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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to critically examine the social influence model of counseling and determine to what extent it was applicable to minority populations. The basic premise of the model was not questioned, but it was proposed that Strong's (1968) model needed to address clients' cultural variables in order for it to better explain the social influence process with minorities. This study specifically examined the social influence model in relation to Asian Americans, to determine whether there would be differences in how the establishment of social influence may differ between Asian American and Caucasian American groups.

It was hypothesized that the cultural variables examined in this study (acculturation, cultural mistrust, self-construal) would affect participants' perceptions of counselors and the counseling process. In general, the cultural variables were hypothesized to affect the perceived social influence attributed to the counselor, the perceived credibility of the counselor, and the willingness to self-disclose of the participants. Between-groups differences were hypothesized to exist on all of these variables between Caucasian American and Asian American participants. In addition, it was hypothesized that there would be within-group differences in the Asian American group by acculturation level and cultural mistrust level.
Participants were 284 Caucasian Americans and 172 Asian American university students. All students were enrolled in an introductory psychology class at The Ohio State University. To maintain a homogeneous sample, all the Asian American participants were either citizens or permanent residents of the U.S. All participants were shown a video segment of a counseling session, and were then administered a packet of questionnaires by the principal investigator.

Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance were used to test between-groups and within-group differences. Support was provided to show that cultural background had a significant effect on how participants viewed counselors and the counseling process. In general, Asian Americans rated the counselor from the video segment as having less social influence and credibility, and were less willing to self-disclose than Caucasian Americans. However, minimal support was garnered for the notion that acculturation level and cultural mistrust level are able to differentiate responses in the Asian American group. Few differences were seen between high and low acculturated Asian Americans, and Asian Americans with high and low levels of cultural mistrust.

Multiple linear regression analyses were used to examine the predictive abilities of each of the cultural variables in the study. The most significant predictor of the dependent variables in the study was independent self-construal. This was true for both the Asian Americans and the Caucasian Americans. Cultural mistrust was able to predict some components of social influence in the Asian American group, but acculturation was not a significant predictor for any of the dependent variables in the study.
Results of the study are discussed in terms of the information they provide about cultural differences in the establishment of social influence in counseling situations. Implications of this study’s findings for counselors and other mental health practitioners who may work with minority populations are also presented. Finally, directions for future research are proposed, as well as limitations of the current study that must be addressed by future research.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the social influence model of counseling is introduced. The development of the model is explained, as well as more recent reformulations of the model. This is followed by a discussion of cultural variables that have been found to be relevant to the utilization of mental health services by ethnic minority groups, as well as cultural variables that help explain within-group differences among ethnic minority groups. In addition, it is proposed that these client variables have been for the most part ignored by the social influence model. This chapter concludes with the purpose of the present study and outlines the general hypotheses of the study.

In one form or another, counseling has been an integral part of the human experience. Regardless of the modality that has been used, whether it was shamanism, religious counseling, or psychotherapy proper, human beings have engaged in conversation for the purpose of helping to assuage our ills. Frank (1961) related how many different cultures shared common practices as part of their healing traditions. Because counseling has been such an important factor in the mental health of the world’s
population, and because of the growth of psychology as a social science, researchers began to study the process of counseling in a more in-depth fashion. Soon, theories emerged that attempted to explain how the “talking cure” was used to improve people's mental health.

One of the more significant of these theories was the social influence model of counseling, which was introduced in the late 1960's by Strong (Strong, 1968). This two-stage model attempted to explain the counseling process in terms of cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). The first stage of Strong's theory involved the counselor trying to increase his/her social influence over the client. In the second stage, the counselor would introduce dissonant information to the client and attempt to get the client to reduce his/her cognitive dissonance in a manner prescribed by the counselor (Corrigan et al., 1980). The premise of the model was that a counselor's attempts to change a client's behavior or opinions would create cognitive dissonance in the client. The client would then have various options to implement in order to reduce this dissonance. Of the options available to the client (discrediting the counselor, discrediting the issue, changing the counselor's opinion, seeking others who agree with the client, changing in the direction advocated by the counselor), the counselor would obviously aim for the last of these.

Over the years, certain revisions have been made to modify the social influence model of counseling. These revisions, however, have focused on the second stage of the model, the mechanism by which change occurs during the process of counseling. One of the earlier revisions of the model focused more on social power as an agent of change, and
how that concept resulted in dissonance reduction (Strong & Matross, 1973). The revision incorporated the ideas of impelling and restraining forces which affected the counselor's social power and the client's level of resistance. A later revision focused more on interpersonal influence in relationships and interpersonal interactions (Strong, 1991), and thus addressed earlier criticisms that the model was unidirectional. Now the client was seen as more active in the process and could influence the counselor, just as the counselor could influence the client. This revision to the model included a version of an interpersonal circle by Strong et al. (1988) that was used to examine information that was communicated through interpersonal responses between counselors and clients. Although these revisions were significant in that they reformulated how the change process in counseling may take place, the first stage of the model was unchanged, and remained a key component of the model. Without successfully completing the tasks of the first stage, the change desired in the second stage would be difficult to accomplish.

In the first stage, Strong (1968), extrapolating from research in social psychology, stated that there were three characteristics that a counselor could manipulate in order to increase social influence. These characteristics were the counselor's attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness. A counselor’s credibility was thought to stem from a combination of his/her expertness and trustworthiness. Many studies have been performed since the introduction of the social influence model that have looked at the effects of manipulations on these three characteristics. In fact, the social influence theory of
counseling was shown to be the most researched model in counseling psychology (Wampold & White, 1985). These studies will be reviewed in detail in the following chapter.

There was a lack of research for many years, however, into other variables that may affect the counseling process. The focus had been on the counselors and what they brought into the counseling session. Kiesler (1971) proposed that there was a myth of client uniformity. This meant that in the counseling process, it was assumed that the only factor that mattered was the counselor's manipulations, as all clients were seen to be basically interchangeable. Fretz (1981) discussed the effectiveness of career interventions in terms of an ATI model. ATI was used in the education field as an Aptitude Treatment-Interaction, but in counseling may be thought of better as a client attribute treatment-interaction. Some work was being performed by career counselors in which client attributes were being taken into consideration, and this was a positive step toward maximizing effectiveness. In relation to psychotherapeutic counseling, however, the situation was different.

Heppner and Claiborn (1989) point out that “Before 1981, relatively few studies in the social influence literature examined the effect of client characteristics.” (pg.369). Strong himself states that “... no work has examined what clients contribute.” (Strong et al., 1992). In fact, the social influence model did not really make room for client characteristics. It promoted a homogeneous view of a counseling client that would be influenced by counselor manipulations to increase their attractiveness, trustworthiness, and
expertness. In effect, it was assumed that these manipulations would affect all clients in a similar manner. There was no attempt to use an ATI model, as client attributes were not seen to be as important as counselor attributes. This notion may have been compatible with the conception of counseling at that time. The goal of counseling and guidance in the 1950's, especially when dealing with minorities, was assimilation into mainstream America to promote integration (Jackson, 1995). With this in mind, it makes sense that the social influence model may have been directed to a uniform type of client, as that was the desired result.

