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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A major trend in counseling theory and research has involved an increased emphasis on the effects of specific counselor behaviors on both the process and outcome of counseling (Bundza and Simonson, 1973; Danish, D'Augelli, and Brock, 1976b; Danish and Hauer, 1973a,b; Egan, 1975, McCarthy and Betz, 1978). One important category of behaviors are those which have typically been organized under the rubric of counselor "self-referent" responses. Two specific types of counselor self-referent responses--self-disclosure and self-involving--have been differentiated by Danish, D'Augelli, and Brock (1976b). The authors define self-disclosure as, "A statement of factual information on the part of the helper about himself."; they define a self-involving response as, "A statement of the helper's personal response to statements made by the helpee."

Self-disclosure has been considered to be a beneficial element in such areas as interpersonal attraction theory (Altman and Taylor, 1973); humanistic psychotherapy (Jourard, 1971); and human potential groups (Gulbert, 1968; Luft, 1969). It has been demonstrated that self-involving responses may have significant implications for the counseling process (McCarthy and Betz, 1978).
The theories and hypotheses concerning the effects of self-disclosure on counseling process and outcome suggest certain effects, although the precise nature of effects has not been specified. Counselor self-disclosure has been hypothesized to relate to such variables as amount and intimacy of client self-disclosure, client willingness to self-disclose, client perceptions of counselor attractiveness, trustworthiness and mental health, and client liking of the counselor. The use of self-disclosure in counseling has been postulated to help the client learn how to communicate his own ideas and feelings within the counseling relationship and in other interpersonal relationships (Danish and Hauer, 1973b; Truax and Carkhuff, 1965).

Some studies have indicated that self-disclosure is an important process to be employed by the counselor (Bundza and Simonson, 1973; Egan, 1975; Jourard, 1971; Mowrer, 1964; Murphy and Strong, 1972), while others have cautioned against the use of counselor self-disclosure, saying that there is a negative relationship between counselor use of the response and client perceptions of counselor mental health (Cozby, 1972; Weigel, Dinges, Dyer, and Straumfjord, 1972). Cozby (1972) suggested that there is a curvilinear relationship between amount of counselor self-disclosure and the effectiveness of this response in facilitating client self-disclosure.

A possible explanation for the inconsistencies in the findings derives from the methodological problems existing in the literature. The body of theory and research concerning the effects of self-disclosure is characterized by a wide variety of vague definitions
of the independent variable. For example, Jourard and Jaffee (1970) considered self-disclosure to be the way one person willingly makes himself known to others. Cozby (1973) said that self-disclosure is any information about oneself that a person verbally communicates to another. Goodstein and Russell (1977) defined self-disclosure as the interpersonal process of revealing psychologically meaningful information about oneself to another. Reisman and Yamokoski (1974) and Savitsky, Zarle, and Keedy (1976) defined self-disclosure as specific information about himself that a counselor gives a client, while Luft (1969) said that self-disclosure concerns what is going on between persons in the present.

Additional definitions of self-disclosure include those by Culbert (1968), Dies (1973), and Johnson and Noonan (1972), who defined self-disclosure as a response in which an individual gives information about himself, his concerns, and his conflicts, or as one in which he talks about his here-and-now reactions and feelings to persons or situations. Shapiro, Krauss, and Truax (1969) provided a similar definition and also said that self-disclosure may be verbal and/or non-verbal behaviors. Highlen and Gillis (1978) defined affective self-disclosure as self-referenced responses that express emotions in feeling terms and contain a reason for the affect given. Truax and Carkhuff (1965) called self-disclosure "transparency," i.e., the extent to which the counselor is open and real in the therapeutic encounter. From these varied definitions, it is unclear what the process of self-disclosure is, how it is to be accomplished, or if more than one type of response facilitates this process.
While most definitions of self-disclosure have been vague, some attempts to define self-disclosure in more operational terms have been made. Thase and Page (1977) defined self-disclosure as the number of topics a subject was willing to discuss plus the degree of intimacy of those topics. Goodstein, Goldstein, D'Orta, and Goodman (1976) defined self-disclosure as a process of permitting others access to significant knowledge of the self and identified self-disclosure responses by counting the number of self-references, although they did not specify which self-references they considered. Similarly, Hekmat and Theiss (1971) defined self-disclosure as sentences begun with "I" and Zarle and Boyd (1977) defined self-disclosure as any statement that contains a self-referent pronoun and conveys information about the emotions, ideas, attitudes, or experiences of the speaker. While these definitions contain somewhat more specificity, taken to an extreme they would define many responses as disclosing something about their speaker.

In summary, research to date has failed to define self-disclosure consistently and in a way conducive to use of the definitions by investigators wishing to replicate or extend earlier studies. Definitions are either not provided, are abstract or inferential in nature, or fail to discriminate between different types of self-referent responses. Because self-disclosure is frequently mentioned as an important variable in the counseling process, research investigating its effects and those of other self-referent responses on this process is needed. But in order for the
results of future research to have implications for the practice of counseling, greater specification of the behaviors of interest is necessary (Egan, 1975; Truax and Carkhuff, 1965).

One attempt to study the effects of specific self-referent responses on counseling process was made by McCarthy and Betz (1978). Using operational definitions provided by Danish, D'Augelli, and Brock, (1976b), they examined two types of counselor self-referent responses--self-disclosure and self-involving. According to the definitions utilized, self-disclosure responses are statements of past histories or personal experiences of the helper, while self-involving responses are direct present tense expressions of helper feelings in response to certain stimuli provided by the helpee. The self-referent responses can be viewed along a temporal continuum ranging from the existential self-involving--"That remark of yours makes me feel...," to the historical content of self-disclosure--"That reminds me of the time when I was a kid." (Egan, 1975).

Both self-disclosure and self-involving responses are self-referent because the counselor is talking about himself/herself, but grammatically they are two different responses. Because self-disclosure may involve information about a counselor's past experiences, the responses will often be in the past tense. Self-involving responses are always in the present tense and contain statements of a counselor's present feelings and reactions to the client. Self-disclosure responses are self-descriptive counselor statements; self-involving responses are affective counselor statements.
The utility of carefully defining and differentiating counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses was demonstrated by the results of the McCarthy and Betz (1978) study. The self-involving counselor was perceived as significantly more expert and trustworthy and somewhat more attractive than was a self-disclosing counselor. In addition, the results suggested that counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses elicit structurally different types of client responses. Counselor self-involving responses were found to facilitate client self-exploration and to maintain the focus of counseling on the client rather than the counselor to a greater extent than were counselor self-disclosure responses.

While the study of McCarthy and Betz suggested that counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses may lead to differential perceptions of the counselor and may elicit different client responses, its generalizability was limited in that the effects of self-disclosure and self-involving responses were investigated using only one type of counselor-client dyad, a male professional and a female client. It is possible that the effects of counselor use of self-disclosure versus self-involving responses may vary depending on the sex of the counselor and/or the client. Thus, consideration of this possibility is necessary before generalizations concerning differential effects of self-disclosure and self-involving responses can be made.

A number of studies have indicated possible sex differences with regard to client responses to the counselor. Four studies suggested that female clients may engage in more self-disclosure
than male clients (Annis and Perry, 1977; Highlen and Gillis, 1978; Jourard, 1971; Roth and Kuiken, 1975) and three studies indicated that female counselors elicit more client self-disclosure responses than male counselors (Goodstein and Russell, 1977; Grantham, 1973; Heilbrun, 1973). Counselor sex and client sex may interact to elicit differential client self-disclosure responses as evidenced by Brooks (1974), who found that all-male dyads contained the least amount of subject self-disclosure and Hill (1975), who found that same sex-pairings produced the greatest discussion of feeling by both counselors and clients.

The results of these studies indicate that there are qualitative differences in the amount and type of client self-disclosure responses to counselors which are related to counselor-client gender pairings. The existence of qualitative differences suggests that there may also be significant structural differences in client responses as a function of gender pairings. For example, clients who engage in greater and more personal amounts of self-disclosure may talk longer, use a larger number of self-referents, express more feelings, and maintain the focus of the conversation on themselves rather than on the counselor. These differences may be a function of counselor sex, client sex, or counselor-client interactions that are elicited regardless of the types of counselor responses utilized. These results which suggest that counselor-client gender pairings differentially affect the qualitative nature of client self-disclosure responses thus have implications for research examining the effects of gender-pairings on structural components of client responses to the counselor.
While several lines of reasoning suggest the possibility that counselor and/or client sex may moderate the effects of counselor responses such as self-referent responses, on client responses, other research has indicated no differences in effect as a function of counselor-client sex. Halpern (1977) investigated client perceptions of their own past and present self-disclosure and client perceptions of counselor self-disclosure. He found that there were no significant relationships between client or counselor sex and client perceptions of either their own or their counselors' self-disclosure. Halpern failed to specifically define self-disclosure and he examined only client perceptions. A more specific definition of self-disclosure as well as consideration of counselor perceptions and overt behavioral measures might provide additional information about potential effects of counselor-client sex pairings.

In general the results of some studies suggest that there are differences in client behaviors such as self-disclosure, and that some of these differences are related to client sex, counselor sex and/or the interaction of counselor-client sex pairings. Other studies have failed to demonstrate these sex differences. These inconsistencies may be partially explained by the methodological problems existing in the literature. The research is characterized by a variety of experimental variables, dependent variables, and definitions of self-disclosure. Greater specificity of the behaviors of interest may provide a more coherent body of results that demonstrate the differential effects of counselor-client sex pairings on client behaviors.
While the major interest in counselor-client gender pairings is on the extent to which they moderate the effects of counselor self-disclosure versus counselor self-involving responses, it is also possible that gender pairings themselves, across categories of counselor responses, may be related to client perceptions of the counselor and to client behavior in the interview. The possible influence of gender pairings is suggested by several other lines of research. Howard, Orlinsky, and Hill (1970) examined the effects of counselor sex on female client satisfaction. The female clients in general rated the counseling sessions with female counselors as more satisfying. Shapiro (1977), studying the differential perceptions of two confederate female clients for eight male and eight female counselors, found that the female counselors were perceived as more reinforcing and less punishing than were the male counselors. Edwards (1974) found that female clients rated male counselors higher in effectiveness than male clients after the first counseling session. Male clients rated male counselors higher in effectiveness than did female clients following the second counseling session.

While these studies suggest that the sex of the counselor and/or the client may moderate the effects of particular counselor responses, such as self-referent responses, no differences in client perceptions of the counselor as a function of gender pairings were found in three additional studies. Hoffman-Graff (1977) examined the differential effects of counselor-client gender pairings and counselor negative self-disclosure and positive self-disclosure on client perceptions
of the counselor and found that there were no differential effects due to interviewer-subject sex pairings. These results were replicated by Hoffman and Spencer (1977) who found no significant effects due to interviewer-subject sex pairings on client perceptions of the counselor.

Heppner and Pew (1977) studied the effects of environmental cues of counselor competence and sex of counselor on perceived counselor expertness and found that sex of counselor did not affect initial client perceptions. There were no significant interactions between sex of counselor and the presence or absence of environmental cues on perceived expertness. The authors suggested, however, that the potential effects of counselor sex warrant further research employing complex designs to control for possible confounding factors including counselor attractiveness, length of experience, and other individual differences among counselors.

Cozby (1973) reviewed the literature on sex differences and self-disclosure and concluded that the results are equivocal. He stated that the nature of any sex differences might be better assessed if researchers were to attend to the types of items which reliably discriminate between males and females and the types of situations in which males and females would or would not differ in self-disclosure behavior. Freeman and Stormes (1977) stated that while the sex of the counselor or client by itself may not be a critical variable in counseling process, the interaction of both as well as the particular counseling situation must be
examined. A specific counselor-client gender pairing may be more effective in one situation than in another. Holahan and Slaikeu (1977) also called for additional research to examine potential interactions of subject sex with sex of counselor to determine their possible effects on self-disclosure. And Brooks (1974) suggested that research be conducted utilizing multiple measures to resolve any contradictory results about sex differences in self-disclosing behavior.

