con group rated the explicit con counselors most favorably, they
tended to give only slightly less favorable ratings to the explicit pro counselor. On the other hand, pro subjects often gave extremely low ratings to the explicit con counselor while giving moderate to highly favorable ratings to the explicit pro counselor. It may be that the views of the con counselor seemed intolerant, narrow and unacceptable to the pro subjects whereas the more liberal views of the pro counselor were more expected and thus did not arouse an unfavorable reaction from subjects who disagreed.

Limitations

In the first place, this study is subject to all the shortcomings of an analogue design (Strong, 1971). Although subjects were asked to place themselves in the client's position and to respond to the taped interview at various points, a client would have greater investment and involvement in the counseling process than an experimental subject. To the extent that these factors differ, generalization from the analogue to the actual counseling relationship remains questionable. However, while there is some question of generalizability to clients involved in counseling, the study may have greater applicability to those considering counseling. Questions concerning how counselors ought to communicate values to potential clients are equally as important as those concerning communication of values during the counseling process.

A second limitation of the study lies in the failure of subjects to acknowledge the implicit communication of values. While this finding is interesting in itself, it also limits conclusions concerning the implicit condition. Possibly, the effects of value similarity and
dissimilarity might have been more clear-cut had subjects in the implicit conditions been made aware of the counselor's values. It is difficult to determine whether the implicit statement was too subtle for subjects to pinpoint or whether the instrument used to assess subject awareness was inadequate.

Another difficulty encountered was a slightly negative reaction to the counselors' nondirective repetitious style. In an attempt to eliminate counselor influence from any statements other than the manipulations, the counselor often conveyed a sense of disinterest and a lack of involvement. Thus, the counselor's ratings may have been somewhat depressed across the dependent measures, therefore masking some differences that might have otherwise been significant.

Implications and Recommendations for Future Research

One of the most important questions raised prior to this investigation involved the effects of an explicit versus an implicit communication of values on clients' subsequent reactions to and confidence in the counselor. The finding that style of communication did not affect perceptions of the counselor or subjects' confidence in the counselor's helpfulness has important implications for counselors desiring to share their values with their clients in an open and honest fashion.

According to several authors (Bart, 1971; Halleck, 1971; Rawlings and Carter, 1977), all forms of psychotherapy contain implicit value systems, making the notion of value-free counseling purely a myth. Thus counselors are faced with a decision concerning whether to overtly communicate the values inherent in their own methods and goals or to allow these values to operate in an implicit, unacknowledged fashion.
The use of covert rather than overt value statements gives the counselor dominance in the counseling relationship and the power to define and accomplish the goals for counseling he/she deems appropriate. This idea of unilateral control, however, is aversive to counselors who cherish the ideals of individual equality and freedom of choice (Rawlings & Carter, 1977). According to Rawlings & Carter, the client's primary safeguards against the counselor's misuse of her influence power in this unilateral fashion are valid information concerning the counselor's values, open discussion of the counselor's and client's individual views and free and informed choice on the part of the client of the goals for counseling.

The results of this study appear to confirm the ease with which unilateral influence may operate in the counseling relationship. Subjects exposed to implicit influence attempts were largely unaware of their existence. Although it is possible that clients actually involved in a counseling relationship might have greater awareness of counselors' implied values and attempts to influence than do experimental subjects, it is also possible that clients' awareness of influence may be diminished by their trust in the counselor and their need for assistance.

Explicit communication of values may be the first step in equalizing the counseling relationship and in giving greater responsibility to clients for choosing the desired outcome. When values have been communicated openly, clients are aware of the potential changes likely to occur in their own behavior and world-view. Again, the results of this study may serve to erase some of the fear counselors have about honestly expressing their biases to clients.
A second important area investigated was that concerning client-counselor value similarity and dissimilarity. The results, consistent with other studies of client-counselor similarity (Haugen & Edwards, 1976; Kessel, 1967; Tessler, 1975) seem to indicate that similarity of values may heighten the counselor's perceived attractiveness and trustworthiness as well as the client's confidence in the counselor's ability to help with problems relevant to their shared values. Several studies have attested to the importance of client's perceptions of such specific counselor attributes as warmth, trustworthiness, competence and likeability in fostering favorable effects of the counseling process (Goldstein & Simonson, 1971; Luborsky, Chandler, Auerbach, Cohen, & Bachrach, 1971; Shapiro, Struening, Barten and Shapiro, 1973; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). Further, Goldstein and his colleagues (Goldstein, 1971; Goldstein, Heller & Sechrest; 1966; Goldstein and Simonson, 1971) have investigated the counseling process from the perspective of interpersonal attraction. They have found some evidence that a high degree of client attraction toward the counselor tends to enhance the client's commitment to treatment, the expectancy of positive outcome and the client's disclosure breadth and receptivity to counselor influence.