Research performed since the 1980's has looked at differences in client variables, however, and has found some significant results. Some client characteristics, such as gender and self-concept, have been found to play a role in the counseling process (Angle & Goodyear, 1984; Zamostny et al., 1981). These results along with others suggest that the social influence model, which holds that clients are in a more passive role during counseling, has to be modified in order to make client attributes a more important factor in the process of establishing counselor social influence.

One characteristic that has not received much attention in relation to the social influence model is client cultural background and ethnicity, in spite of support for the notion that cultural differences may affect a client’s perception of the counselor (Atkinson et al., 1978). Cultural variables may play a major role in many aspects of the counseling process, and must be taken into account when doing process research. Research has
shown that minorities often underutilize mental health services, and if they do go to get services, often drop out of treatment prematurely (Sue, Zane & Young, 1994).

While client cultural background may play a significant role in the utilization of mental health services, there are other factors that may be more influential. For example, acculturation has been shown to affect many aspects of an ethnic minority group member’s life, from vocation (Leong & Chou, 1994) to mental health (Berry & Kim, 1988). Acculturation refers to the changes individuals go through when they leave their own culture and enter another culture, becoming minorities in the new culture. Immigrants, for example, have certain choices when they enter a new country. They can retain their own culture and reject the new culture (low acculturation), embrace the new culture and minimize their own culture (high acculturation) or create a balance, where they adopt characteristics of both cultures and feel comfortable going from one to the other (bicultural). What level of acculturation an individual has attained can have a great impact on his/her reaction to counseling. It may also affect what type of counselor he/she would prefer to see, and what characteristics of the counselor will be most influential during therapy (Atkinson, Maruyama & Matsui, 1978).

Another cultural variable that may be particularly salient to the social influence model of counseling is cultural mistrust. Cultural mistrust, when proposed, referred to the attitude of mistrust between African Americans and European Americans (Terrell & Terrell, 1981). While Terrell and Terrell (1981) were specifically examining feelings of mistrust between African Americans and European Americans, it would be logical to
conclude that this type of mistrust could exist in any ethnic minority group. The mistrust is supposedly a result of direct or vicarious mistreatment by European Americans (Caucasian Americans). While it is arguable that African Americans have borne the brunt of most of the racism in this country, they are by no means alone.

Asian Americans are one group of people who have also had to deal with varying levels of racism in this country. Similar to the institutional racism of slavery, Japanese Americans were interred during World War II. Also, the Chinese were harassed in the late 1800's when they were seen as a threat to jobs for Caucasian Americans. This harassment culminated in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, a racist immigration law (Sue & Sue, 1990). This type of treatment creates psychological barriers that can affect the counseling process. For example, trust is supposedly one of the cornerstones of establishing a therapeutic relationship (Gelso & Carter, 1985). Cultural mistrust could be an important factor that would lead to a hindrance in the creation of a therapeutic relationship. It may also affect the amount of social influence a counselor has over clients, as very mistrustful clients will not attribute much social influence to some counselors. Suspiciousness is a manifestation of cultural mistrust, and clients may be hypersensitive to possible racist attitudes when seeing a counselor.

Self-construal is another cultural factor that could affect the effectiveness of counseling. Self-construal denotes the manner in which persons define themselves and their relationships with others. There are two main types of self-construal, the independent self-construal and the interdependent self-construal. The independent
self-construal is related to the concept of individualism. An independent self-construal emphasizes: internal abilities, thoughts, and feelings; being unique and expressing the self; promoting one’s own goals; and being direct in communication (Singelis, 1994).

The interdependent self-construal, on the other hand, more closely resembles the notion of collectivism. It emphasizes: external, public features such as statuses, roles, and relationships; belonging and fitting in; occupying one’s proper place in society; and being indirect in communication and “reading others’ minds” (Singelis, 1994). Most individuals will incorporate both types of self-construals in their personality, but one will be exhibited more than the other.

What type of self-construal is exhibited in an individual’s personality can play a very important role during therapy. It may affect the type of relationship the individual wants to have with the therapist, and how open the person will be with the therapist. Persons with a more prominent interdependent self-construal may feel the need to maintain harmony in relationships, their self-esteem being tied in to how others perceive them. These people would be less willing to admit to personal problems, and may be more prone to somaticize their emotional distress. This type of somatization is often seen in Asian American clients (Cheung & Lau, 1982). Competent therapists would have to be aware of self-construal types in order to maximize their social influence and properly treat clients depending on whether they exhibited independent or interdependent self-construal.
The purpose of the present study was to critically examine the social influence model of counseling and determine whether it was applicable to ethnic minority clients. While the basics of the model were not questioned, it was hypothesized that there would be cultural variables that have not been accounted for by Strong's (1968) model that need to be incorporated into the model for it to better explain the social influence process with ethnic minorities. This study specifically examined the social influence model in relation to Asian Americans, to determine whether there would be differences in how the establishment of social influence may differ between Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans.

It was hypothesized that the cultural variables in this study (acculturation, cultural mistrust and self-construal) would each affect perceptions of the counseling process. They were hypothesized to affect the perceived social influence attributed to the counselor, the willingness to self-disclose of the participants, and the perceived credibility of the counselor by the study participants. It was also hypothesized that there would be group differences on all these variables between Caucasian American participants and ethnic minority participants, in this case Asian Americans. In addition, it was hypothesized that there would be differences in the Asian American group by acculturation level and cultural mistrust level, such that the higher acculturated (lower cultural mistrust) Asian Americans would respond to the counselor in a fashion more similar to the Caucasian American group than the lower acculturated (or higher cultural mistrust) Asian American group.
Specifically, it was hypothesized that Asian Americans would have some cultural mistrust which would cause them to have a lower perception of counselor credibility, be less willing to self-disclose, and would perceive the counselor as having less social influence over them. Asian Americans were also hypothesized to exhibit more interdependent self-construal, as opposed to Caucasian Americans who were hypothesized to exhibit more independent self-construal. These two variables were thought to play a similar role in the perceived effectiveness of the counselor as cultural mistrust. Asian Americans who had interdependent self-construal were hypothesized to believe that the counselor would have less social influence over them. They would also be less willing to self-disclose to the counselor, and have lower perceptions of counselor credibility.

In general, it was hypothesized that lower acculturated Asian Americans would find that the counselor wielded a lesser amount of social influence over them than Caucasian Americans and higher acculturated Asian Americans, as evidenced by their ratings of counselor credibility, counselor social influence, and willingness to self-disclose. Higher acculturated Asian Americans were hypothesized to provide ratings in a fashion similar to Caucasian Americans. Thus, the Asian American sample was examined for differences evidenced by differing acculturation levels. This study examined differences between two cultural groups, Caucasian Americans and Asian Americans, and within a single group, Asian Americans, by acculturation level and cultural mistrust level.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review is composed of six sections. The first section will deal with the social influence model of counseling. Specifically, it will first describe the model, then look at the constructs of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Next it will examine manipulations of these constructs and how these manipulations affect client perceptions of the counselor. Following this, client variables that may affect perceptions of social influence will be studied. Lastly, the methodology that has been used over the years to study the social influence model will be examined.