The suggestions of these authors were summarized by Shullman (1978), who examined differences in counseling process and outcome for different counselor-client sex pairings. Based on a review of related research, Shullman concluded that neither counselor sex nor client sex alone provide consistent predictors of differential client perceptions of the counselor, client behaviors, or outcomes in counseling; counselor-client sex interactions may be more significant, although somewhat unpredictable.

Therefore, while several studies have suggested that different counselor-client gender pairings may differentially affect client behaviors and perceptions of the counselor, the exact nature of these differences is not known. The lack of operational specificity of counselor and client behaviors as well as the limited emphasis on specific treatment procedures, e.g., counselor responses, may partially explain the inconsistencies of the results.

Thus, the purposes of the present study were: 1) to examine the extent to which counselor use of self-disclosure versus self-involving responses resulted in different client perceptions of
and responses to the counselor, and 2) to investigate the extent to which counselor sex, client sex, and counselor-client gender pairings moderated the effects of counselor use of these two specific self-referent responses.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research concerning the effects of self-disclosure responses on the process and outcome of counseling is characterized by a wide variety of experimental variables, dependent variables, and definitions of self-disclosure. Because of the great variety of approaches in these studies and because of a general lack of consistency of results even across studies of the same variables, research to date on self-disclosure has failed to yield either a coherent body of knowledge concerning the construct or any consistent reliable recommendations concerning its use in counseling.

Experimental approaches have examined self-disclosure in dyadic relationships, such as relationships between friends and strangers; between experimenter and subject; between interviewer and interviewee; among leaders and members of T-groups, encounter groups, marathon groups, and psychotherapy groups; between a counselor and client; and in counseling analogues. The counseling analogues have tended to be either simulated counseling sessions between the subject and "counselor", or subject reactions to transcripts of a counseling session.

A great number of independent and dependent variables have been considered in the literature. Dependent variables have included:
1) subject perceptions of counselor trustworthiness, attractiveness, expertise, mental health, or liking for the counselor; and
2) subject self-disclosure assessed via self-reports about past self-disclosure; self-predictions of future self-disclosure; or observations of subject self-disclosure by friends, strangers, observers, or counselors. Independent variables have included:
1) subject variables—age, sex, status; and 2) self-disclosure length, content, and intimacy.

For purposes of the present review, research will be organized according to the type of dependent variable(s) of interest in the study, i.e., subject perceptions of the self-discloser, and the effects of self-disclosure by one person on the responses of the subject.

Perceptions of the Self-Discloser. Several studies have been concerned with subject perceptions of the self-discloser. Johnson and Noonan (1972) examined the effects of reciprocal self-disclosure by a confederate and his warm agreement with (acceptance of) subject self-disclosure or disagreement with (rejection of) subject self-disclosure on subject trust of the confederate. They concluded that a client will like and trust a counselor who accepts self-disclosure and reciprocates self-disclosure; the client will feel more influenced by a non-self-disclosing, rejecting counselor, but will dislike and distrust the counselor.

Weigel, Dinges, Dyer, and Straumfjord (1972) investigated the relationship between the perceived usage of self-disclosure by clients and therapists, their liking for each other, and their
evaluation of each other's mental health. They obtained ratings of these variables from members and therapists of five sensitivity groups, two psychotherapy groups, and two marathon groups. They found a positive relationship between liking and mental health and between liking and self-disclosure both for members ranking other members and for therapists ranking members. There was a significant negative relationship between mental health and self-disclosure for members' ranking of therapists and a nonsignificant negative relationship between liking and self-disclosure. The authors concluded that the negative relationships may be due to violation of role expectations by the therapist who self-discloses; he may be behaving "unprofessionally". Weigel et al. (1972) questioned the effectiveness of therapist self-disclosure, saying it might be detrimental to client perceptions of and responses to the therapist.

In a similar study, May and Thompson (1973) found a positive relationship between encounter group members' perceptions of group leaders' self-disclosure, mental health, and helpfulness. They found no differences between low self-disclosing members' ratings of the leaders and high self-disclosing members' ratings. The authors concluded that self-disclosure is an appropriate counselor response in some situations, but they cautioned against indiscriminate use of self-disclosure, suggesting that there may be a curvilinear relationship between the amount of self-disclosure and its effects on the client; that is, too much or too little counselor self-disclosure could block progress in one's personal development.
Cash and Salzbach (1978) investigated the effects of physical attractiveness and self-disclosure by non-professional counselors in initial counseling interviews. Their dependent measures included client perceptions of counselor expertness, social attractiveness, and trustworthiness as rated by The Counselor Rating Form (Barak and LaCrosse, 1975). The counselors utilized responses that were contextually similar to client responses to give either personal or demographic self-disclosure, or they did not self-disclose. The authors found that both types of self-disclosure eliminated the effects of physical attractiveness or unattractiveness, and that moderate amounts of personal and demographic self-disclosure improved client perceptions of physically unattractive counselors’ expertness and social attractiveness. Personal self-disclosure increased perceived trustworthiness of unattractive counselors. The authors concluded that physically unattractive counselors who self-disclose appropriate feelings and experiences can increase their perceived expertness, social attractiveness, and trustworthiness to a point of equality with physically attractive counselors.

Dies (1973) examined the relationship between the amount of group counselor self-disclosure and client perceptions of the counselor. He found that a more self-disclosing counselor was evaluated as more friendly, disclosing, trusting, and intimate by his clients than was the less self-disclosing counselor. Although not statistically significant, there was also a trend for the more self-disclosing counselor to be judged as less relaxed, strong,
stable, and sensitive than the less self-disclosing counselor. Dies, like Weigel et al. (1972), suggested that this finding may be due to violation of role expectations by the counselor.

Egan (1975) hypothesized that positive similarity self-disclosure increases counselor attractiveness, enhances his trustworthiness, and adds credence to his statements of accurate empathy. Egan also discussed the possible effect of self-disclosure on a client. He suggested that the more severe problems a client has, the more he is affected adversely by counselor self-disclosure; self-disclosure becomes threatening rather than being helpful. Studies using "normal" students may find that counselor self-disclosure elicits client self-disclosure because of the lack of severity of problems they present.

Culbert (1968) studied varying amounts of self-disclosure by trainers in two T-groups. He examined trainer "interaction self-references" and "self-only" references and found differential usage of the responses by the trainers. Culbert could not determine if it was the high frequency of self-only or interaction self-references that produced differences in the results. Nevertheless, he concluded that group members perceive a high self-disclosing trainer as more therapeutic than a low self-disclosing one. There was a greater increase in self-awareness by the members who experienced the more self-disclosing trainer than by those who experienced the less self-disclosing trainer. Culbert also found resistance by members with the more self-disclosing trainer to form
two-person therapeutic involvements with other members. He stated that too much self-disclosure—self-only and/or interaction self-reference—may be responsible for this reaction.

Worthy, Gary, and Kahn (1969) defined self-disclosure in dyadic interactions by examining the revelation of personal information that is not generally known about oneself and is not otherwise available to the other person. The authors found that a person who self-disclosed was liked by the other person, and that self-disclosure by one person elicited self-disclosure by the other person.

Thus, the majority of the studies reviewed indicate that a counselor who self-discloses tends to be perceived as attractive and trustworthy and is liked by the client. However, there is also evidence that he may be perceived as less mentally healthy than a less disclosing or non-disclosing counselor; this effect may be related to findings which suggest that a counselor who uses self-disclosure violates role expectations and is not perceived as being as "expert" nor as influential as a non-disclosing counselor. It is also possible that a counselor who uses self-disclosure responses with clients who have severe problems may be perceived as less expert because his self-disclosures are threatening to the clients.

But any conclusions that might be made from the findings are confounded by the methodological problems. Johnson and Noonan (1972), Dies (1973), and Culbert (1968) fail to differentiate self-disclosure from self-involving responses. Weigel et al. (1972)
and May and Thompson (1973) never define "self-disclosure". Only Egan (1975) and Worthy et al. (1969) make fairly adequate attempts to define the response. Thus, it is not surprising that inconsistent results are yielded by studies whose definitions of the central variable differ so widely in both content and specificity.

The utility of specific and circumscribed definitions of self-disclosure versus other types of responses was shown in a study by McCarthy and Betz (1978). The authors investigated the extent to which counselor self-disclosure and counselor self-involving responses have differential effects on client perceptions of the counselor. Counselor self-disclosure is a response in which the counselor reveals factual information about himself/herself. Self-involving responses are those in which the counselor makes a direct statement of his/her feelings in response to certain stimuli presented by the client. One half of the subjects listened to taped counselor and client dialogues in which the counselor made self-disclosure responses, and the other half of the subjects listened to taped counselor and client dialogues in which the counselor made self-involving responses. Subjects were asked to make written responses to either the self-disclosing or self-involving counselor and to rate the counselor on the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.

The results suggest that the self-involving counselor was perceived as significantly more expert and trustworthy and tended to be perceived as more attractive than was the self-disclosing counselor.
Subject Responses. A second major group of studies have been concerned with the effects of self-disclosure by one person on the behaviors of the subject, particularly subject self-disclosure. While the focus of these studies has been to examine the qualitative differences in subject responses such as the amount and content of subject self-disclosures, the existence of any differences suggests that there may also be structural differences in subject responses. For example, subjects who engage in greater amounts of self-disclosure may talk longer, use a larger number of self-referents, express more feelings, and maintain the focus of the conversation on themselves rather than the other person. Several studies have indicated that self-disclosure by one person does affect the qualitative nature of subject self-disclosure responses; these results have implications for studies of the effects of counselor responses on the structural components of client responses.

Bundza and Simonson (1973) examined the relationships between client willingness to self-disclose and client impressions of the counselor following counselor self-disclosure. They found that subjects were more willing to disclose to the self-disclosing counselor than to the non-self-disclosing counselor. The subjects also viewed the self-disclosing counselor as more "nurturant." There were no differences in perceived intrapersonal of the two types of counselors.

Halpern (1977) investigated the relationship between client perceptions of counselor self-disclosure, warmth, empathy, and genuineness and client perceptions of their own past and present
disclosure. He found that a client's past tendency to self-disclose was significantly related to present tendencies to self-disclose and that present self-disclosure was strongly related to client perceptions of the counselor as being self-disclosing, warm, and empathic. But there are several limitations to the generalizability of these findings. Halpern examined only client perceptions. Counselor perceptions as well as objective measures of actual self-disclosure might provide a more complete understanding of the process of self-disclosure in counselor-client dyads. Halpern failed to provide a specific definition to clarify what behaviors he considered to be self-disclosure. He also used the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard, 1969) to assess client perceptions of self-disclosure behavior. This instrument has been demonstrated to lack both concurrent and predictive validity when compared to actual self-disclosure behaviors (Abendroth, Horne, Ollendick, and Passmore, 1977; Hurley and Hurley, 1969; Vondracek, 1969).

Thase and Page (1977) studied the effects of self-disclosing models on subjects' reported willingness to self-disclose in both laboratory and non-laboratory settings. Subjects in both settings were exposed to either a high self-disclosing model, a low self-disclosing model, or no model. In both settings the subjects exposed to the high self-disclosing model were significantly more willing to self-disclose than were subjects exposed to the low self-disclosing model. The levels of self-disclosure did not differ in the two settings for subjects exposed to a model; however,
subjects not exposed to a model were more willing to self-disclose in the lab than in the non-laboratory setting. While the results indicate that self-disclosure by one person is positively related to self-disclosure by another, the precise meaning of the findings is not clear. The authors assessed subject willingness to self-disclose, not actual subject self-disclosure. Also their definition of self-disclosure as the number of topics a subject is willing to discuss plus the intimacy value of the topics causes questions as to the exact behaviors categorized as self-disclosure.