Research on counselor communication of values and client-counselor value similarity is still in its infancy. Many questions remain unanswered. When is it best to introduce the explicit value communication? Does explicit value communication reduce the counselor's influence power? How much awareness do actual clients and counselors have of the presence of implied values and counselor influence attempts? For what types of
individuals is value similarity most important to the success of counseling and on what specific issues is agreement most crucial?

As counselors begin to become aware of their own biases and to advertise themselves as "Feminist" counselors, "Nonsexist" counselors "Humanistic" counselors,"Christian" counselors, etc., it might be interesting to investigate the effects of such advertising on actual client awareness of counselor values and on the type of client-counselor pairings that result. Is such advertising an effective means of explicit value communication? Do these labels communicate accurately to the perspective client? Hopefully, research will help to provide clearer guidelines to counselors concerning the effects of their values on clients and the results of the communication of values prior to and during the course of counseling.
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APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW

Co. Hi. How you doing?

Cl. Oh. Ok.

Co. Did you have a good week?

Cl. Yes, it was pretty good. Remember that math test I told you about? Well I got it back and I got an 85 on it.

Co. Great! You must really be pleased.

Cl. Yea. I was really happy about it. That's the best grade I've gotten all quarter.

Co. Well that's super. Sounds like you're working hard. How're other things going?

Cl. Well, ok. It was kind of a blah week besides that I guess. I just did a lot of studying and, well, I did spend a lot of time with Jim. You know, though nothing really super exciting.

Co. How's your relationship with Jim going? We left off last week talking about some changes you thought you might want to make.

Cl. Well, Jim and I talked and things are really going pretty well. I mean I really realized again this week how much I do love him. Well, I don't know, I guess there is one thing we should talk about. I mean something kind of came up this weekend. I guess I should tell you about it.

Co. Sounds like it might be bothering you some.

PAUSE

Cl. Yea, it is, but I don't know how to say this. I'm just kind of embarrassed. I don't know why. I mean you've been so great. I can talk to you about everything. But, you know, you just kind of feel weird talking about some stuff.

Co. Take your time. I know some of these things are really hard to get out.

Cl. Well, the other night, we went to a movie and then we came home and I think I told you that Jim has his own apartment. So we went back to his apartment and... well... you know... what you do. Well we were talking well, just about a lot of stuff, you know... I've told you that we've talked about getting married in the future... so we were just talking about how neat that would be. Of course, that won't be for awhile, not until after we both graduate.
Co.  Um Hmm.

Cl.  Anyway, so we were just sitting around talking and kissing and stuff and we felt really close. We've gotten pretty close, uh sexually, and well, talking about marriage and stuff, well, Jim... Why do I feel so dumb saying this?

Co.  I know this is a very personal subject and it's hard to talk about but why don't you try telling me a little more about your sexual relationship with Jim.

Cl.  Well, I suppose we've done the usual stuff. Touching, kissing. It's really good. He's really gentle and loving with me.

Co.  Sounds like you've had some very intimate and very special times together.

Cl.  We really have. And I guess that's why Jim asked what he did the other night.

Co.  Would you like to tell me about that?

Cl.  Well, we were talking and just felt really close and well... Jim asked me to make love. Whew! . . . I'm glad that's out.

Co.  How did you feel about that?

Cl.  That's the thing, I don't know. I wanted to but something inside me just wasn't sure. So I said no, not now anyway, because I just didn't know what to do. I just needed some time to think about it. I felt kind of stupid. I'm not sure Jim really understood. I mean, he thinks that if you love someone it's just natural to sleep with them.

Co.  But you just weren't sure and didn't want to do something you hadn't thought about.

Cl.  Yes. You know I've thought about it before, but just not been confronted with the real situation. I've never gone to bed with anyone before. A lot of my friends think that's pretty weird. I just don't know what to do. I was brought up in kind of a strict home and got some values from there but now I don't know if they're right or not.

Co.  Um Hmmm.

Cl.  I just don't know what to do. I mean Jim loves me an awful lot and I love him, but yet I know my parents would just die if they found out. I don't know how I'd feel if I did something they really disapprove. But yet it seems like nearly everyone else I know does it. Some of my friends said that guys don't care if
they marry virgins anymore. They've slept with guys and they said it's great, especially when you really love someone. But my parents say it's really best if you're married because then you have the commitment and security to be yourself. I feel so confused. There are arguments on both sides and I don't know how to make the decision.