The next part of this literature review looks at cultural factors that have been found to play a role in counseling. Although more than one ethnic minority group will be examined, the case of counseling with Asian Americans will be the primary focus of attention. This section will attempt to show that while the social influence model may begin to explain the process of change that occurs in counseling, it is ignoring important cultural factors that lessen its applicability to ethnic minority clients.
The third section of the literature review examines clients' willingness to self-disclose to a counselor. The basis of successful counseling is the ability of a client to discuss personal issues with a counselor. This section will examine degrees to which people are willing to self-disclose, and what factors may affect their willingness to self-disclose.

The fourth section of this literature review will look at the construct of cultural mistrust. Cultural mistrust has been shown to play a significant role in the underutilization and early termination of African American clients from counseling. How cultural mistrust may play a role in the social influence process with other ethnic minority groups in counseling will be examined.

The fifth section of the literature review examines the construct of acculturation. Acculturation is the process by which an ethnic minority group adapts to the culture of the majority group. The outcome of the acculturation process affects an individual's ethnic identity. A person can adapt in different ways, such that they identify with only their original ethnicity, with the ethnicity of the dominant culture, a combination of both (bicultural), or they may divest themselves of both cultures (marginalization). This section will look at the effects of acculturation on the counseling process, and how this construct may be a useful addition to the social influence model when concerned with ethnic minority mental health.

The final section of this literature review examines the construct of self-construal. Self-construal examines how a person defines him/herself and his/her relationships with
others. The two types of self-construal are independent and interdependent, and each has ramifications as to how a person will relate to another. Again, because counseling is to a large degree based on the relationship between two people, how people construe themselves may have a great impact on the counseling relationship and on the efficacy of counseling.

**The Social Influence Model**

Counseling as an interpersonal influence process was first described by Strong (1968). Although his was the landmark paper on the topic, he was stimulated by earlier writers such as Frank (1961) and Goldstein (1966). Frank (1961) discussed ways in which healers in many cultures attempt to influence the health of people who are suffering by using psychological means to mobilize healing forces. Goldstein (1966) furthered this notion by specifically looking at how interpersonal attraction affected psychotherapy. Strong (1968) used the construct of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) to explain the process by which he felt psychotherapy was effective in altering client perceptions. The main question that social influence theory attempts to answer is “What can counselor’s do to help a wide variety of clients change?” (Heppner & Claiborn, 1988). Counseling, as a process, essentially involves one person’s attempt to persuade others to change their attitudes, behaviors, or values; basically to change their world view. Jerome Frank (1961) was one of the first persons to show the universalities of the counseling process in different cultures. He was also one of the first to look to constructs from social psychology to help explain the counseling process (Corrigan et al., 1980). Harold
Pepinsky was the first counseling psychologist to pursue the notion of using ideas from social psychology to describe the counseling process (Strong et al., 1992). This attempt to incorporate facets of social psychology to explain psychotherapy was picked up by Strong (1968), who wrote a paper that unified the ideas of others that were turning to social psychology to help understand counseling psychology, and presented the notion of counseling as a process of interpersonal influence.

Strong’s (1968) landmark paper introduced the social influence model of counseling, a model of counseling that has led to a great amount of research. In fact, Wampold and White (1985) performed a cluster analysis of research themes in the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. Their results showed that for the years 1974, 1977, 1980, and 1982 the social influence model was the primary representative model for research involving counseling process and outcome. Considering that Strong introduced the model in 1968 and that it was still the primary model studied in 1982, it is clear that counseling psychology had adopted the model as the most appropriate way to explain the process of counseling. It is therefore important to have an understanding of what the model proposes, and to explore why these propositions may not provide a complete understanding of the counseling process for all populations.

Strong (1968) theorized that when counselors attempted to change clients' behaviors or opinions, they would create cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) in the clients. Cognitive dissonance refers to the discomfort people feel when they hold attitudes that conflict with other attitudes, or when their attitudes conflict with their behaviors. To
reduce the cognitive dissonance created by the counselor, the client could follow one of five options: “a) change in the direction advocated by the counselor, b) discredit the counselor, c) discredit the issue, d) change the counselor’s opinion, or e) seek others who agree with the client.” It was felt that to increase the likelihood of option a) the counselor would have to diminish the possibility of options b) and c). In order to do that, Strong hypothesized that the more expert, attractive, and trustworthy the counselor seemed to the client, there was less chance of the client being able to discredit the counselor. He also felt that if the counselor possessed those three characteristics the client would be more involved in counseling, thus reducing the ability of the client to discredit the issue. Studies have shown that dissatisfied clients (premature terminators) do rate their counselors as less attractive, expert, and trustworthy than clients who successfully terminate (McNeill, May & Lee, 1987).

In effect, Strong had proposed a two-stage model of social influence in counseling. In the first stage, counselors need to establish their power base over the client in order to maximize the chances of the client’s changing in the desired direction. This was done by the counselors presenting themselves as expert, attractive, and trustworthy to the client. The importance of these three constructs has been consistently emphasized in the social psychology literature (Corrigan et al., 1980). The second stage actually involved the influence process, whereby the counselor would enhance his/her power, reduce client opposition and resistance, and proceed to use influence strategies to complete the desired attitude change.
The initial stage in the social influence model, increasing a counselor’s expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness in the eyes of the client has received a lot of attention. Much of the focus of research in this area has been on variables that are effective in enhancing counselors’ perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Studies have looked at these characteristics by themselves, or in combination, such as expertness and attractiveness together. If the initial power base is not established, the chances of a successful outcome are minimal. It is this issue, however, that is also the weakness in the model when the model is used to examine counselor effectiveness with ethnic minority clients. To see this weakness, it is necessary to study in detail the research surrounding the notions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, and how these three concepts may best be accentuated differently depending on the client’s ethnic status.

Reformulations of the model suggest that rather than the effectiveness of cognitive dissonance reduction, the change process may be better explained by the concept of impression management (Strong et al., 1992) as practiced by counselors and clients. The original social influence model for the most part ignored the role of the client, and focused more on the role of the counselor. Strong and Matross (1973) reworked the model in force-field terms and social power theory such that the client was given more of an active role in the process. In this manner, the new model was able to incorporate client characteristics such as opposition and resistance, both of which often play a key role in the therapeutic process. Additional revisions of the model (Strong & Claiborn, 1982) enhanced the model further by adding components to it such as reciprocal influence and a
multilevel view of communication, thus tapping into communications theory to help explain the change process in counseling. This model then incorporated the role of influence that is posited to be inherent in interpersonal relationships, often through non-verbal modes.

While a large body of research has been accumulated on the social influence model, few studies have incorporated the revisions to the model (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). This lack of focus on the recipient's characteristics "perpetuates the myth that the counseling process is uniform for all clients" (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989, pg. 381). The implications of this become obvious when one looks at the issue of multicultural counseling. A growing body of literature has shown that there are indeed many differences in what clients expect from counseling, how they react to counseling, and what they need from counseling (Sue & Sue, 1990).