Cozby (1973) reviewed empirical findings on the use of self-disclosure in counseling and in experimenter-subject situations. He concluded that an interviewer or experimenter who uses self-disclosure elicits greater self-disclosure from the subjects. He is also evaluated by the subjects as more trustworthy than an experimenter who does not self-disclose.

Simonson and Bahr (1974) examined subject self-disclosure and attraction to the counselor using a paraprofessional and a professional counselor who made self-disclosure responses. They found that demographic self-disclosure by both a paraprofessional and a professional elicited self-disclosure and attraction by the subjects. They did not explain what the self-disclosure responses were, however. The subjects preferred demographic self-disclosure to personal self-disclosure by a professional, perhaps because personal self-disclosure violates expectations (at least during the initial session). Personal self-disclosure by the paraprofessional is psychologically "closer" to the subjects. The authors suggested
that it is the person and/or the subject's relationship with the self-discloser and not simply the content of the response that is critical.

Savicki (1972) defined self-disclosure as a process by which a person makes himself known to others. He varied levels of intimacy of the self-disclosure by a confederate to naive subjects. He found that the confederate's self-disclosure increased both the level of intimacy and the amount of subject self-disclosure. But he could not find evidence for the curvilinearity hypothesis that too much self-disclosure by one person inhibits self-disclosure by the other person. Savicki said that this hypothesis may not be demonstrable by a behavioral index, i.e., amount of self-disclosure. A person may dislike the over-discloser and psychologically withdraw while continuing to disclose himself. But Savicki did not ask whether or not the subjects liked the confederate or if they felt comfortable with the amount of self-disclosure.

In their study of interviewer-interviewee similarity self-disclosure, Murphy and Strong (1972) defined self-disclosure as short comments about the interviewer's experiences, attitudes, or values that conform to the interviewee's preceding statements. They found that student interviewees felt liking and positive feelings for interviewers and willingness to disclose to them when the interviewers used similarity self-disclosure. But Murphy and Strong raised the question, "Would the set of 'help-seeking' change the students' reactions? Would their own needs to be helped make
them intolerant of learning about the counselor's experiences, or would it help them because they need a comparison?" In subsequent extensions of this study, Gianandrea and Murphy (1973) and Mann and Murphy (1975) found evidence for a curvilinearity hypothesis, i.e., a moderate amount of counselor self-disclosure was positively related to increased subject self-disclosure, positive perceptions of the counselor, and return for a second interview. Too much or too little self-disclosure by the counselor were related to less subject self-disclosure, less positive perceptions of the counselor, and a decrease in the number of subjects returning for a second interview. The subjects in these follow-up studies were volunteers and not "real" clients, however.

Most of the findings support the hypothesis that counselor self-disclosure elicits client self-disclosure, but there are methodological concerns. The inadequate definitions of self-disclosure in many of the studies present a problem with interpreting the findings. Different assessment methods such as self-reports, reports by others, measurement of perceptions, and measurement of overt behaviors may produce contradictory findings within and across studies. Some of the studies were not done as counseling analogues; they were examining experimenter and subject or interviewer and interviewee interactions. Therefore, there may be some question as to the generalizability of the findings to the counseling setting because subjects are not "help-seeking" clients with more severe problems (Murphy and Strong, 1972).
The methodological issues have contributed to the inconclusiveness of the findings. For example, many authors have cautioned against the over-use of self-disclosure (Culbert, 1968; Egan, 1975; Goodstein, et al., 1976; Luft, 1969; Mowrer, 1964). They suggest using self-disclosure when it is "appropriate". Savitsky, Zarle, and Keedy (1976), Gianndrea and Murphy (1973), and Mann and Murphy (1975) said that indiscriminate self-disclosure is not necessarily beneficial to the counseling process, partially because specific effects of self-disclosure are unknown. Such usage of the response would be an over-simplified and unjustified assumption. Many authors (e.g., Bundza and Simonson, 1973; Cozby, 1973; Dies, 1973; Savitsky, et al., 1976) call for more research to determine the effect of specific information given by a counselor on a client's behavior.

An attempt to examine the effects of specifically defined counselor self-disclosure responses versus another type of response, counselor self-involving responses, was provided by McCarthy and Betz (1978). They investigated the extent to which counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses have differential effects on client verbal responses to the counselor. Examining the structural components of client responses, they found that counselor self-disclosure responses elicited more client responses in the form of questions directed to the counselor and containing more counselor referents while counselor self-involving responses elicited more client responses that were client-focused and contained more client referents. Based on these findings, the authors
concluded that counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses are distinctly different responses that have important implications for counseling process.

In summary, while there has been a considerable amount of research on the effects of self-disclosure in a variety of settings using a number of variables, generally this research has not provided useful information for theorists and practitioners. It seems evident that several methodological improvements are necessary if research on self-disclosure is to provide such information. In particular, additional studies need to utilize definitions of self-disclosure which are not only specific but which differentiate self-disclosure from other types of self-referent responses, in particular, self-involving responses. The importance of examining these two types of counselor self-referent responses separately has been demonstrated by McCarthy and Betz (1978). Further research examining self-disclosure and/or self-involving responses needs to define these variables specifically enough to allow replication and meaningful interpretation of the research results.

While numerous studies have examined the variable of self-disclosure, few have provided specific definitions which would lead to more easily interpretable results. One study in which counselor and client behaviors have been clearly specified suggests important implications for theorists and practitioners (McCarthy and Betz, 1978). However, the findings of this research need to be replicated and extended in order to provide additional information for counseling process. A limitation of the McCarthy
and Betz study involved their use of one type of counselor-client dyad, a male counselor and a female client. The generalizability of their results to other counselor-client gender pairings may be limited since a number of studies have indicated that different counselor-client gender pairings may differentially affect client behaviors and client perceptions of the counselor.

Gender and Client Responses. A number of studies have examined the differential effects of counselor-client gender pairings on the qualitative aspects of client self-disclosure responses. Differences in such variables as the amount and content of client self-disclosure suggest implications for studies examining the structural components of clients' responses. Brooks (1974) manipulated counselor sex and status to study their effects on the amount and content of client self-disclosure. She found that, overall, neither subject sex, interviewer sex, nor interviewer status significantly affected self-disclosure. There were significant interactions between subject sex and both interviewer sex and status. All-male dyads contained the least amount of subject self-disclosure; male interviewer-female subject and female interviewer-male subject dyads contained the greatest amount of subject self-disclosure. Subject disclosure was highest in dyads containing a female, either as subject or as interviewer. Male subjects disclosed more in high status conditions and less in low status conditions, while female subjects disclosed more in low status conditions and less in high status conditions. Based on these findings, Brooks suggested that
self-disclosure may be facilitated by assigning opposite sex counselor-client pairs. She stated that her conclusions are tentative until her study is replicated with real clients.

Hill (1975) studied the effects of sex of client and sex and experience level of the counselor on specific client and counselor behaviors. She found that inexperienced male counselors and experienced female counselors were rated more empathic and elicited more feelings from clients while experienced male counselors and inexperienced female counselors were rated lower in empathy and elicited fewer client feelings. Same-sex pairings produced the greatest discussion of feeling by both the counselors and clients. Clients of female counselors reported more satisfaction with the counseling session than did clients of male counselors. Hill concluded that counseling process and outcome was influenced by the sex of clients and sex and experience level of the counselors. The results suggest that different counselors and clients act differently with each other and that these differences have implications for the process of counseling.

Grantham (1973) examined the effects of counselor sex and race on client depth of exploration. He found that both male and female black clients engaged in more self-exploration with female counselors of both races. Heilbrun (1973) also examined the amount of self-disclosure by female subjects to male and female interviewers and found that the subjects disclosed more to females than to males. He defined self-disclosure as the amount of time required for a subject to begin her response and the total length of time
that she responded. While female subjects did respond in varying amounts to male and female interviewers, the content of their responses is not known. The content of self-disclosure has been demonstrated to be an important variable by Pederson and Breglio (1968) who found that females used fewer words to describe themselves but disclosed more intimate information about themselves than males. Additional measures such as a content analysis of the subjects' responses might help to clarify the meaning of the findings.

Goodstein and Russell (1977), defining self-disclosure as the interpersonal process of revealing psychologically meaningful information about oneself to another, examined differential self-disclosure by male and female subjects to male and female friends and relatives. They found that the subjects reported significantly more self-disclosure to females than males and to friends than relatives. However, this pattern of subject self-disclosure was not supported by reports of the recipients of the self-disclosure, i.e., the friends and relatives. The authors suggested that reports by others are important supplements to self-reports of self-disclosure. The findings of their study are difficult to interpret because of the contradictory results they obtained and because they did not precisely define self-disclosure. Their definition could include self-involving responses as well as self-disclosure responses.

Highlen and Gillis (1978) studied the effects of sex of subject, subject role, type of feeling, and sex of best friend on
amount of affective self-disclosure and self-reported anxiety in hypothetical conversations with the subjects' best friends. The authors defined affective self-disclosure as self-referenced responses that express emotions in feeling terms and contain a reason for the affect given. They found that female subjects disclosed more feelings than males, more affective self-disclosure was made to same-sex rather than opposite-sex friends, subjects expressed more positive feelings than negative ones and reported more anxiety when expressing negative feelings. The authors concluded that affective self-disclosure is a complex variable which seems to be sex-linked and situation specific. The results of their study need to be interpreted cautiously, however, due to their definition of affective self-disclosure. They seem to be defining self-involving rather than self-disclosure responses.

Roth and Kuiken (1975) manipulated immediate self-disclosure by one person to another and the cognitive compatibility of the members of the dyad to assess their impact on the immediacy of subject self-disclosure. They defined immediate self-disclosure as the explicit expression of privately held attitudes to another person. Cognitive compatibility was defined as having attitude similarity and attraction towards the other person. The authors examined the effects of immediate and non-immediate self-disclosure and compatibility and non-compatibility of a confederate on the amount and type of subject self-disclosure. The confederate's and subjects were matched on sex and either matched or opposed on compatibility. They found that immediacy of subject self-disclosure
was significantly facilitated in compatible dyads, at least for female subjects. The immediacy of the confederates' self-disclosure alone produced no significant main effects. Based on these results they concluded that female clients may engage in more immediate self-disclosure behaviors than male clients, especially if the clients perceive themselves as similar to the counselor.

Annis and Perry (1977) attempted to determine the degree of dependence of self-disclosure on group sexual composition and on the viewing of a video-taped model who demonstrated self-disclosure behaviors. Subjects were assigned to either all-male, all-female, or mixed-sex groups. One-half of the groups saw the model while the other half, serving as controls, did not view the model. The authors found that females tended to disclose more than males regardless of the treatment condition or sex composition of their group. Subjects who viewed the videotape self-disclosed more than the subjects in the control group. They also found that the sexual composition of the groups had no significant effects on self-disclosure. There were no significant interaction effects. Annis and Perry concluded that their results tend to support the hypothesis that females disclose more than males. The authors did not define self-disclosure specifically enough to distinguish it from other types of responses, e.g., self-involving responses. Therefore, their conclusions should be considered cautiously.

One study has failed to demonstrate differential effects of counselor-client gender pairings on client behaviors including self-disclosure. Halpern (1977), in his study of client perceptions
of their own self-disclosure and counselor self-disclosure, found no significant relationships between counselor or client sex and client perceptions of either their own or their counselor's self-disclosure. Halpern did not examine actual counselor-client behaviors and he did not clearly define self-disclosure. Thus, it is difficult to reach any conclusions about the effects of counselor-client gender pairings on self-disclosure.

**Gender and Perceptions of Counselor.** While the study of McCarthy and Betz (1978) showed differential client perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness as a result of counselor self-disclosure versus self-involving responses, it is not known the extent to which these differences were specific to a male counselor.