Co. You seem to be really torn between the arguments some of your friends are presenting and the things your parents have told you. This is really a tough decision for you and the fact that both sides seem to have some validity makes it especially tough.

***

Cl. Yes. I can say things for or against either side. I want to because I love Jim, but I don't want to because I'm not sure if it's the right thing to do. I want to because some people tell me that it's great and really adds a whole lot to your relationship and they don't seem to think it's wrong at all, but then I don't want to because my parents say it will eventually take away from a relationship outside marriage and they would really be disappointed in me if I did it. But yet I have to do the right thing—what I want to do but I don't know what I want to do. I just keep thinking through everything and can't make any decision. What do you think? What would you do?

PAUSE

Co. You know, this has to be your decision. No one else can make it for you. I think it will be good for you and I to talk about it and clarify your ideas so you can make a decision. However, I do think it's only fair that I should tell you that I do have feelings about this. I do have my own personal values and lifestyle and feel that I should be honest with you about that. Generally, I find that when you're a mature individual and you go into relationships with a lot of thought, that sex is an important part of that relationship—something that's a natural part of the relationship. So in general, I don't see anything wrong with having sex outside of marriage. I think it's important for you to know my feelings because they may affect what I say to you. But I also want you to remember that I believe you must make this decision yourself as I know you believe too. (Explicit value statement—pro)

PAUSE

Cl. I really appreciate your honesty. I do know it's my decision and well, I guess that's my problem, I just don't know what's right for me.
Co. You've expressed a lot of confusion to me. Let's see if we can't get at the problem bit by bit. First you said you were worried about your parents. Tell me a little more about that.

Cl. Well they're kind of religious and have pretty strict standards about what they believe and they raised me to believe that certain things are wrong to do. They didn't come out and say "don't ever do this" or anything but I know from the way they've talked and the way they live that they wouldn't want me to do certain things. They didn't say "don't ever go to bed with a guy" but at the same time I know that if I did they would be pretty upset with me. I guess it would kind of be violating their trust. They think of me as believing about the same things they do and well, I don't want to hurt them. Plus, I guess in some ways I do agree with many of the things they value.

Co. So while your parents never expressly forbid you to do certain things they did give you a pretty good idea about the kinds of values they hold. And you have adopted some of these values.

Cl. Yea. A lot of things they've said and done seem right to me but when I talk to my roommates, I begin to wonder if some of my parents' values are wrong or just old-fashioned. And then Jim says a lot of the same things some of my friends do. It makes me so confused. I don't know who or what to believe anymore.

Co. In other words, the conflict between what your parents taught you and what some of your friends seem to be saying has given you some real doubts about where you stand, especially concerning sexual standards. And that doubt is kind of scary and upsetting.

Cl. It really is scary, I guess because I've always pretty much felt sure about where I stood on things before this. It seems like I'm being influenced by my parents and by my friends. I guess I want my friends to like me and not think I'm a prude or something but I also want my parents to trust me and approve of what I do. I just don't know which way to go. I don't know which values are the right ones. Both sides say that if you do it our way, it'll be great!

Co. And you don't know what the consequences of either side will be for sure.

***

Cl. It seems like either way I choose has some good and some bad consequences. That is if I believe all the people who I keep talking to. I love Jim a lot. We have a really good relationship and I don't want anything to ruin that. He's really special to me, and being close physically is a really good part of our relationship. But somehow I feel like there's this line between kissing
and touching and making love. I don't know if that line should really be there or not. My parents would say keep it and my friends would say drop it.

Co. So you feel that the sex that you do have is good but somehow there's a difference between what you've done so far and making love and you're not sure whether or not that distinction should exist.

C1. Yes. What I'm trying to figure out is if this line makes sense. I just don't know. I feel like I have to make some decision about this but I don't know what to think.

PAUSE

Co. This line has really got you confused. It's there in your mind but in many ways you see it as a product of what your parents have told you and perhaps not of your own true feelings. Here at school you've been exposed to different standards and ideas and you're beginning to wonder if that line really isn't kind of an arbitrary one. You seem to feel that you may miss out on some really special and close times with Jim if you keep this line where it is.