The social influence model, then, remains a two stage model. The additions to the second stage of the model are important, however, because they do not treat the client as a passive recipient of manipulations of attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness. Also, the second stage of the model, the influence process, has been developed such that the notions of social power, reciprocal influence (a two-way rather than one-way interaction) and the importance of the interpersonal relationship have been accentuated. The latter aspect has not received much attention in the literature. This study, however, will examine more closely the first stage of the model in relation to working with ethnic minority clients. Although many revisions to the second stage of the model have been
made since Strong’s original proposition, the first stage of the model, establishment and enhancement of the counselor’s social influence, remains unchanged and an integral part of the process.

This review of the literature on the social influence model will focus on studies that have examined the first stage of the model, manipulations of the constructs of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Next, client variables will be examined to see how they affect perceptions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Lastly, the methodology that has been used to study the social influence model will be reviewed.

**Expertness**

Expertness was defined as “the extent to which a communicator is perceived to be a source of valid assertions” (Hovland et al., 1953). Strong (1968) used this definition and operationalized it. He said that perceived expertness could be influenced by objective evidence (diplomas, titles, certificates), behavioral evidence (rational and knowledgeable comments, confidence in presentation), and presentation as an expert. Researchers have studied many variables, singly and in combination with other variables, to measure their effects on perceived expertness. Generally, it has been found that verbal and non-verbal behavioral cues seem to have the most effect on perceived expertness.

Counselors have many different options when trying to present themselves as experts in their fields. Simple manipulations in a counselor’s attire can affect a client’s perception of their expertness (Kerr & Dell, 1976). It was found that counselor’s who had been dressed casually were rated as less expert than those who were dressed more
formally. Roll and Roll (1984), however, found that informal attire of the counselor was positively related to perceived expertness. More studies are needed to resolve this issue. Another manipulation that affected perceived expertness was whether the counselor had degrees and certificates present in his/her office or not (Siegel & Sell, 1978). As expected, those with degrees and certificates present were rated as more expert. A study by Bloom et al. (1977) showed that even the setting of a therapy session can greatly influence perceived expertness. They found that a male therapist in a “humanistic” office setting was rated as more expert, while a female in a “traditional professional” office was rated as more expert. It is interesting that factors that are in no way associated with the actual counseling process can still have an effect on the client’s perceptions of the counselor’s expertness. This fact can be especially salient when one considers cultural differences between Asian and European clients.

Other sources of perceived expertness have also been found in the literature. For example, Hartley (1969) found that counselors who were introduced as experienced were rated as more expert than those introduced as having less experience. Although this finding may not be surprising, the fact that this higher rating persisted over ten counseling sessions is. It shows the enduring quality of first impressions, in this case the first impression being based on an introduction. Scheid (1976) found similar results, such that counselors introduced as PhD’s with experience were rated higher on measures of counselor competence and comfort level than counselors introduced as students who were seeing their first clients. It seems that introductions can have a lasting influential effect on
a client’s perception of a counselor’s expertness. Interestingly, however, Heppner and Heesacker (1982) found that actual level of experience of the counselor did not affect perceived expertness of client participants. These results show that actual clients, versus analogue study participants, may look at different cues to assess expertness.

Another factor that has not received much attention in the social influence literature is the effect of race on perceived expertness. One study by Atkinson et al. (1978) showed that counselors who were introduced as Asian American were rated as more credible and approachable than a Caucasian counselor by Asian American students. A later study by Gim, Atkinson, and Kim (1991) lent further support for the notion that Asian American students preferred Asian American counselors over Caucasian counselors. Merluzzi et al. (1977) performed a study with Caucasian participants and either African American or Caucasian female counselors. It was found that the students rated the Caucasian-expert interviewers more expert than the African American-expert interviewers. Paurhoit et al. (1982) found that ethnicity (African American) was positively related to perceived expertness. All of these studies point out the importance that racial similarity may have on perceived expertness in a counselor. It is therefore necessary to be aware that some counselors, even though they may be experts in their field, will not be perceived as experts by all clients.

The manipulations discussed above are all concerned with impressions a counselor may make even before the actual course of therapy begins. Behaviors performed by the therapist during the counseling session have also been seen to affect a client’s perceptions
of a counselor's expertness. For example, Atkinson and Carskadden (1975) found that counselors who used more professional jargon during a session were rated to be more knowledgeable. As knowledge level is one of the bases of expertness, using professional jargon may increase perceived expertness. Anderson and Anderson (1985) found that counselors who made more positive self-involving statements were rated as more expert. Atkinson et al. (1978) studied the type of therapy used (directive vs. non-directive) with Asian American participants. They found that the directive counselors were rated as more credible than the non-directive counselors. This study highlights some cultural differences that need to be further studied to see why the social influence model may not fully explain the effectiveness of counseling in all populations.

Other studies have looked at counselor non-verbal behavior and found that non-verbal behavior (expert vs. inexpert) had a more positive effect on ratings of the counselor than the presence of diplomas and certificates (Siegel & Sell, 1978). Tyson and Wall (1983) also concluded from their study that non-verbal messages can positively or negatively influence the counselor's verbal message, depending on congruency of the two forms of communication. Corrigan et al. (1980) in their review of research in social influence say that "Visible evidence of a counselor's competence, information regarding a counselor's reputation, and the observed verbal and non-verbal behavior of a counselor all provide cues by which clients infer the expertness of the counselor." (pg. 406). They conclude that behavioral cues seem to be especially significant in affecting a client's perceptions of expertness. In fact, some studies have found that nonverbal behaviors
account for more of the variance than cues such as attire and setting (Lee, Uhlemann, & Haase, 1985; Robbins & Haase, 1985). However, it is important to note that these studies have not used uniform measures of expertness. Also, many of these studies were based on one time meetings (initial sessions) or on analogue study designs, both of which limit the generalizability of the findings.

In general, counselor ratings of expertness have been seen to be manipulable through different means. Objective cues such as diplomas on the wall, counselor attire, and office setting have been seen to affect ratings of expertness (Angle & Goodyear, 1984; Kerr & Dell, 1976). Verbal behaviors such as introductions and self-involving statements have also been seen to increase perceived ratings of expertness (Anderson & Anderson, 1985; Scheid, 1976). Lastly, non-verbal behaviors have been seen to play as great a role, if not greater, than verbal behaviors (Barak, Patkin & Dell, 1982; Tyson & Wall, 1983).

Attractiveness

The second construct that Strong felt was important in establishing a power base is attractiveness. Strong conceived that perceived attractiveness was based on how similar and compatible a client felt a counselor was, and on the client's liking for a counselor (Corrigan et al, 1980). Some variables used to study attractiveness have been evidential cues (physical attractiveness, sex, race, attire, setting), reputational cues (direct and trait structuring), and behavioral cues (self-disclosure and non-verbal behavior). Research has
found that perceived unattractiveness may be more important than perceived attractiveness. Also, similar to research with expertness, behavioral cues were seen to show the most robust results.