There is some evidence to suggest that counselor-client gender pairings may influence the results of client perceptions of counselors who use self-disclosure versus self-involving responses. Howard, Orlinsky, and Hill (1970) examined the effects of counselor sex on female client satisfaction and found that female clients rated counseling sessions with female counselors as more satisfying. Shapiro (1977) found that female counselors were perceived as more reinforcing and less punishing and less behaviorally reinforcing than male counselors when rated by two confederate female clients. Edwards (1974) found that female clients rated male counselors higher in effectiveness than male clients after the first counseling session, while male clients rated male counselors higher in effectiveness than female clients following the second counseling session.
While these studies suggest that the sex of counselor and/or the client may moderate the effects of particular counselor responses, such as self-referent responses, a number of other studies indicate that counselor-client gender pairings may not influence the results of client perceptions of counselors who use self-disclosure versus those who use self-involving responses. Both Hoffman-Graff (1977) and Hoffman and Spencer (1977) suggested that either male and female counselors using the same counseling behaviors may be perceived similarly by male and female clients, i.e., that self-disclosure is a powerful enough counselor behavior that clients focus on the behavior rather than the counselor's sex.

Hoffman-Graff examined the differential effects of counselor-client gender pairings and counselor positive and negative self-disclosure on client perceptions of the counselor. She defined positive self-disclosure as interviewer statements revealing personal strengths, or positive experiences and personal characteristics; negative self-disclosure was defined as interviewer statements revealing personal foibles, or negative experiences and personal characteristics. She found that negatively disclosing interviewers were perceived as significantly more credible, empathic, and warm than were positively disclosing interviewers regardless of the interviewer-subject sex pairings.

In a replication and extension of this study, Hoffman and Spencer (1977) found that subjects perceived the negatively self-disclosing interviewer as significantly more credible than the
positively disclosing interviewer while there were no significant
differences in perceptions of counselor empathy and warmth. Again,
there were no significant effects due to counselor-client sex
pairings.

Pew (1977) extended previous research to examine environmental
cues of counselor competence and sex of counselor as they affect
perceived counselor expertness. They found that while diplomas
and awards increased initial perceptions of counselor expertness,
sex of counselor did not affect initial perceptions and there were
no significant interactions between sex of counselor and presence
or absence of environmental cues of expertness. The authors
suggested, however, that the potential effects of counselor sex
warrant further research employing complex designs to control for
possible confounding factors such as counselor attractiveness,
length of experience, and other individual differences among
counselors.

Scher (1975) studied the relationship between verbal activity,
sex of counselor-client dyads, and experience of the counselor and
successful outcome in psychotherapy. He defined success as symptom
relief and counselor and client satisfaction. He found that only
counselor experience was related to therapeutic outcome. Sex of
the counselor and client did not significantly influence counseling
outcome. The amount of verbal activity was not a significant
influence either. There was a significant interaction between
counselor experience and client sex for one item measuring symptom
relief; dyads involving experienced counselors with male clients
and inexperienced counselors with female clients reported greater therapeutic success. Scher concluded from the results that counselor and client sex as well as counselor and client verbal activity are not predictors of therapeutic success. While some clients might benefit more from same-sex or opposite-sex counselors for some concerns, gender in general is not a significant predictor of outcome. The study did not include measures of overt behaviors. And the results, while raising some implications for counseling outcome, do not indicate whether counselor-client sex pairings differentially affect specific client behaviors during the counseling process.

The results of numerous studies of the differential effects of sex pairings are contradictory and difficult to interpret. The inconclusiveness of the findings is partially a methodological problem. Studies examining the relationship between sex-pairings and self-disclosure are confounded by inadequate and incomplete definitions of self-disclosure. It is possible that the studies have examined very different behaviors. Another methodological problem is that a wide variety of variables including counselor and client self-disclosure, client exploration, counselor facilitativeness, counselor experience and status, and counselor and client satisfaction, etc., have been considered. The studies also vary in their assessment procedures, i.e., self-reports, reports by observers, perceptions of behavior, overt behaviors. Participants in the studies have included counselors, clients, interviewers, students, friends, relatives. These different measurements have produced inconsistent findings within and across studies.
An additional problem with the studies of sex-pairings is that the interactions of sex with other variables, rather than main effects due to sex alone, may be the reality of the situations studied (Freeman and Stormes, 1977; Holahan and Slaikeu, 1977; Shullman, 1978).

In summary, several studies have suggested that counselor-client gender pairings have differential effects on counseling process, while other studies have failed to demonstrate these sex differences. Additional research including greater specificity of the variables of interest and examining possible interactions of counselor-client sex variables may provide more meaningful, useful results for counseling theorists and practitioners.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Design

Many studies have demonstrated that counselor self-disclosure may lead to client self-disclosure (Annis and Perry, 1977; Bundza and Simonson, 1973; Cozby, 1973; Culbert, 1968; Danish and Hauer, 1973b; Egan, 1975; Johnson and Noonan, 1972; Murphy and Strong, 1972; Savicki, 1972; Simonson and Bahr, 1974). Studies have also indicated that counselor self-disclosure is positively related to client perceptions of counselor trustworthiness (Cash and Salzbach, 1978; Egan, 1975; Dies, 1973; Johnson and Noonan, 1972; Murphy and Strong, 1972; Worthy, et al., 1969) and attractiveness (Bundza and Simonson, 1973; Cash and Salzbach, 1978; Danish and Hauer, 1973b; Dies, 1973; Egan, 1975; Johnson and Noonan, 1972; Jourard, 1971; Murphy and Strong, 1972; Simonson and Bahr, 1974; Worthy, et al., 1969). Three studies have suggested that counselor self-disclosure may be negatively related to client perceptions of counselor expertness (Dies, 1973; Johnson and Noonan, 1972; Weigel, et al., 1972); one study has indicated that counselor self-disclosure may be positively related to client perceptions of counselor expertness (Cash and Salzbach, 1978).

While counselor self-disclosure is certainly an important focus of study, lack of specificity in its definition has led to the
inclusion of another potentially important class of counselor self-referent responses, self-involving responses, in studies of self-disclosure (McCarthy and Betz, 1978). A major implication of the McCarthy and Betz study is that counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses appear to be distinctly different responses that have differential effects on the counseling process. Due to the differences between self-disclosure and self-involving responses, it was a major purpose of the present study to replicate the McCarthy and Betz (1978) study by determining the differential effects of counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses on client perceptions of the counselor and on the content of client responses to counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses.

A limitation to the generalizability of the findings of the McCarthy and Betz study is that they examined one specific type of counselor-client dyad, a male counselor and a female client. A number of studies have suggested that counselor-client gender pairings may differentially affect counseling process and outcome. Some of the findings indicate that under certain conditions female subjects disclose more often and more intimately than male subjects (Annis and Perry, 1977; Goodstein, et al., 1976; Heilbrun, 1973; Highlen and Gillis, 1978; Jourard, 1971; Pederson and Breglio, 1968; Roth and Kuiken, 1975); that females are the recipients of a larger amount of self-disclosure than are males (Goodstein and Russell, 1977; Grantham, 1973); or that there are interactional effects between counselor and client sex (Cozby, 1973; Heilbrun, 1973; Holahan and Slaikeu, 1977; Shullman, 1978) which affect client
responses such as self-disclosure. Other studies of counselor-client gender pairings suggest that sex of client affects perceptions of counselor effectiveness (Edwards, 1974) and that female counselors may be more favorably perceived by female clients (Shapiro, 1977).

Due to this evidence, a second major purpose of the present study was to examine differential effects of counselor-client gender pairings on client verbal responses and client perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Interactions between counselor-client gender pairings and counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses were examined to determine their possible differential effects on client verbal responses and client perceptions of the counselor.

Accordingly, the design of the study involved the presentation of counseling interview stimulus materials containing either male or female counselor self-disclosure or self-involving responses. Male and female subjects were asked to write hypothetical client responses and to evaluate the counselors on several variables.

Hypotheses

On the basis of theoretical considerations and available research evidence, the following hypotheses were formulated for investigation in the present study:

Client Perceptions of Counselor.

1) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, a counselor who uses self-involving responses will be rated significantly higher in attractiveness than will a counselor who uses self-disclosure responses.

2) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, a counselor who uses self-involving responses will be rated significantly
higher in trustworthiness than will a counselor who uses self-disclosure responses.

3) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, a counselor who uses self-involving responses will be rated significantly higher in expertness than will a counselor who uses self-disclosure responses.

Content of Client Responses.

4) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, counselor self-involving responses will elicit significantly longer client responses than will counselor self-disclosure responses.

5) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, counselor self-involving responses will elicit a significantly larger proportion of affective words in a client's response to the counselor statements than will counselor self-disclosure responses.

6) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, counselor self-involving responses will elicit a significantly larger proportion of present tense verbs in a client's response than will counselor self-disclosure responses.

7) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, counselor self-disclosure responses will elicit a significantly larger proportion of future tense and past tense verbs in a client's response than will counselor self-involving responses.

8) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, counselor self-disclosure responses will elicit a significantly larger number of client responses in the form of questions than will counselor self-involving responses.

9) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, counselor self-involving responses will elicit a significantly larger number of client responses that are not questions than will counselor self-disclosure responses.

10) Across all counselor-client gender pairings, counselor self-involving responses will elicit a significantly larger proportion of client self-referent words in a client's response than will counselor self-disclosure responses.

11) Across all counselor-client gender pairings counselor self-disclosure responses will elicit a significantly larger proportion of counselor referent words in a client's response than will counselor self-involving responses.
Counselor-Client Gender Pairings. In addition to examination of the above hypotheses, the possible effects of counselor-client gender pairings on client perceptions of the counselor and on client responses were investigated. Due to the inconclusiveness of previous studies of the differential effects of counselor-client gender pairings, it is not possible to know the impact of the effects of counselor-client sex pairings on client responses to and perceptions of the counselor. Therefore, the investigation of counselor-client gender pairings was an exploratory study of the possible main effects of counselor sex and client sex as well as the interaction of counselor-client sex with counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses.

Instrumentation

Tape recordings of simulated counseling sessions between the eight possible pairings of a male and female counselor and a male and female client were devised. Two counselors, who were advanced graduate students in counseling psychology, and two clients, who were undergraduate students, read a prepared transcript adapted from The Helping Skills Reliability Tape (Danish, et al., 1976a). Used to establish interrater reliability for identifying types of counselor responses, The Helping Skills Reliability Tape consists of 140 counselor-client interchanges involving various types of counselor responses. Each recording contained nine 1-minute and one 2-minute dialogues between the counselor and client. The first dialogue on each tape was two minutes in length to allow subjects to become familiar with the experimental process.
The content of the simulated counseling interview involved the client's discussion of feelings of dissatisfaction with himself/herself, lack of friends, and problems interacting with his/her parents. All of the counselor responses with the exception of the last response in each segment were either open-ended questions, reflections of content, or reflections of feelings, in order to simulate a typical first interview (Simonson, 1976; Simonson and Bahr, 1974). Open-ended questions are counselor responses that cannot be answered by the client with "Yes", "No", or with one or two words; content responses reflect the content of the prior client statement(s); and reflections of feelings--affective responses--reflect feelings which the client has not yet labelled (Danish, et al., 1975).

On four of the tapes, the last response in each segment was a counselor self-disclosure response; tapes using self-disclosure as the last response throughout were made using a male counselor and male client, a male counselor and female client, a female counselor and female client, and a female counselor and male client. On the other four tapes, the last response in each segment was a counselor self-involving response; tapes using self-involving responses as the last response were made using the four counselor-client gender pairings. The counselor and client responses during each tape were identical with the exception of the last counselor response in each excerpt, the self-disclosure or self-involving response. The transcript for the counseling interview that was used as stimulus material in the present study is contained in Appendix A.
Perceptions of Counselor. In order to assess subjects' perceptions of the expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness of the male and female self-disclosing and male and female self-involving counselors, The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) (Barak and LaCrosse, 1975) was utilized.