***

***Tape is stopped at this point for S to respond.

Explicit Con Value Statement

Co. You know, this has to be your decision. No one else can make it for you. I think it will be good for you and I to talk about it and clarify your ideas so you can make a decision. However, I think it's only fair that I should tell you that I do have feelings about this. I do have my own personal values and lifestyle and believe that I should be honest with you about that. Generally, I think that sexual relationships are very important and special—that sex adds a special dimension to a relationship that's not there without it, and that there are implications beyond just how much the two of you love each other. I think that having sex with someone demands a great deal of commitment to the relationship and so, in general, I think it's just a better idea to wait until you're married. I think it's important for you to know my feelings because they may affect what I say to you. But I also want you to remember that I believe you must make this decision yourself as I know you also want.

Implicit Influence Attempt—Con

Co. This line has really got you confused. It's there in your mind and yet other people, Jim, your friends, are telling you that
it's not necessary. But you're not quite sure. You aren't sure that you're really ready to cross that line yet. You're worried about violating your parents trust but even more, you're concerned that you do have similar values to them and that, at least for now, crossing that line might cause you a lot of disappointment in yourself.

Control Summary Statement

Co. This line has really got you confused. On the one hand your friends are telling you it's not necessary, in fact it's rather arbitrary, but on the other hand your parents seem to believe it's a valid line and that you'd be better off not crossing it. You're caught between the two sides and right now you're not sure where you stand.
OSU ATTITUDE SURVEY

The following is part of a research project being conducted at Ohio State. Your participation in this research is greatly appreciated. Please indicate, as closely as possible, your opinions concerning each area discussed. Following each set of questions is an item asking you for any additional opinions you have about the area explored in the four preceding items. Fill this in at your option. Your answers to these questions will be kept completely confidential.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements using the scale below. Please place your response in the blank space to the left of each statement. Fill in the "additional remarks" in the space provided.

1 - strongly disagree
2 - disagree
3 - undecided
4 - agree
5 - strongly agree

Dorm Life

_____ 1. All freshmen students who do not live at home should be required to live in dorms.

_____ 2. Dorm life is one of the best experiences college has to offer.

_____ 3. I prefer a co-educational living arrangement.

_____ 4. Resident advisors serve an important function in the dorm.

Additional Remarks:

Fraternity-Sorority System

_____ 1. The fraternity-sorority system is outmoded and ought to be abolished.

_____ 2. I would like to join or have joined a fraternity or sorority.

_____ 3. Individuals in sororities and fraternities can be easily stereotyped.

_____ 4. Fraternities and sororities are very important parts of the social life at OSU.
Additional Remarks:

Drugs-Alcohol

1. Marijuana should be legalized.
2. I have not nor do I intend to ever smoke pot.
3. I believe drugs of any form (including alcohol) are harmful.
4. I often drink alcoholic beverages.

Additional Remarks:

Marriage-Divorce

1. I believe people should live together before marriage.
2. Marriage is an outmoded institution.
3. If a couple are unhappy together, they should not feel obligated to remain married.
4. I see marriage as a life-long commitment and do not consider divorce an option.

Additional Remarks:

Sex

1. It is not important for a person to be a virgin until marriage.
2. In general, it is best to wait until after marriage to engage in sexual intercourse.
3. My views on sex are similar to those of my parents.
4. I do not believe I will wait until I am married to have sexual intercourse.

Additional Remarks:

**Social Issues**

1. I am in favor of the ERA.
2. Capital punishment should be reinstated in Ohio.
3. Abortion on demand is morally wrong.
4. I am in favor of the Gay rights movement.

Additional Remarks:
COUNSELOR EVALUATION STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine your impressions of the counselor you are about to hear. However, researchers have found that individuals often listen more closely to the client than to the counselor the first time they hear a taped counseling session. Therefore, we want to ask you to pay special attention to the counselor and also to read the following summary which will give you a brief overview of the client's problem. The synopsis below will familiarize you with the client's presentation so that you can closely attend to the counselor.

The tape which you will hear is an excerpt from the initial portion of the third counseling session between Sally, a college student, and a professional psychologist. Sally and the counselor have previously discussed several issues but in this particular session, Sally introduces a decision she is struggling with concerning whether or not she should have sexual intercourse with her boyfriend Jim. Sally is torn between her parents' and her friends' values and is not sure where she stands on the issue of premarital sex. Due to the personal nature of the decision with which she is faced, Sally is hesitant to discuss the matter with the counselor at the beginning of the session.

The tape you will hear will focus on Sally's decision not on her sexual activities. As you listen to the tape, try to put yourself in Sally's position and to react to the counselor as if you were the client. The tape will be stopped in three places in order to give you a chance to respond to the counselor as if you were the client. You may write your responses below.