Attractiveness can have different components to it as with expertness, the most obvious component being physical attractiveness. As is to be expected, more physically attractive counselors were rated as being more attractive than unattractive counselors (Cash et al., 1975). When gender was introduced as a variable, it was found that physically attractive female counselors were rated highest on attractiveness (Carter, 1978).

Cash et al. (1975) performed a study using a videotape of either a physically attractive or unattractive counselor. Results showed that the physically attractive counselor was rated higher overall, and participants in the study felt more confident about the helpfulness of the physically attractive counselor. An interesting finding by Cash and Kehr (1978) showed that unattractiveness may be more important than attractiveness. In their study, female participants listened to tapes of counseling interviews by counselors of both sexes. The manipulation used was that some participants were shown a picture of a physically attractive counselor, some were shown pictures of an unattractive counselor, and some were given no picture. It was found that the attractive and anonymous counselors were rated equally, but the unattractive counselor was rated lower. Thus it may not be physical attractiveness that is a key component, but unattractiveness.

The notion of physical attractiveness, however, is based on individual preferences, much more so than the concept of expertness. While it would be very difficult to ascertain
every individual’s conception of physical attractiveness, it would be possible to find more
general, cultural differences. It is therefore necessary to examine cultural differences in
what is generally accepted as attractive. The research to date has focused generally on the
European American conception of physical attractiveness, and this may not be an
appropriate assumption when dealing with clients of other cultures. This issue will be
discussed further when the effects of cultural differences are examined in regards to
expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.

Just as attire and setting have been studied as influencing expertness, they have
also been studied with regards to attractiveness. Kerr and Dell (1976) in the study
mentioned earlier found that counselor attire had an effect on expertness, but did not
affect ratings of attractiveness. Another study by Amira and Abramowitz (1979)
replicated the Kerr and Dell (1976) study and found similar results. Neither attire nor
counseling setting affected ratings of attractiveness. Again, these results may not be
replicated if one is using a non-European American sample of participants. Cultural
differences, for example the notion that Asian Americans may prefer more formal settings
and attire, have yet to be studied.

The concept of attractiveness has received little study in regards to the effects of
race and gender (Corrigan et al., 1980). The Atkinson et al. (1978) study with Asian
Americans showed a race effect for rated credibility, but they did not assess perceived
attractiveness specifically. Merluzzi et al. (1977) also found a race effect for perceived
expertness, but again they did not assess attractiveness. It is possible to assume, however,
that if race plays a role in perceived expertness, there is the possibility that it will also affect perceived attractiveness. This is an area that requires more study. The results of studies that have looked at gender main effects have not been consistent. Carter (1978) found that attractive female counselors were rated highest on several variables. Cash and Kehr (1978) did not find any main effects for counselor gender. It is possible that cues other than gender, such as race, may be more salient to clients. It is also possible that physical attractiveness may be based on factors other than gender. In regards to both gender and race, it is difficult to come to any conclusions on their effect on perceived attractiveness because of the lack of research studies in this area.

It was seen that the type of introduction used can have an effect on a counselor's perceived expertness. This does not seem to always hold true for perceived attractiveness, however. Goldstein (1971) performed studies with actual clients. The clients were told that the counselor they would see either matched their description of a counselor they would want to see, or did not. In addition, they were told that they would either get along "very well", "all right", or told nothing. Out of a series of three studies, only one showed any effect on a measure of perceived attractiveness. Related studies used the notion of trait structuring to examine its effects on perceived attractiveness. Goldstein (1971) presented clients with lists of adjectives supposedly describing their counselors, with the variation that one group had the adjective "warm" on the list while the other had the adjective "cold". Main effects were found such that the "warm" counselor was rated as more attractive. These results, however, have been difficult to
replicate (Savitsky et al., 1976). Angle and Goodyear (1984) and Bernstein and Figioli (1983), however, both found that introductions did affect perceived attractiveness. It is possible then, that although introductions can affect perceived expertness, there are other factors that are more important when it comes to clients rating perceived attractiveness.

As was the case with perceived expertness, behavioral cues during the counseling session may also affect perceived attractiveness. The behavior that has received the most attention is self-disclosure (Corrigan et al. 1980). While overall self-disclosures by the counselor are seen to have a positive effect on clients' perceptions, it is not a direct relationship, and contrary findings have also been reported. Daher and Bankiotes (1976) found that perceived attraction was rated highly with greater amounts of disclosure only when the disclosures were similar in content. Hoffman-Graff (1977) reported that counselors whose self-disclosures were similar to interviewee behaviors were rated more favorably, but Mann and Murphy (1975) did not find that similarity resulted in differential ratings. Davis and Skinner (1974) found that there was no clear preference for a counselor that was self-disclosing.

Giannandrea and Murphy (1973) reported that perceived attraction, based on willingness to return for a second interview, had a curvilinear relationship with self-disclosures. Counselors who self-disclosed very little and those who self-disclosed a lot were both rated lower than a counselor who self-disclosed a moderate amount. Similar results were reported by Mann and Murphy (1975), and by Davis and Sloan (1974), such that it seems that high disclosure (10 or more) and low disclosure (2 or less) counselors
are perceived as less attractive than moderately disclosing counselors (3-9 self-disclosing statements). Remer et al. (1983) found that counselor who used positive self-involving statements were seen as more attractive, but this behavior did not affect perceived expertness or trustworthiness. In general results also support the notion that if the perceptions of similarity between the client and the counselor are increased by self-disclosures of the counselor, then the counselor will receive a higher rating of perceived attractiveness.

Since counseling is a method of verbal persuasion, it stands to reason that verbal behaviors such as self-disclosures will receive much attention. It is interesting to note, however, that non-verbal behaviors have also been shown to greatly affect a counselor’s ratings of perceived attractiveness. Haase and Tepper (1972) reported that non-verbal behaviors accounted for more of the variance than verbal messages when looking at ratings of counselor empathy. Surprisingly, Kleinke and Tully (1979) report that there was an inverse relationship between the amount of verbalizations by a counselor and the interviewee’s rating of how much they liked the counselor. Robbins and Haase (1985) found that non-verbal cues of attractiveness significantly affected ratings of attractiveness, but not of expertness or trustworthiness. Eye contact was reported to be positively related to attractiveness ratings of counselors by Kleinke et al. (1975). This is an important finding, especially in relation to studies with minorities that suggest that eye contact may have different meanings in different cultures. In fact, many non-verbal behaviors have different meanings in different cultures (Sue & Sue, 1990). Research that
has looked at non-verbal behaviors has mostly been successful when studying a single behavior. Corrigan et al. (1980) conclude, however, that “Attempts to investigate complex patterns of non-verbal behavior such as would be expected in actual counseling have resulted in complex interactive effects that are difficult to interpret.” (pg. 420).