The three perceived counselor characteristics of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness can be defined in various ways. Strong (1976) defined these characteristics as follows: "Expertness is evidence of a counselor's competence. During a counseling session the expert counselor is relaxed, interested, reactive to the client, and he speaks confidently. The trustworthy counselor has no hidden purpose. He has a sincere interest in the client. Some of his responses are so unexpected that the client believes they must be the counselor's honest opinion. The attractive counselor is one toward whom the client feels similarity, liking, or compatibility. He has had some experiences in common with the client. He responds positively in the same direction as the client on certain topics."

Development of the CRF, contained in Appendix B, was based on the definitions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness provided by Strong. The CRF consists of thirty-six 7-point bi-polar items; each of the three scales, expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, contains 12 items. The score range for each scale is from a minimum of 12 to a maximum of 84. The CRF is completed by placing a check mark in the space that indicates to what degree an adjective describes the counselor and scores are obtained by adding the numbers corresponding to the 12 item responses for each scale.
Previous research has indicated that the CRF can differentiate reliably both within and between counselors on the three dimensions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Barak and Dell, 1977; Barak and LaCrosse, 1977; LaCrosse and Barak, 1976).

**Content of Client Responses.** Client verbal responses were obtained by asking subjects to write hypothetical client responses to the counselor. They were asked to respond as they believed the client on the tape would respond at that point in the interview.

The content of the subjects' responses to the counselors was analyzed by three independent raters, an undergraduate psychology major, a third-year Ph.D. candidate in counseling psychology, and the experimenter. Responses were analyzed in terms of eight categories per response: 1) number of words; 2) number of affective words; 3) number of present tense verbs; 4) number of past and future tense verbs; 5) number of questions; 6) number of "others" (i.e., sentences that are not questions directed to the counselor). A six-hour training program was conducted by the experimenter to train the raters in content analysis procedures; the training involved learning specific definitions of each of the eight categories and practice in analyzing written responses. The training procedures are outlined in Appendix C. Each rater analyzed responses for approximately one-third of the subjects and recorded the data on a "Response Rating Form", contained in Appendix D. The raters did not have knowledge of either the experimental condition or the gender pairing of the materials being rated.
Subjects

Although the population of interest was psychotherapy clients, the use of real clients would have made it extremely difficult to control counselor behavior closely enough to provide a standard stimulus for client responses. Therefore, a counseling analogue was conducted using as subjects "naive" individuals who had never been in psychotherapy. Use of an analogue permitted precise control of counselor behavior, and use of naive subjects was designed to control for possible confounding due to experiences with other counselors. The subjects were 120 undergraduate students, 60 males and 60 females, from the Introductory Psychology course at The Ohio State University. Subjects were assigned to maximize their similarity to the clients on the tapes, who were described to the subjects as either a male or female college freshman. Subjects were blocked on the variable of sex and each block of subjects was then randomly assigned to one of four treatment conditions. Male subjects were assigned to: 1) Self-disclosure, male counselor-male client; 2) Self-disclosure, female counselor-male client; 3) Self-involving, male counselor-male client; 4) Self-involving, female counselor-male client. Female subjects were assigned to: 1) Self-disclosure, female counselor-female client; 2) Self-disclosure, male counselor-female client; 3) Self-involving, female counselor-female client; or, 4) Self-involving, male counselor-female client.

Procedure

With the exception of the type of counselor responses presented (i.e., self-involving or self-disclosure) and the particular counselor-
client gender pairing utilized, the experimental procedures for the
eight subject groups were identical. The experiment was conducted
in a laboratory with a central tape system and twenty individual
carrels in which subjects listened to a tape through headphones.

Prior to beginning the experiment, subjects were given a set of
instructions. They were told that they would hear a tape of various
segments of an initial counseling session between a counselor and a
client. The tape was described to the subjects and they were given
directions for making responses. The full set of instructions is
contained in Appendix E.

Following the provision of instructions, the experiment was
begun. After listening to each of the ten segments of the tape,
subjects were given one minute to respond in writing to the counselor
the way they thought the client would respond to him or her. The
subjects were signalled to begin writing each response when they
heard the experimenter on the tape say, "Write your response now."
At the end of one minute the experimenter announced the beginning
of the next segment. Following their responses to the ten segments,
the subjects completed The Counselor Rating Form as they believed
the client would complete the form. The written responses and
questionnaires were collected at the end of the experiment.
Subjects were debriefed upon completion of the experiment;
debriefing included discussion of the hypotheses of the experiment
and description of the procedures and instrumentation.
Data Analysis

Interrater Reliability. The reliability of the raters' analyses was assessed by having the three raters independently analyze a total of 160 written responses for the same sixteen subjects. The sixteen subjects were a random sample of two subjects from each of the eight conditions. The raters did not know to which condition the subjects belonged. Each rater analyzed the 160 responses according to each of the eight categories.

For each category, an alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) indicating the degree of interjudge agreement in response categorization was obtained. The alpha coefficients for the eight categories are presented in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, the alpha coefficients ranged from \( \overline{r} = .94 \) to \( \overline{r} = .99 \). The mean reliability for the eight categories was \( \overline{r} = .98 \).

An estimate of the reliability of data rated by one rater for each category was calculated using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. The coefficients for the eight categories are presented in Table 2. As shown in Table 2, the coefficients ranged from \( \overline{r}_{tt1/3} = .83 \) to \( \overline{r}_{tt1/3} = .99 \). The mean estimated reliability for one rater across the eight categories was \( \overline{r}_{tt1/3} = .94 \).

The results of the reliability assessments suggest that interrater reliability as well as the estimated reliability for each individual rater analyzing different subjects' responses over the eight categories was adequate. Thus, the raters were in high agreement as to categorization of the responses for the same 16
Table 1
Interrater Reliability in the Analysis of Hypothetical Client Responses\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Words</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affective Words</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Present Tense Verbs</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Past/Future Tense Verbs</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Client Referents</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Counselor Referents</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Others</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Interrater reliability was assessed for three independent raters.

\textsuperscript{a}n = 160 client responses analyzed according to the eight response categories.
Table 2
Estimated Reliability for One Rater in the Analysis of Hypothetical Client Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Spearman-Brown Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Words</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affective Words</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Present Tense Verbs</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Past/Future Tense Verbs</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Client Referents</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Counselor Referents</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Others</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Interrater reliability was assessed for three independent raters.

\[^a_n = 160\] client responses analyzed according to the eight response categories.
subjects and each rater was likely to be highly consistent when rating one-third of the total subject responses.

Tests of Hypotheses. In order to test the three hypotheses concerning client perceptions of the self-disclosing versus the self-involving counselor, the means for the two blocks of subjects' ratings of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness were obtained. In order to test the eight hypotheses concerning client hypothetical responses the means for total written responses for the two blocks of subjects were obtained for each of eight categories: 1) number of words; 2) proportion of affective words to total words; 3) proportion of present tense verbs to total verbs; 4) proportion of past and future tense verbs to total verbs; 5) proportion of client referents to total words; 6) proportion of counselor referents to total words; 7) number of questions; 8) number of "other" sentences.

Statistical Analysis. The design involved a 3-way completely crossed analysis of variance. The three independent variables included counselor self-disclosure versus self-involving responses, counselor sex, and client sex. Since each of the three independent variables contained two levels, the design involved eight cells. The subjects were blocked according to sex and male subjects were randomly assigned to one of the four cells corresponding to male clients while female subjects were randomly assigned to one of the four cells corresponding to female clients.

Because a total of eleven dependent variables were of interest, multivariate analyses of variance rather than simple analyses of
variance procedures were used to minimize the potential of Type I error. One multivariate analysis was used to examine the effects of counselor response, counselor sex, and client sex on client perceptions of counselor expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. A second multivariate analysis was used to examine the effects of the independent variables on the eight structural categories of client responses to the counselors. Significant main and interaction effects indicated by the multivariate analyses were examined further using univariate analyses of variance procedures.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The multivariate analysis of variance procedures provided an analysis of the overall relationship of the independent variables to the dependent variables. The independent variables were: counselor self-disclosure versus counselor self-involving responses, counselor sex, and client sex. Multivariate analyses were conducted on two sets of dependent measures: (a) subject perceptions of counselor and (b) content of subject written responses. The perceptions of the counselors were analyzed according to three dimensions: 1) expertness; 2) attractiveness; and 3) trustworthiness. Content of the written responses was analyzed along eight dimensions: 1) number of words; 2) proportion of affective words; 3) proportion of present tense verbs; 4) proportion of past tense and future tense verbs; 5) proportion of client referents; 6) proportion of counselor referents; 7) number of questions; 8) number of "other" sentences. Post hoc univariate analysis of variance procedures were conducted to examine the factors contributions to significant multivariate effects.

Perceptions of Counselor

Results of the analysis of variance procedures utilized for the dependent variables of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness are presented in Table 3. The means and standard deviations for perceived counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness across
Table 3
Multivariate Analysis of Variance
of Perceived Counselor Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Expertness</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Multivariate Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Sex (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235.21</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>333.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Sex (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Response (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1099.22</td>
<td>7.27**</td>
<td>800.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124.04</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>56.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116.02</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>235.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>24.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>138.80</td>
<td>86.61</td>
<td>97.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 120

*p < .05

**p < .01
the three independent variables of counselor response, counselor sex, and client sex are presented in Table 4.

The results of the multivariate analysis indicated a significant main effect for counselor response type, $F(3, 110) = 3.43, p < .05$, but no other significant main or interaction effects. The univariate analyses of perceived counselor attributes as a function of counselor responses indicated statistically significant differences on all three counselor attributes. As shown in Table 4, self-involving counselors were rated as significantly more expert ($F(1, 112) = 7.27, p < .01$), significantly more attractive ($F(1, 112) = 9.25, p < .01$), and significantly more trustworthy ($F(1, 112) = 4.34, p < .05$) than were the self-disclosing counselors. The ratings of both the self-disclosing and self-involving counselors were greater than the mean range of 55-60 found in previous studies of perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Dell, 1977). However, means for the self-involving counselors indicated that they were viewed as very expert (mean = 69), very attractive (mean = 68), and very trustworthy (mean = 70). In contrast, the self-disclosing counselors were rated less expert (mean = 63), less attractive (mean = 63), and less trustworthy (mean = 67).

Content of Written Responses

To analyze the differences in subjects' responses to counselors' self-disclosing or self-involving statements, the means for each response category were derived from a total of the subjects' ten responses for that category. Due to the large amount of data generated, results of the analysis of variance procedures utilized for the eight dependent measures are presented in two tables. The means and standard
Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Counselor Attributes as a Function of Counselor Self-Disclosure versus Self-Involving Responses, Counselor Sex, and Client Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group a</th>
<th>Counselor Attributes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group b</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Involving (SI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Expertness M</th>
<th>Expertness SD</th>
<th>Attractiveness M</th>
<th>Attractiveness SD</th>
<th>Trustworthiness M</th>
<th>Trustworthiness SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (con't.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Expertness</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a_n = 15 \) for each Group.

\( b_n = 60 \) for each Total Group.
deviations for the eight dependent measures are also presented in two tables. Results of the analysis of variance procedures utilized for the four dependent measures of length of responses, the number of "question" or "other" sentences, and the proportion of affective words to total words are presented in Table 5. The means and standard deviations for the four dependent measures are presented in Table 6. While the proportion of affective words to total words, rather than the total number of affective words, determine the significance of the group differences, these proportions were converted to absolute numbers in order to facilitate interpretation and meaningfulness of the results.