Response 1. ____________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Response 2. ____________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Response 3. ____________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
ADDITIONAL REACTIONS AND COMMENTS

To what extent were you able to identify with Sally (the client)?

_____ Did not identify at all with her
_____ Identified slightly with her
_____ Identified moderately with her
_____ Identified highly with her

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

Please indicate what you believe the purpose of this experiment to be.
Implicit Debriefing

I'd like now to explain the purpose of this experiment. Research has shown that in successful counseling, clients tend to adopt their counselors' values even when counselors make no conscious attempts to influence. Counselors can communicate their values to clients in one of two manners: they can directly explain their values or they can indirectly state values through the use of certain techniques, through the choice of various counseling goals, or through the interpretations of client statements in biased ways. The purpose of this experiment was to compare subjects' ratings of a counselor who stated values explicitly with subjects' ratings of one who stated values implicitly. In the tape you just heard, the counselor stated her values implicitly when she made the closing statement of the interview. This statement may have seemed to be a summary of the client's previous responses but, actually, it represented a biased interpretation of the client's statements. For half the subjects who hear the implicit value statement, the counselor's interpretation will favor premarital sex, while for the other half, the counselor's interpretation will be opposed to it.

(To next page)

Explicit Debriefing

I'd like now to explain the purpose of this experiment. Research has shown that in successful counseling, clients tend to adopt their counselors' values even when counselors make no conscious attempts to influence. Counselors can communicate their values to clients in one of two manners: they can directly explain their values or they can indirectly state values through the use of certain techniques, through the choice of various counseling goals, or through the interpretations of client statements in biased ways. The purpose of this experiment was to compare subjects' ratings of a counselor who stated values explicitly with subjects' ratings of one who stated values implicitly. In the tape you just heard, the counselor stated her values explicitly when she told the client her stand on the issue of premarital sex. Half of the subjects who hear the explicit value statement will hear the counselor say she sees nothing wrong with premarital sex and the other half will hear the counselor say she believes that, generally, it is best to wait until you are married to have sexual intercourse.

(To next page)
You have indicated your own beliefs about premarital sex on the Attitude Survey and you have also noted your agreement or disagreement with the counselor's views on the Counselor Reaction Questionnaire. This study will also attempt to examine whether or not your agreement or disagreement with the counselor's values effected your ratings of the counselor.

I want you also to understand that while both the counselor and client expressed certain opinions in the tape you heard, these opinions are not necessarily representative of those held by counselors or by students at Ohio State. While the counselor you heard was a professional psychologist, the opinions she expressed on the tape and her counseling style were dictated by the role she was playing and are not indicative of her own opinions or counseling style. Furthermore, many of the client's statements, particularly concerning the number of students engaging in premarital sex, were greatly exaggerated. A great number of students, as shown by responses to the OSU Attitude Survey, do not intend to have sexual intercourse until after they are married.

We would appreciate it if you would not disclose any of this information since others will also be listening to these tapes. Thanks again for your participation.
COUNSELOR RATING 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.
agreesable 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
skillful ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unskillful
sociable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unsociable
deceitful ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ straightforward
trustworthy ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ untrustworthy
genuine ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ phony
warm ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ cold
Counselor Reaction Questionnaire

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements using the scale below. Place your response in the blank space at the left of each statement. We are interested in your first response, so work quickly, but not so fast that you feel "rushed".

Use the following scale in responding to each item:

1 - strongly disagree
2 - disagree
3 - undecided
4 - agree
5 - strongly agree

___ 1. The counselor seemed generally friendly.
___ 2. The counselor did not seem to have an ulterior motive.
___ 3. The counselor believes that generally it is best to wait until after one is married to have sexual intercourse.
___ 4. The counselor appeared interested and involved.
___ 5. The counselor directly stated her values and opinions.
___ 6. The counselor seemed to express caring for the client.
___ 7. I could place my trust in the counselor.
___ 8. I felt the counselor was not arrogant, nor did she speak "over the client's head".
___ 9. I think the counselor attempted to influence the client's thinking.
___ 10. The counselor seemed to like the client.
___ 11. I felt the counselor shared many of the same attitudes and values that I have.
___ 12. The counselor helped the client clarify her ideas.
___ 13. I do not know what this counselor believes about premarital sex.
___ 14. The client seemed able to confide in the counselor.
___ 15. The counselor seemed to imply but did not directly state her values.
16. The client seemed able to express her thoughts openly.
17. The counselor seemed to pay attention to the client's statements.
18. The counselor conveyed a sense of honesty.
19. The counselor seemed to be trying to change the client's views.
20. The client appeared to be very involved in the interview.
21. I had the impression the counselor had prepared for the interview.
22. I tended to agree with the counselor when she expressed her opinions about different matters.
23. The counselor presented an air of confidence.
24. Generally, the counselor seemed poised and assured.
25. I would be willing to refer a friend to this counselor.
26. Should I encounter personal problems, I would be willing to see this counselor.
HELP WITH SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