In general, then, research on perceived attractiveness has shown mixed results. Physical attractiveness has been found to be a salient factor more so when the counselor was portrayed as unattractive, rather than attractive. Other factors that have been shown to have an effect on perceived expertness, such as gender, attire, and setting, have had moderate and mixed results. Behavioral cues have been seen to show greater effects than the ones stated above. Moderate numbers of self-disclosures have shown to positively affect attractiveness ratings, especially if they serve to increase the similarity between counselor and client. Again, these results have been found with generally European American participants. They may well be very different when studied using ethnic minority participants. Specific cultural differences that may affect perceived attractiveness will be discussed below.

**Trustworthiness**

The last of the three constructs that Strong postulated as being critical to establishing a counselor power base is trustworthiness. Trustworthiness, as conceptualized by Strong (1968), is based on a counselor’s reputation for honesty, social role, sincerity and openness, and lack of motivation for personal gain. There has not been as much research done on the construct of trustworthiness as expertness and
attractiveness. However, one main finding is that it seems that the social role of the
counselor in itself is enough to oftentimes boost perceived trustworthiness without
manipulating any other variables (Heppner & Heesacker, 1982). Some studies have found
that a counselor’s manner, over verbalizations, may affect counselor perceived
trustworthiness (Kaul & Schmidt, 1971). Some of the manipulated variables involved
with trustworthiness have included introductions, reputational cues, and verbal and non-
verbal behaviors.

Credible introductions, as was the case with expertness, have been shown to affect
perceived trustworthiness in a positive manner (Bernstein & Figioli, 1983; Littrell et al.,
1987). McKee and Smouse (1983) found that doctoral level counselors were found to be
more trustworthy than trainees, showing that reputational cues did affect perceived
trustworthiness. In fact, Littrell et al. (1987) found that even when a counselor was
presented as having negative reputational cues, participants who later saw a videotape of
the counselor rated them highly on measures of credibility and attractiveness. This
suggests that behavioral cues (verbal and non-verbal) may be more salient to perceptions
of trustworthiness than introductions. It may also be in part due to the notion that the
societal role of counselors prescribes a certain level of trustworthiness in itself.

Roll, Schmidt, and Kaul (1972) performed a study using African American and
Caucasian inmates. Their results showed no racial differences in perceived
trustworthiness. Their results did, however, support the notion of the importance of
counselor manner (Kaul & Schmidt, 1971) and that trustworthy content matter is not as
influential as when it is matched with trustworthy non-verbal behaviors. Trustworthiness ratings also were not affected by racial differences in Lafranboise and Dixon's (1981) study with Native Americans. Race effects were significant in the case of expertness (credibility) in the Atkinson et al. study (1978) and attractiveness (Green et al. 1986), but surprisingly not with trustworthiness. An especially surprising finding is that both Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans rated Mexican American professionals as less trustworthy and attractive than Anglo American professionals and Mexican American nonprofessionals (Acosta & Sheehan, 1976). One reason for this may be that because of the low numbers of Mexican American professionals in the field, they have not yet proved their public credibility. This finding needs to be studied more, as cross-cultural counseling literature has shown that cultural mistrust may play a large role in how trusting a client is of a counselor of a different race, especially if the counselor's race is that of an oppressive group. The construct of cultural mistrust will be examined below, in a separate section.

Johnson and Noonan (1972) performed a study looking at the relationship of trustworthiness and self-disclosures. Counselors either expressed acceptance or rejection of the client's self-disclosures, and then either reciprocated with their own self-disclosure or not. It was found that accepting counselors who reciprocated self-disclosures were found to be more trustworthy. These counselors were also more liked, and were perceived as more similar, which would most likely affect ratings of attractiveness as well.

Non-verbal behaviors have also been studied in regards to their effects on perceived trustworthiness. For example, Suiter and Goodyear (1985) found that
counselors who used a very intimate non-verbal action, a semi-embrace, were rated as less trustworthy than counselors using less intimate non-verbals. Another behavior, note-taking in the session, was studied by Miller (1992). It was found that although there were no differential ratings on measures of trustworthiness, expertness, or attractiveness, there was the effect that clients were more willing to return to see the counselor who did not take notes than the counselor who did take notes.

One of the reasons given for the lack of research on trustworthiness is that it is very difficult to manipulate (Corrigan et al., 1980). A major consideration in that is the reality of Strong’s (1968) proposition that the social role of counselor carries with it a high level of trustworthiness. That is, counselors may not have to show themselves as being trustworthy because being trustworthy is supposedly inherent in the counselor role. Rotter and Stein (1971) performed a study looking at the perceived trustworthiness of different professionals. Of the twenty professions examined, psychiatrists and psychologists scored high on ratings of altruism and truthfulness. The only professions rated higher were clergy and physicians on altruism, and for truthfulness the only professions rated higher were the latter two along with dentists and judges. Therefore, it seems that rather than having to prove oneself as trustworthy, it may be more important for counselors to show that they are not untrustworthy. This resembles the results of studies of perceived attractiveness. In that case, it was not the level of attractiveness that seemed to play a pivotal role, but more so the level of unattractiveness that affected ratings.
Client Variables

The social influence model underwent certain revisions (mentioned above) that made client characteristics more important to the process, as the client was no longer seen to be a passive agent. Studies that have looked at client characteristics, however, have not had very much success in finding client variables that seem to affect perceptions of the counselor. The most studied variable has been gender (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). The results, however, have been conflicting, partly due to the methodology used. When the study involved actual counseling or a written transcript of a counseling session, gender had no influence (Remer et al., 1983; Zamostny et al., 1981). When the stimulus used was a videotape, gender was seen to affect perceptions, but not in a consistent manner (Banikotes & Merluzzi, 1981; Vargas & Borkowski, 1983). Heppner and Claiborn (1989) conclude that gender may play a salient role when moderate stimulus cues (videos) are present, but not when minimal (transcripts) or maximal (actual counseling) cues are present. More study of this is needed before any conclusions can be made regarding the influence of gender on perceptions of counselors' attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness.

One study by McKay, Dowd, and Rollin (1982), did find some effects for race and educational level of client on the client's perception of the counselor. Results showed that African American and lower educated clients rated a counselor of low social influence higher on all measures (trustworthiness and empathy), while Caucasian and higher educated clients rated a counselor high on social influence higher on measures of
trustworthiness and empathy. The authors concluded that the race main effects may be due to the fact that the African American clients had lower levels of education, more so than because of race alone. These results do open up the possibility that race effects with other minorities, such as Asian Americans, may exist and need further study. Although many other client variables have been studied, including sex-role orientation, marital status, and self-concept, to name a few, no significant results have been found (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989). One reason for this may be that most studies are looking at single variables, while in reality it may be a more complex interaction between variables that may affect perceptions of the counselor. Surprisingly, ethnic diversity has not been a focus of study regarding client characteristics that may affect counseling. It may be important to look at cultural components such as acculturation and cultural mistrust to find significant effects of client characteristics on the counseling process.