Multivariate main effects were statistically significant for counselor self-disclosure versus counselor self-involving responses, $F(8, 105) = 6.94, p < .001$, and was nonsignificant for counselor sex, $F(8, 105) = 1.87, p < .07$ and client sex, $F(8, 105) = 1.88, p < .07$. The subsequent univariate analyses of variance indicated statistically significant differences between subject groups in the counselor self-disclosure condition versus subject groups in the counselor self-involving condition in length of subjects' responses and in number of questions asked of the counselor. Across all counselor-client gender pairings, responses to the self-disclosing counselors were significantly longer, $F(1, 112) = 6.37, p < .01$; responses to the self-disclosing counselors involved an average of 211 words, while responses to the self-involving counselors involved an average of 182 words. Responses to the self-disclosing counselors contained a significantly greater number of responses in the form of questions, $F(1, 112) = 7.91, p < .01$; of the 10 responses to the self-disclosing counselors an average of 2 contained questions, while of the 10 responses to the self-disclosing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Words</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Other Total Words</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Sex (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5373.36</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Sex (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30496.28</td>
<td>7.94***</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.55*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Response (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24452.96</td>
<td>6.37***</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4650.06</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>190.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3360.20</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (con't.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Multivariate Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3255.21</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>112.13</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3840.21</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 120

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001
Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations of Length and Type of Responses and Proportion of Affective Words as a Function of Counselor Self-Disclosure versus Self-Involving Responses, Counselor Sex, and Client Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Words M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Number of Questions M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Number of Others M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Proportion of Affective Words to Total Words M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>230.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>212.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>207.1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>210.8</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Involving (SI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>186.6</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>182.2</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (con't.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Words M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Number of Questions M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Number of Others M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Proportion of Affective Words to Total Words M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>212.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>186.6</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>189.8</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>230.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>207.1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>203.2</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (con't.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Words M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Number of Questions M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Number of Others M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Proportion of Affective Words to Total Words M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>207.1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>180.6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>212.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>230.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>186.6</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>212.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The means for each category represent an average total over 10 written responses per subject.

\(a_n = 15\) for each Group.

\(b_n = 60\) for each Total Group.
counselors, one was a question. There were no significant differences between subjects' responses to the self-disclosing versus the self-involving counselors in proportion of "other" sentences or in proportionate use of affective words.

Univariate analyses indicated significant differences in the number of "other" sentences used in subject responses as a function of counselor sex. As shown in Table 5, responses to female counselors contained a significantly larger number of "other" sentences than did subjects' responses to male counselors \((F (1,112) = 7.02, p < .01)\). Responses to the female counselors contained an average of 17 "other" sentences over 10 responses; and responses to male counselors contained an average of 14 "other" sentences over 10 responses. There were no significant differences in the proportion of affective words, length of responses, or number of questions in subject responses to male versus female counselors.

Univariate analyses indicated significant differences in both the length of responses and number of "other" sentences as a function of client sex. Female subjects' responses were significantly longer, \(F (1,112) = 7.94, p < .01\), than were male subjects' responses. As shown in Table 6, female subjects used an average of 212 words over 10 responses, while male subjects used an average of 190 words over 10 responses. In addition, female subjects' responses contained a significantly larger number of "other" sentences \((F (1,112) = 4.55, p < .05)\); female subjects' responses contained an average of 16 "other" sentences over 10 responses, while male subjects' responses included an average of 14 "other" sentences over 10 responses. There were no significant differences
between male and female subjects' responses in proportion of affective words or in number of questions asked of the counselors.

There were no statistically significant interactions between any of the three independent variables of counselor response, counselor sex, and client sex for the dependent variables of length of responses, number of "question" or "other" sentences, and proportion of affective words to total words.

Table 7 presents the results of the multivariate and univariate analyses of variance of the proportions of present tense verbs to total verbs, the proportion of past and future tense verbs to total verbs, and the proportions of counselor and client referents to total words. Means and standard deviations of each variable within the eight experimental groups are shown in Table 8.

A statistically significant main effect was found for type of counselor response \( F(8,105) = 6.94, p < .001 \), but the analysis indicated no other statistically significant main or interaction effects. For counselor response, the proportion of past and future tense verbs utilized in response to the self-disclosing counselors was significantly greater than was the proportion used by subjects in response to the self-involving counselors \( F(1,112) = 7.87, p < .01 \). Sixteen percent of the verbs used in responses to the self-disclosing counselors were either past tense or future tense verbs (8 verbs over 10 responses), while 12% of the verbs used in responses to the self-involving counselors were past or future tense verbs (5 verbs over 10 responses).

As shown in Table 8, most verb usage was of present tense verbs; eighty percent of the verbs used in response to the self-disclosing
Table 7
Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Proportion of Present Tense Verbs, Past and Future Tense Verbs, and Counselor and Client Referents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Present Tense to Total Verbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Past/Future Tense to Total Verbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Client to Total Referents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>7.87*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>7.65*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Counselor to Total Referents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (con't.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  \( N = 120 \)

*\( p < .01 \)

**\( p < .001 \)
Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of Proportion of Present Tense Verbs, Past and Future Tense Verbs, and Counselor and Client Referents as a Function of Counselor Self-Disclosure versus Self-Involving Responses, Counselor Sex, and Client Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Proportion Present to Total Verbs</th>
<th>Proportion Past/Future to Total Verbs</th>
<th>Proportion Client to Total Referents</th>
<th>Proportion Counselor to Total Referents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong>^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Group</strong>^b</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Proportion Present to Total Verbs</td>
<td>Proportion Past/Future to Total Verbs</td>
<td>Proportion Client to Total Referents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Involving (SI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (con't.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Proportion Present to Total Verbs</th>
<th>Proportion Past/Future to Total Verbs</th>
<th>Proportion Client to Total Referents</th>
<th>Proportion Counselor to Total Referents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SD)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Male Client (SI)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SD)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor-Female Client (SI)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The means for each category represent an average total over 10 written responses per subject.

\( ^a_n = 15 \) for each Group.

\( ^b_n = 60 \) for each Total Group.
counselors were in the present tense (about 4 verbs per response), while 80% of the verbs used in response to the self-involving counselors were in the present tense (about 4 verbs per response). There were no significant differences in the proportions of present tense verbs utilized in response to the self-disclosing versus the self-involving counselors.

With regard to proportionate use of counselor and client referents, the univariate analyses indicated significant differences in the use of client referents as a function of counselor response ($F (1,112) = 7.65, p < .01$) but no significant differences in proportionate use of counselor referents. The proportion of client referents utilized in response to the self-involving counselors (27 client referents out of 182 words) was significantly greater than was the proportion utilized in response to the self-disclosing counselors (27 referents out of 211 words).
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine the extent to which the utilization of counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses across different counselor-client gender pairings has differential effects on client perceptions of the counselor and on client verbal behaviors. The fact that previous research on counselor use of self-disclosure has yielded equivocal results may at least in part be attributed to the failure of researchers to differentiate self-disclosure from other types of counselor self-referent responses, in particular, self-involving responses. Consequently, the present study involved explicit definition and differentiation of two types of counselor self-referent responses postulated to have different effects on the counseling process.

The type of counselor self-referent responses used in the present study were positive counselor self-disclosure and positive self-involving responses. Positive counselor self-disclosure responses are counselor statements of personal experiences that are similar to the client's experiences. Positive counselor self-involving responses are counselor statements of positive feelings about the client and about client behavior.

While several studies have suggested that different counselor-client gender pairings may differentially affect client behaviors and perceptions of the counselor, the exact nature of these differences
is not known. Therefore, the present study examined how the use of counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses by male and female counselors differentially affects male and female client responses to and perceptions of the counselor.

The design of the study involved the presentation of counseling interview stimulus materials containing self-disclosure or self-involving responses by either male or female counselors to male and female subjects who were then asked to write hypothetical client responses and to rate the counselors on the variables of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The structural components of the written responses were assessed by a content analysis conducted by three independent raters who assessed: 1) number of words; 2) number of affective words; 3) number of present tense verbs; 4) number of past and future tense verbs; 5) number of client referents; 6) number of counselor referents; 7) number of questions; and 8) number of "other" responses. The counselor variables were measured by The Counselor Rating Form (Barak and LaCrosse, 1975), a questionnaire that assesses client perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.

Across all counselor-client gender pairings, self-involving counselors were perceived as significantly more expert, attractive, and trustworthy than were self-disclosing counselors. There were no significant interaction effects between the independent variables of counselor response, counselor sex, and client sex and no significant main effects due to counselor sex or client sex on client
perceptions of the counselor. The findings that self-involving counselors were perceived as more expert, more attractive, and more trustworthy than self-disclosing counselors were in accordance with the hypotheses of the study.

The findings of the present study that self-involving counselors were rated as significantly more expert and trustworthy than were self-disclosing counselors are in agreement with those of a study by McCarthy and Betz (1978). And while self-involving counselors were also rated as somewhat more attractive in the earlier study, the difference was nonsignificant in contrast to the significant differences in attractiveness found in the present study.

Self-involving counselors, demonstrating a greater willingness to risk their own personal feelings than self-disclosing counselors, may enhance their perceived trustworthiness. Their self-involving responses may also act as a positive reinforcement, providing positive feelings toward the client. These positive statements from the counselors could increase client liking which would tend to enhance counselor attractiveness. Clore (1975) stated that attraction is based on a subject's affective experience with the stimulus person and not on his information about the stimulus person. Self-involving responses may provide that affective experience and thus enhance counselor attractiveness.

Further, self-disclosing counselors may turn the conversation onto themselves instead of exploring the clients' problems. The clients may perceive a lack of concern which could decrease liking for the counselors, thus decreasing their attractiveness. Self-disclosure of a "me-too" nature may not be seen as a risk-taking
response by the clients. The counselors are revealing information similar to what the clients have already revealed; the clients take the first risk while the counselors follow their lead. It is also possible that the self-disclosure is not always believed by the clients. Some research suggests that too frequent self-disclosure by a counselor causes him/her to be perceived as phony (Murphy and Strong, 1972). Both the counselors’ failure to initiate risk-taking behavior and their perceptions by the clients as being phony could decrease their perceived trustworthiness.

Previous research has indicated that counselor use of self-disclosure responses may detract from his/her expertness; counselor self-disclosure of problems may lead to client perceptions of the counselors as less mentally healthy or as violating their "professional role", and decrease client perceptions of counselor expertness. In contrast to counselor self-disclosure, counselor self-involving responses provide challenging feedback to the clients through direct expression of counselor feelings toward the clients. The self-involving responses are reactive to the client and may enhance, rather than detract from perceived counselor expertness.

Several findings of the present study were in accordance with the hypothesized differences in client responses to the self-disclosing versus the self-involving counselors. Across all counselor-client gender pairings, counselor self-involving responses elicited a significantly greater proportion of client referents to total words in client responses, while counselor disclosure responses elicited client responses that contained significantly larger proportions of
past tense and future tense verbs and more responses in the form of questions directed to the counselors. There were no significant main effects due to counselor sex or client sex and no significant interactions between counselor sex, client sex, and counselor response on the proportions of client referents, past and future tense verbs, and number of questions. Client responses to the self-involving counselors were thus more focused on the clients and their concerns while client responses to the self-disclosing counselors were less often focused on the here-and-now of the concerns and were more likely to place the focus of the conversation on the counselor.

Because counselor self-involving responses are direct statements of counselor feelings toward the client in the immediate moment, they may encourage more client exploration, while counselor self-disclosure responses which reveal information about the counselor may tend to encourage the client to explore the counselor's concern. In contrast, counselor self-disclosure responses are not direct challenges to the client to react in the immediate moment; therefore, they may be more likely to elicit client responses that focus on the past or future.

Several other hypotheses were not supported by the findings of the present study. Across all counselor-client gender pairings, there were no significant differences in the proportions of affective words to total words; the proportions of present tense verbs to total verbs; the proportions of counselor referents to total words; and the number of "other" sentences, i.e., sentences that
are not questions directed to the counselor, in client responses to self-disclosing versus self-involving counselors. The finding that counselor self-disclosure responses, across all gender pairings, elicited a significantly greater number of words in client responses than did counselor self-involving responses was in the opposite direction of the hypothesized differences.