Please read carefully:

We now wish to learn your expectations about how helpful the counselor on the tape 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am very doubtful that this person could help</th>
<th>I am moderately doubtful that this person could help</th>
<th>I am slightly confident that this person could help</th>
<th>I am moderately confident that this person could help</th>
<th>I am very confident that this person could help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If my problem was:</td>
<td>My impression is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anxiety or nervousness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An alcohol problem</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A problem with sexual functioning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts with parents</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety speaking in front of a group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in dating</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing a career</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having trouble sleeping</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A drug addiction problem</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of inferiority</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety about taking tests in school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties making friends</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having trouble studying</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I
Examples of Subject Responses

to the Counselor's Influence Attempt

Responses to the Con Counselor

Con Subjects

"That's really the main thing to me, the disappointment it will cause in myself. I just think that I'd lose self respect and our relationship might lose something."

"Well, I might be disappointed in myself either way. If I decide that way I may feel later I should have made the other decision."

"That is true. It would disappoint me if I crossed that line. I don't think I am ready to do that yet. My moral values from my parents are there."

"Yes, crossing that line would lead to disappointment in myself. You are right."

"Yes, I think that is true. That must be why I don't just go ahead and do it."

"I'm beginning to see now that my values are important to me and part of me and that I should listen to myself before following my peers opinions and advice. I do believe a lot of what my parents do say."

"Yea, I think that pretty well sums up where I stand. I'm just going to have to convince Jim I love him without disappointing myself by doing anything to give me a guilty conscience."

Pro Subjects

"I guess I really don't want to disappoint myself. If Jim really does love me he should understand my values."

"Yes, since I really need this respect of my parents, for now I think I'll wait."

"Yes I guess I realize that now, after talking with you, I don't think I am ready to make that step because if I was, I wouldn't have all these doubts."

"That's true. I think I'd rather not cross that line since I'm so confused about it."

"I don't know if I would be so disappointed or just feeling guilty because of my parents."

"I don't know about that. Maybe I wouldn't be disappointed in myself. I might just be worried about what someone else thinks."
Responses to the Pro Counselor

Con Subjects

"But if Jim is worth it and he feels I'm worth it, he'll stick around, so I won't miss out in the long run as you say. It will come later."

"I really feel like doing it, I guess, but pressure from my parents makes me wonder if my values are wrong."

"Maybe I am placing too much confidence in my parent's beliefs. After all I have to be me. But it still seems like that line is as big and bold as ever and I'm just not sure how to cope with it..."

"Yeah, because our relationship is so good, I'd hate not to enjoy our relationship to the fullest, but I'm just not sure that having sex would do everything my friends say it would for our relationship."

"You miss out on nothing. If making love is something you don't want to do, you're o.k. You'll be satisfied you made a decision."

"Yes, in a way I do feel that I'll miss out and I fear that he won't understand. But on the other hand, I feel our relationship might be better if we saved this aspect of it for marriage."

"I think the line I believe in was probably put there by my parents. I guess it really isn't exactly what I feel. I don't want to lose out with Jim, but since I'm not straight yet on my values, maybe I could hold out for a while."

Pro Subjects

"Yes, I do feel as if I'd miss out, but then I wonder what would be better in the long run..."

"Yes, I want to learn from life. Why not now? Certainly Mom, Dad and my friends can see I will be gaining a new experience - if not more."

"I do feel that I may miss out, but that isn't really a way to look at it or it shouldn't be."

"I feel like I'm missing out now, but if my parents are correct then I won't miss out but instead I'll have it when the time is right."

"The line is just in my head, probably put there by my parents like all parents do to their girls to keep them out of trouble."

"If I keep 'the line' then I may lose some close times, which I don't want to happen. If I drop the line I may lose my parents' respect. I may be best not to lose any close times with a person I may marry."
"It seems like you're telling me to follow my own feelings, those that say I want to make love with Jim. This is something I really want to do and what's preventing me I guess are ideas my parents raised me with."