**Methodology**

Since the conceptualization of counseling as a social influence process, there has been a need to assess the effectiveness of counselors. Many variables have been manipulated in order to see the effects they have on perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, as discussed above. These include counselor attire, office setting, evidence of training, non-verbal behaviors, counselor self-disclosures, and therapeutic style, to name a few. The types of manipulations have varied, as have the tools that have been used to assess the effects of these manipulations.
There have been many problems with the research that has been performed in the past, especially surrounding the issue of external validity. One problem mentioned is that ratings of counselors are often obtained not from actual counselor-client interactions, but from analogue sessions. Another problem has been that even in studies that use actual counselors and clients, the ratings often are obtained after a single meeting (Corrigan et al., 1980), and the first session of counseling may be very different from subsequent sessions. Although the question of external validity has yet to be answered sufficiently, there is some evidence that results from analogue studies may generalize to counseling situations (Helms, 1978).

While most researchers would agree that using actual client-counselor live interviews would be ideal in studying social influence, that is a very expensive and time consuming methodology. Heppner and Claiborn (1988) give some reasons why it may be satisfactory to use a videotape analogue study. The justifications are: it is too expensive to conduct live interviews; the social psychology literature that this research is attempting to parallel used videotape techniques; and, the research has a theoretical importance that goes beyond the practical relevance. For these reasons, although the methodology of analogue studies is somewhat problematic, it is still used and can contribute to the understanding of the social influence process.

To measure the effects of manipulations on social influence, various tools have been used. This section will mention some of the measures used to assess social influence, but will focus on the Counselor Rating Form (CRF; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975), as it has
been the assessment tool that has been used most to assess social influence (Ponterrotto & Furlong, 1985). Prior to 1975, there was not very much consensus on the measures used to assess counselor characteristics and effectiveness. Some of the scales used included the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) (Barrett-Lennard, 1962), the Counselor Evaluation Inventory (CEI) (Linden, Stone & Shertzer, 1965), and the Counselor Effectiveness Scale (CES) (Ivey, 1971).

All of the scales mentioned have been used in multiple studies to examine ratings of counselors. The reason that CRF will be the focus of attention, however, is that it has been used the most. While its popularity alone is not reason enough to endorse its use, because it has been used so extensively its statistical properties have also been examined extensively, and this makes it a more valuable tool. For this reason it is the best tool to use. In addition, it uses the social influence model as its basis of counselor effectiveness evaluation. Three of the scales mentioned (the BLRI, the CEI, and the CES) use other criteria, such as client attitudes toward counselor (BLRI and CES) and client perceived rapport (CEI) (Ponterotto & Furlong, 1985). Because it has been used extensively and has as its theoretical basis the social influence model, the CRF will be used in this study and thus examined more closely.

The Counselor Rating Form (CRF; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) was developed to measure social influence as theorized by Strong, specifically to measure the constructs of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. The scale consists of 36 adjectives that are paired with antonyms. Each of the adjectives are supposed to be exemplars of one of the
constructs mentioned above, such that each construct is represented by 12 adjectives. The participant then rates the counselor on a 7-point Likert scale for each of the adjective pairs. An example of an item pair would be “alert-unalert” or “trustworthy-untrustworthy”. Each of the three subscales could then have a score range from 12 to 84.

The CRF was initially evaluated by having 202 students evaluate three therapists (Rogers, Perls and Ellis from the film *Three Approaches to Psychotherapy*, Shostrom, 1966) (Barak & LaCroese, 1975). The results were promising but more verification was needed to show that the three constructs were truly separate factors. LaCrosse and Barak (1976) replicated the earlier study with 127 students evaluating a single therapist (one of the three mentioned earlier). Results showed that the reliability coefficients for the scales across counselors were: .874 for expertness, .850 for attractiveness, and .908 for trustworthiness. Although the subscale intercorrelations were high for the three constructs, the authors state that “each dimension appears to have enough uniqueness to be considered a separate entity for both theoretical and practical use.” (pg. 171). They also state that the high intercorrelations may also reflect another common component of perceived counselor behavior, a component termed “persuasiveness” or “charisma”.

The CRF has also been found to have predictive validity, such that ratings on the CRF have been associated with counseling outcomes with actual clients and counselors (LaCrosse, 1980). It was found that ratings of expertness were the most powerful predictors of counseling outcome. It was also found that ratings of counselors increased significantly from precounseling to postcounseling. The intercorrelations among
constructs remained relatively high, but were lower than previous studies. Because this study took place in a field setting, it provides further evidence that the CRF may be a useful tool to assess counselor characteristics. Barak and Dell (1977) found similar results in that the three dimensions of the CRF were found to correlate positively with client willingness to self-refer to an observed counselor.

There has been some criticism of the CRF as well. The main argument is that because of the high intercorrelations between the three dimensions, it is argued that the CRF may be measuring a single characteristic rather than three separate entities. A study by Tracey et al. (1988) attempted to find the best model for the CRF Short version (CRF-S; Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983) using factor analysis. The CRF-S took the best items from the CRF, thus still measures the same three dimensions. The authors propose that a two-step hierarchical model best accounts for the results found with the CRF-S. They did find that there are three relatively independent social influence factors (expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness). However, as a second step, they found a higher-order factor that they feel is an index of charisma or extent to which a counselor is seen positively. The authors conclude that participants may make some differentiation between the three dimensions initially, and these should increase over time.

Although it is clear that the CRF is not an ideal measure of counselor characteristics, research shows that it is the best tool available. The CRF uses the social influence model as its theoretical basis and aims to measure the constructs of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. It is possible that it also measures a higher order
construct mentioned above. Because so much work has been done to evaluate the CRF, and because reliability coefficients and predictive validity have been shown to be in the acceptable range, the CRF is a good tool to measure the social influence of counselors. Also, because the CRF is used so often, it will be helpful to see how effective it is when used by an ethnic minority population, thus attesting to its generalizability.

**Willingness to Self-Disclose**

One of the important variables used in studying the social influence model is the number and type of self-disclosures by the client. Self-disclosure is simply defined as "the act of revealing personal information to others." (Jourard, 1979; pg.2). The importance of self-disclosures in a counseling situation cannot be overestimated, and the effects of varying levels of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness on the number and types of self-disclosures were reviewed in a previous section. The basic process of therapy involves the exchange of information between two parties. If one of those parties does not feel capable or comfortable in divulging information to the other, the therapeutic process, for all intents and purposes, is non-existent. Willingness to self-disclose does measure the social influence of the counselor, but can also take into account other cultural factors that may impinge on the number and types of self-disclosures. It has been shown that counselors have high social influence based on their role in society, but cultural components of the therapeutic process may reduce that social influence and affect willingness to self-disclose.
Studies have shown that Asian Americans underutilize mental health services compared to the general population (Sue & Kirk, 1975). This does not mean, however, that they have fewer psychological problems. In fact, Asian Americans have been seen to have higher than normal levels of psychological distress (Leong, 1986). The question remains, then, as to why Asian Americans are not willing to seek counseling to relieve their distress. One reason concerns the high level of stigmatization that mental illness carries in the Asian community (Sue & Morishima, 1982). It is felt that admitting to psychological problems may bring shame not only to oneself, but also to one’s family. Another reason that Asian Americans do not go to counselors is that there is a tendency for that group to somatize their problems. This results in Asian Americans going to utilize medical services instead of psychological services to relieve symptoms which would most likely be better treated with counseling (Cheung & Lau, 1982). In the case of Asian Americans, it seems that self-disclosures are more permissible if they concern physical health, but not mental health.