The main effects due to counselor sex and client sex were non-significant. However, individual analyses indicated that female self-disclosing and self-involving counselors elicited a significantly greater number of "other" sentences, i.e., sentences that are not questions directed to the counselor, in subjects' responses than did male counselors. Female subjects' responses to male and female self-disclosing and self-involving counselors were significantly longer than were male subjects' responses and contained significantly larger numbers of "other" sentences than did male subjects' responses. These results suggest the possibility that female clients might be more likely to engage in greater amounts of self-disclosure than would male clients and that female counselors might elicit more responses that are client-focused rather than counselor-focused than would male counselors. However, these findings of possible sex differences should be interpreted cautiously, because the multivariate analysis of these variables only approached significance.

While findings in the McCarthy and Betz (1978) study and the present study regarding perceptions of the counselors were very similar, some differences were found in the type of client responses elicited. Both the present study and that by McCarthy and Betz
indicated that responses to self-involving counselors contained significantly greater proportions of client referents, while responses to self-disclosing counselors contained a greater number of counselor-directed questions. However, the present findings that counselor self-disclosure responses elicited significantly longer client responses that contained a greater proportion of past and future tense verbs than did counselor self-involving responses were not evident in the earlier study; and the findings of McCarthy and Betz that responses to self-disclosing counselors contained a significantly greater proportion of counselor referents, while client responses to self-involving counselors contained significantly more present tense verbs and "other" responses, were not indicated by the results presented herein.

The findings in the McCarthy and Betz study that a self-involving counselor was perceived as more expert and trustworthy and tended to be viewed as more attractive than a self-disclosing counselor are stronger and more generalizable due to their replication in the present study. Their generalizability is also increased because the number of independent variables examined herein was greater than in the earlier study. The findings in the present study concerning client responses that are in accordance with those of the McCarthy and Betz study are also more generalizable. However, the findings of the earlier study that were not replicated in the present study are in need of further assessment to clarify their relationship to self-disclosure and self-involving counselor statements.

While some of the hypothesized differences between counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses supported by the results
of the McCarthy and Betz study were not borne out by the results of the present study, it is apparent that self-disclosure and self-involving responses are distinct responses which do have differential effects. Furthermore, the results of this study indicate that in terms of differential client perceptions of the counselor and differential client verbal responses to the counselor, the type of responses the counselor makes to the client are more influential than is either client sex or counselor sex.

In summary, one major implication of this study is that counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses appear to be distinctly different responses that have differential effects on the counseling process and, further, that these differential effects are relatively consistent regardless of the sex of the counselor or client or the counselor-client gender pairing.

The importance of these differential effects is indicated by their differential implications for the counseling process. For example, when a counselor discloses himself/herself, he/she may arouse the client's curiosity or concern or the counselor may be providing the client an opportunity to avoid threat of discussing his/her concerns by questioning the counselor. A role reversal can take place with the counselor discussing his/her problem while the client listens. Counselor self-disclosure may also encourage premature closure on client exploration of a problem. A response by the counselor that reveals a similar concern may not stimulate the client to elaborate on his/her problems. Rather, the client might jump to a quick solution by asking the counselor how he/she solved his/her problem.
Counselor self-involving responses may be more likely to facilitate client exploration in the present and to maintain the focus of counseling on the client rather than the counselor. Because counselor self-involving responses are present tense immediate statements of counselor feelings about client behavior, the client and his/her behavior remain the focus of the conversation. Client responses are "I" statements in the present to answer the counselor's challenge. This client self-exploration could perhaps be better facilitated by counselor use of self-involving as opposed to self-disclosure responses because the counselor would be providing direct feedback to the client. Counselor self-disclosure, on the other hand, could inhibit client exploration by shifting the focus to the counselor.

Counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses also affect client perceptions of a counselor's expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. These perceptions have important implications for the counseling process (LaCrosse and Barak, 1976). The results of the present study suggest that perceptions of a counselor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy are facilitated by self-involving responses.

A second major implication of the present study is that counselor-client gender pairings may not have differential effects on client responses to and perceptions of self-disclosing and self-involving counselors. The variables of counselor sex and client sex were not related to client perceptions of the counselors and only tended to affect client responses to the counselors. There were no significant
interaction effects between these variables and the independent variable of counselor response on either client perceptions of the counselors or on client responses.

Self-disclosure and self-involving responses may be powerful enough counselor behaviors that both male and female clients focus on the counselor's behavior rather than on the counselor's sex (Hoffman-Graff, 1977; Hoffman and Spencer, 1977); gender pairings do not seem to moderate the effects of counselor self-referent responses. Any conclusions regarding the effects of sex differences in counseling process must be supported by additional research to determine the types of situations in which males and females would or would not differ in their behaviors (Cozby, 1973).

While the results of this study thus have several potentially significant implications for the practice of counseling, several considerations suggest caution in making premature conclusions. Some aspects of the design of the study lead to limitations in the generalizability of the results. The study was a counseling analogue that examined one type of counselor-client dyad, professional counselors with undergraduate clients. More research with different types of counselor-client dyads such as dyads containing counselors with different levels of training from professional to paraprofessional and different client populations would increase the generalizability of the findings. The use of real counseling situations is desirable, but a counseling analogue may be quite similar to a real situation. Bundza and Simonson (1973) hypothesized that factors facilitating self-disclosure are relevant in many if not all dyadic exchanges. The same may be possible for self-involving responses.
Another limit to the generalizability of the findings was the use of written hypothetical client responses as a dependent measure. Gormally and Hill (1974) indicated that counselor written responses lack generalization to real situations because written and verbal counselor responses are not always highly correlated. It is possible that client written and verbal responses would not be highly correlated either, especially when done by non-client samples. Therefore, additional research using verbal responses is necessary.

The present study emphasized the structural qualities of counselor and client responses rather than their therapeutic quality. While certain inferences regarding the relationship between structural qualities and therapeutic effectiveness are possible, additional assessments of the therapeutic effects of counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses on client responses are necessary.

One further limitation to the generalizability of the findings is that the study examined one specific type of counselor self-disclosure and self-involving responses, i.e., positive self-disclosure in which the counselor revealed a similar experience after the client had self-disclosed; and positive self-involving responses that indicated positive counselor feelings about client behavior. Other types of self-disclosure responses in need of further study include those in which a counselor talks about his/her experiences prior to client disclosures of such experiences
and negative self-disclosure in which a counselor relates experiences that are dissimilar to the client's disclosures. Other types of self-involving responses include those that express counselor feelings about the client rather than the client's behavior, e.g., "I like you", and negative self-involving responses in which a counselor shares negative feelings about the client, e.g., "I'm frustrated with you right now". These types of responses also need to be studied for their possible differential effects on the counseling process to determine whether the differences are due to the timing of the responses, the focus, or the direction (i.e., positive or negative) of the self-disclosure and self-involving responses. In particular, the effects of negative self-disclosure and self-involving responses are in need of investigation.

In conclusion, previous studies have primarily investigated self-disclosure responses. The present study suggests that self-disclosure and self-involving responses must be carefully and precisely defined in further studies of their differential effects on counseling process and outcome. Further studies examining the effects of specifically and carefully defined counselor responses on specific client behaviors should assist in the clarification of past research results as well as provide a more coherent basis for future research. And finally, greater understanding of the effects of specific counselor self-referent responses and clarification of the extent to which counselor-client gender pairings
moderate these effects, will hopefully lead to more knowledgeable and effective utilization of such responses in actual counseling situations.
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APPENDIX A

Transcript of Simulated Interview Using
Counselor Self-Disclosure or
Counselor Self-Involving Responses

Segment #1:

Co: Hello, Joan/John. Tell me what is bothering you.

Cl: Well, I don't know exactly. I just seem to be tired, irritable.

Co: What do you mean by tired and irritable?

Cl: You know, tired, not up for doing anything. I seem to mope around a lot.

Co: What do you mean you mope around?

Cl: Well, I mostly drink and watch T.V. I just hate myself when I do that. I hate to watch T.V. when I'd really like to be doing something else.

Co: You hate yourself when you're not doing what you want to do?

Cl: Right.

Co: What would you like to do?

Cl: I'd really like to get out of here. Sort of start all over again. A lot of times I feel as though I've missed the boat somewhere along the line.

Co: You really don't like it here.

Cl: Yeah. I want to be someone else. Someone at peace with themselves. I want a sort of quiet approach to life. Away from all this noise and hassle. I'm all closed-in.

Co: Tell me, when you start to feel closed-in with everything, what do you do to get yourself back together?

Cl: I don't know, just listen to records or something. I like to walk in the woods. You know, get away from all of the crowds.
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Co: You like to be alone with yourself.

Cl: Right. I really get off on just separating myself from the whole mess. Just getting away from everybody.

Co: You just said you like to be alone; you've also said that you usually drink and waste your time when you're alone.

Cl: No, I like to be alone. I just drink when I'm not doing what I want to do.

Co: What stops you from doing what you want to do?

Cl: I'm not sure; that's why I'm coming to you. I want to get some insight into what is stopping me.

Co: It seems that you're pretty irritated with how you stop yourself.

Cl: Yeah! I really get mad at myself. I get angry and then nervous and then start chain-smoking. Look at all of these cigarette butts! I hate it when I have no self-control.

Co: When you feel frustrated you sort of attack yourself.

Cl: Yeah. I think about all the things I don't like about myself.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: I do that too, at times, get down on myself.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: Well, I like the good things I've seen about you.

"Write your response now."

Segment #2:

Co: What were you like as a child?

Cl: I drove em crazy when I was a kid. I think I liked doing that. Sort of gave me some power over them.

Co: Who do you mean by them?

Cl: My parents. They are both dead now. They died or rather my father died last year. He died of stomach cancer. It was horrible, seeing him just lie there in so much pain. There wasn't anything we could do for him.

Co: It seems to have affected you greatly.
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Cl: The pain of watching him and hearing him was hard, but I don't have much feeling for him as a person, or as a parent.

Co: You didn't care for him very much.

Cl: Right. He didn't care about me. Never a kind word. Always on me for something or other. But I feel sort of sad about my mother. We were never as close as I wanted it. We never really talked. In fact, I never really talked to either one of them.

Co: You seem to feel cheated by them.

Cl: I do. I really do. They never put much effort into bringing me up. I sort of did it all myself.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: I remember having to struggle alone when I was growing up.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: I'm glad to see that you made it.

"Write your response now."

Segment #3:

Co: What would you say is the central thing that is bothering you?

Cl: Well, I think the real problem--if there is even one real problem--is that I don't have any discipline in my life.

Co: What does being disciplined mean to you?

Cl: I'm not sure, somehow it's all tied-up in getting things done. I seem to need to get a certain number of things done or think I've made progress or else I don't feel as though I'm worth anything.

Co: When you don't do anything you feel worthless.

Cl: Right. I must have something produced, something to show.

Co: Who do you need to show something to?

Cl: Well, let me think about that one for a minute...I don't know of anyone.

Co: You don't have anyone to show what you've done.

Cl: No, I can't think of anyone but I know I have to prove myself to others.
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Co: What are you trying to prove?

Cl: That I'm grown-up. If they saw how I really feel they'd think I was a spoiled little child.

Co: Who are you?

Cl: On one hand I'm a little kid, but sometimes I feel very strong.

Co: You feel powerful.

Cl: Yes, and I hate myself for not letting it out.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: I'd feel that way, too, if I thought I was hiding my feelings.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: I'm confident that you have more control over yourself than that.

"Write your response now."

Segment #4:

Co: When you were a child, when did you feel most loved?

Cl: I remember my parents really being happy with me when I made the honor roll for the first time in high school. And when I was accepted to college. When I was younger, my mother always made a big deal about how smart I was and how proud she was of me.

Co: Sounds as though you had to do something to get your love from your parents. You had to earn their love.

Cl: Yeah, I think that was how things worked around our house.

Co: How about now?

Cl: I do seem to set myself up for earning my own love. I guess I sort of gather friends that way. I'm always getting these friends who act like parents to me.

Co: It sounds as though you're gathering shoulders to cry on.

Cl: Yeah. I don't want parents or caretakers for friends. I want people who are open and honest. People who are leading meaningful lives. I don't want to use my friends.
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* Tape 1-4 Co SD: Well, I wouldn't want to do that, either.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: I'm pleased to hear you say that.

"Write your response now."

Segment #5:

Co: What happens when you meet someone who is open and honest?

Cl: Well, I drive them away.

Co: How do you drive them away?

Cl: By acting the way I do. By drinking too much and watching T.V. and generally being a slob.

Co: So you're a slob to stop people from being nice to you.

Cl: Yeah. I stay the way I am to keep people from getting close.

Co: Sort of like you're afraid to let them know you.

Cl: Yeah, I'm afraid to be real with people.

Co: Afraid of what?

Cl: Afraid that they won't like me or reject me especially if I'm not always nice to them, saying things to please them.

Co: Nice means not making others uncomfortable.

Cl: No, I guess I tend to filter a lot of stuff. I stop being honest when I become uncomfortable or when I can fantasize some sort of result from what I'd say that would put me one down.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: Sometimes I find myself doing the same thing.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: You're working hard to explain this right now and I'm feeling good about that.

"Write your response now."

Segment #6:

Co: How do you feel when someone has control over you?

Cl: Hemmed-in, sort of watched over.

Co: When someone is in control of you, you feel trapped by them.
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Cl: Right, it's like I'm a kid again, being watched over by my parents.

Co: And you don't like being treated like a child.

Cl: Right. I don't want them to tell me what to do...but I don't want to control them either.

Co: You're afraid of being dominated by others and you are afraid of dominating them.

Cl: Yeah, that fits.

Co: What does it mean to have control over others?

Cl: If I have control over someone I'm responsible for what they do.

Co: And you don't want to be responsible for their actions.

Cl: Yeah. It's pretty ridiculous to think I could control anyone.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: I don't think I could, either.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: I feel glad about you realizing that.

"Write your response now."

Segment #?

Co: How do you feel about talking about yourself?

Cl: I'm comfortable when I talk or think about my relations with people, but I don't like talking about myself.

Co: You feel uncomfortable when the subject of conversation is you.

Cl: Yeah, I really don't like to talk about myself. It's like dealing with quicksand. I can never seem to be still long enough to carefully analyze my feelings toward myself.

Co: You seem to be afraid of looking at yourself.

Cl: Yeah, but I don't understand what I'm afraid of. I'm nothing to be afraid of.

Co: You're nothing to be afraid of?

Cl: That's right. I guess it's not so much that there isn't anything to be afraid of, but that I'm afraid that there isn't anything there to be afraid of.
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Co: What do you mean?

Cl: I'm saying I'm not sure there is anything to me.

Co: You don't know who you are.

Cl: Right, I just seem to be whatever people want me to be. I don't seem to exist.

Co: You're just an empty shell... You're feeling pretty sad now.

Cl: Yeah. That's such a bummer.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: I feel sad when I'm in that place, too.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: I'm feeling sad for you right now.

"Write your response now."

Segment #8:

Co: What is happening to you?

Cl: I guess I'm running away, running from my nothingness.

Co: You keep yourself closed in from other people because you're afraid there isn't anything to you?

Cl: Yes, and when I run away from people and have to count on myself, I get bored and depressed.

Co: What do you do when you feel that way?

Cl: That's when I drink and watch T.V. and shut myself up in my room.

Co: You hide away from everyone. You don't get things done.

Cl: Plus I get moody and make life miserable for anyone that comes around me.

Co: What do you mean, moody?

Cl: Well, very bored with myself. I feel so dull and uninteresting--like I have nothing to offer anyone. And I get so tired of doing nothing.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: When I'm not doing much of anything, I usually feel bored with myself, too.
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* Tape 5-8 Co SI: I'm concerned about you because you feel like you have nothing to offer.

"Write your response now."

Segment #9:

Co: What do you want to do?

Cl: Anything! I always have to have something to do or I go nuts. I always have to be involved with something or else I waste time. Besides, I'm afraid I'll miss something important.

Co: And whenever you are doing something, you, by necessity, miss something else.

Cl: Yeah, and then I don't enjoy what I'm doing in the first place.

Co: Why is that?

Cl: Because I think about what I'm missing, and what I'm missing is better than what I'm doing.

Co: You're never into what is happening right now.

Cl: Right. I'm always somewhere else.

Co: You're not into the present in your life.

Cl: I guess not. I never think about how I'm feeling or what I'm doing at a particular moment.

Co: Tell me more about that.

Cl: I'm always looking ahead to what I'm going to do next or re-running in my head what I've already done. Maybe that's why I get confused a lot.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: When I get caught up in the future or the past I know that I feel confused, too.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: I'm really happy you see that.

"Write your response now."

Segment #10:

Co: How do you keep yourself confused?

Cl: I never pay attention to myself. I always say, "I'll think about how I feel later."
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Co: You put-off being aware of how you are at any one time.

Cl: Yeah. Because if it's a bad situation, then I don't want to lose control of myself.

Co: What's a bad situation?

Cl: Like if I'm around someone I'd like to get to know and I'm nervous, I just don't think about what's happening.

Co: What do you do?

Cl: I clam-up. I don't say anything unless they ask me a question. I look away like I'm done talking to them.

Co: It sounds like you close yourself-up.

Cl: Yeah, I guess that's how it would seem; I'd come off like I was better than everyone else.

Co: How do you think the other person feels when you come across that way?

Cl: Hm... Probably a little hurt, or at least like giving-up on trying to get to know me. Maybe I'm turning people off that way.

* Tape 1-4 Co SD: Sometimes I turn people off that way, too.

* Tape 5-8 Co SI: I appreciate it that you aren't turning me off.

"Write your response now."

* Tape 1-4--Co SD are counselor self-disclosing responses;

* Tape 5-8--Co SI are counselor self-involving responses.
APPENDIX B

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 heard on each end of the scales. Please rate the counselor as you believe the client on the tape would rate the counselor.

If the client feels 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 the client thinks that one end of the scale quite closely describes the counselor, then check the scale as follows:

rough ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ smooth

OR

rough ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ smooth

If the client feels that one end of the scale only slightly describes the counselor, then make your check mark as follows:

active ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ passive

OR

active ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ passive

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

hard ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ soft

Your first impression is the best answer.

PLEASE NOTE: PLACE CHECK MARKS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SPACES

Copyright c, M.B. LaCrosse, and A. Barak, 1974, 1975. Not to be reproduced without permission.
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agreeable __:__:__:__:__:__:__ disagreeable
unalert __:__:__:__:__:__:__ alert
analytic __:__:__:__:__:__:__ diffuse
unappreciative __:__:__:__:__:__:__ appreciative
attractive __:__:__:__:__:__:__ unattractive
casual __:__:__:__:__:__:__ formal
cheerful __:__:__:__:__:__:__ depressed
vague __:__:__:__:__:__:__ clear
distant __:__:__:__:__:__:__ close
compatible __:__:__:__:__:__:__ incompatible
unsure __:__:__:__:__:__:__ confident
suspicious __:__:__:__:__:__:__ believable
undependable __:__:__:__:__:__:__ dependable
indifferent __:__:__:__:__:__:__ enthusiastic
inexperienced __:__:__:__:__:__:__ experienced
inexpert __:__:__:__:__:__:__ expert
unfriendly __:__:__:__:__:__:__ friendly
honest __:__:__:__:__:__:__ dishonest
informed __:__:__:__:__:__:__ ignorant
insightful __:__:__:__:__:__:__ insightless
stupid __:__:__:__:__:__:__ intelligent
unlikeable __:__:__:__:__:__:__ likeable
logical __:__:__:__:__:__:__ illogical
open __:__:__:__:__:__:__ closed
prepared __:__:__:__:__:__:__ unprepared
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unreliable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ reliable
disrespectful ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ respectful
irresponsible ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ responsible
selfless ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ selfish
sincere ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ insincere
skillful ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ unskillful
sociable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ unsociable
decitful ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ straightforward
trustworthy ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ untrustworthy
genuine ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ phony
warm ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____ cold

As with all of the information obtained in this experiment, the contents of this questionnaire are strictly confidential.
APPENDIX C

Procedures for Content Analysis
of Client Responses

I. Number of Words:

1. Count every word.
2. A hyphenated word counts as one word.
3. Contractions of two words count as two words.
4. Count only words that are there—do not count omitted words.

II. Number of Affective Words:

1. They are one-word direct statements of feelings. They are usually adjectives.
2. Count every affective word as long as it describes a person's state of feeling, sensation, awareness.
3. Usually if, "I feel..." can be written in front of the word, then it is affective.
4. Concern, care, alone, hate, love are affective words.
5. Words such as honest, responsible, good, and bad are only rated as affective words if "I feel..." precedes them.

III. Number of Verbs:

1. Count all verbs, verb phrases (1 verb), and gerunds (e.g., to be, in going, being, etc.).
2. Helping verbs are part of a verb phrase and count as one verb, e.g., in going, had done, would have felt.
3. Present tense verbs are action now; at the present time; a habitual action (begun in the past but still happening); to express a general truth.
4. Past tense verbs are action in the past that did not continue into the present.
5. Future tense verbs are action in the future. They always include "shall" or "will"; also "am going to" and "am about to".
6. Gerunds should be rated the same tense as the tense of the predicate in the sentence, e.g., "I want to know." = 2 verbs, both present tense.
7. "Can do" is a present tense verb; "may do" is a future tense verb.
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IV. Referents: Personal Pronouns

1. Client referents--I, me, mine, my, myself.
2. Counselor referents--you, your, you're, (only if referring to the counselor).
3. Count every pronoun of these types.
4. "Own" is not a client referent.

V. Question/Other:

1. First decide how many complete sentences there are. Use the subjects' punctuation as a guide, e.g., 2 periods = 2 sentences (even if they are sentence fragments). If punctuation is omitted, then count only complete sentences.
2. Rate each individual sentence as either "question" or "other".
3. Questions are client responses that seek information about the counselor. They are asking the counselor to talk more about himself/herself, his/her ideas, feelings, etc. They may not be grammatical questions, e.g., "Tell me more about that." would be considered a question.
4. All sentences that are not counselor-directed questions, rate as "other".
5. One response may contain both types of sentences.

VI. Some General Rules:

1. Read through a response first to get an understanding of it.
2. When counting verbs, circle them in pen.
3. Consistency is crucial! Be consistent from subject to subject in how you rate a certain word, sentence, etc.
APPENDIX D

Response Rating Form

Rater Name ________________
Subject Number ____________

Total Responses ____________
Date ______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Affective Words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Present Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Past/Future Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Client Referents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Counselor Referents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Instructions to Subjects

This is an experiment on psychotherapy. In a couple of minutes you will be asked to put on the headphones in front of you. All of the carrels are turned on and ready. You may adjust the volume once the tape is in progress by turning the knob in front of you.

What you will listen to are various segments of a counseling session between an experienced male/female counselor and a male/female client who is a freshman at Ohio State. This is the first counseling session they have had together. The client will be discussing feelings of dissatisfaction with himself/herself, his/her lack of friends, and problems interacting with his/her parents in the various segments of the tape.

There will be ten segments of conversation between the counselor and client. Each segment will be announced, e.g., "Segment #1". The last response you will hear at the end of each segment will be made by the counselor. At the end of each segment you will be asked to write a written response that you believe the client might make at that point. There are no right or wrong answers. Just write the first response that occurs to you. It is important to answer every segment and answer them just as if you were the client (put yourself in his/her place). You will be given one minute to write each response.
Appendix E Continued

The segments of the tape are from different points in the counseling session; one segment will not necessarily follow from the preceding one. But each new segment you hear will be from some progressively later time in the session.

After listening and responding to the entire tape you will be asked to complete a brief questionnaire as you believe the client would. The questionnaire will be handed-out and explained at that time.

You have a packet of papers on your desk. Use each paper in the order in which you find them to write your responses to each segment. Each piece of paper should have the same subject number on it and should be numbered Segments 1 through 10. Turn over each piece of paper after you have made your response.

The experiment will be explained to you in more detail at the end. Do you have any questions?