Poston, Craine, and Atkinson (1991) have found that cultural mistrust may affect a client’s willingness to self-disclose to a counselor. It was found that African Americans were less likely to self-disclose to a counselor who was Caucasian. Sue and Zane (1987) discussed the need for a counselor to have ascribed and achieved credibility. One of the reasons proposed for the lack of self-disclosure by Poston et. al (1991) was that cultural mistrust diminished the ascribed credibility of the counselor, and clients are not willing to self-disclose to a therapist they do not find to be credible. Although this study was done
with African Americans, the racism felt by many Asian Americans may also affect the perceived credibility of Caucasian counselors in their eyes.

Plasky and Lorion (1984) conducted a study to determine what demographic characteristics were significant in predicting amount and type of self-disclosures. Participants of this study were members of the community, differing in socioeconomic status, to see if socioeconomic status affected self-disclosures. Race differences were found such that overall disclosures by Caucasians were greater than those of African Americans, independent of socioeconomic status. However, all the interviewers were Caucasian American, which then brings up the possibility of cultural mistrust affecting the interview process. An interesting finding was that lower socioeconomic and ethnic minority groups were more willing to self-disclose to non-professionals. Poston et. al (1991) also found that income correlated positively with self-disclosure to Caucasians by African Americans. These findings support the notion of cultural mistrust, and also support the idea of incorporating non-professionals in the therapeutic process when dealing with lower socioeconomic and ethnic minority clients.

Ridley (1984) discusses the apparent paradox of self-disclosure for African American clients, and also presents a typology of self-disclosure that seems applicable to any ethnic minority, not just African Americans. The paradox is that although self-disclosure in therapy situations is supposed to be a necessary condition for attaining psychological health, self-disclosure in many other situations can be damaging to minorities, making them targets of racism and disparagement. Ridley proposes that there
are two types of paranoia (functional and cultural) that can affect self-disclosure. Functional paranoia is an unhealthy condition that is an illness. Cultural paranoia is akin to cultural mistrust, a healthy psychological reaction to racism. The problem that occurs is that therapists are often unaware of cultural paranoia, and can mislabel an ethnic minority client as either functionally paranoid or resistant, not understanding that non-disclosure to this client is a healthy coping mechanism in many situations.

While cultural factors such as those described above can have strong effects on self-disclosure, therapist behavior has also been shown to affect client self-disclosures. Bundza and Simonson (1973) performed a study in which they found that therapists who made warm, nurturant self-disclosing remarks elicited the most self-disclosures from clients. Perception of the therapist as nurturant and client self-disclosures have been found to be predictive of positive therapeutic outcome (Bergin & Strupp, 1969). An interesting study by Cherbosque (1987) had dissimilar results. Mexican and American subjects both were more willing to self-disclose to a therapist that did not self-disclose. Because these results, in regards to American participants, are contrary to other studies, the author states that the type of self-disclosure and the timing of the self-disclosure by the therapist may be important. It is possible that Americans do not prefer therapists who self-disclose in the first session.

The Mexican participants, on the other hand, rated a therapist that self-disclosed as less expert and trustworthy on the Counselor Rating Form. They found this self-disclosure to be unprofessional and stated that they wanted feedback and understanding
concerning their problems from the therapist. These results may be significant for Asian Americans as well. It has been shown that Asian American clients often prefer a directive counseling style (Yuen & Tinsley, 1981). Self-disclosure on the part of the therapist may then be more reflective of a humanistic style of therapy, and will not result in greater self-disclosure by the ethnic minority client. In the past, the idea seems to have been that the more self-disclosures a client offers, the better their prognosis in therapy. The question arises, however, as to the utility of this idea when dealing with ethnic minority clients. The expectation of self-disclosures from these clients may be one of the reasons for the underutilization of mental health services by minorities, as well as premature termination by ethnic minority clients.

Hinson and Swanson (1993) showed that willingness to self-disclose to a counselor is not a common phenomenon. Results of their study indicated that the greatest amount of self-disclosure was directed toward friends, then parents, counselors and strangers. Many of their participants (the majority of whom were Caucasian) stated that they would only go to see a counselor if they felt their problem was so great that none of the other people in their life could help them. It seems then that willingness to self-disclose may be partly motivated by the severity of the problem, such that the more severe the problem the more willing the person is to self-disclose.

Waxer (1989) found differences in willingness to see a counselor between Chinese and Canadian students. The Chinese students were less willing to see a humanistic counselor (Carl Rogers) than were the Canadian students. In addition, the Chinese
students were less condemning of a directive style of therapy (Albert Ellis). These results
show that cultural differences will have a great impact on clients’ willingness to self-refer
to a counselor. Like the Mexican population in the Cherbossue (1987) study, it is
possible that the Asian students were not comfortable with the idea of personal self-
disclosure, and would rather have a directive counselor with a problem-solving
orientation. The following section will examine cultural factors that may affect a client’s
willingness to self-disclose to a counselor, as well as the counselor’s social influence over
the client.

**Cultural Variables Salient to Counseling**

There are many important constructs that can affect the counseling process, three
of which are cultural mistrust, acculturation, and self-construal. The cultural variables
discussed in this section focus on differences in clients that can affect perceptions of
counselors, as well as the counseling process. Therapist variables that may also affect the
counseling process are examined, as well as differences in the process of counseling that
may be necessary when dealing with ethnic minority clients.

**Cultural Mistrust**

One of the basic tenets in counseling psychology is that in order to help alleviate
distress a counselor must be able to form a therapeutic relationship with their client. A
therapeutic relationship can be defined as feelings of liking, respect, and trust that the
client holds toward the therapist, and also that the therapist holds toward the client
(Kanfer & Goldstein, 1991). While this can often be a challenge in many counseling
situations, it may be particularly difficult in cross-cultural / multicultural counseling situations. One reason for this is that the client and the counselor may hold differing world views. World views "are not only composed of our attitudes, values, opinions, and concepts, but also they may affect how we think, make decisions, behave, and define events" (Sue & Sue, 1990, p.137). Clearly, world views affect numerous aspects of our personalities, behaviors, and relationships, and thus will play a prominent role in counseling situations.

A major component of forming a therapeutic bond with a client involves creating a trusting relationship. Again, this may be problematic in many situations, but may play an especially prominent role in cross-cultural situations. This is particularly true in situations where the counselor is European American (White), and the client is African American (Black). This attitude of mistrust between African Americans and European Americans has been termed "cultural mistrust" (Terrell & Terrell, 1981). While cultural mistrust may exist between any two cultures, the majority of the research in the field (all the research, in fact) looks at cultural mistrust between African Americans and European Americans. This section will examine the construct of cultural mistrust and how it can play a major role in cross-cultural / multicultural counseling situations with members of ethnic minority groups.

Terrell & Terrell (1981) first coined the term cultural mistrust. They operationalized the construct by creating the Cultural Mistrust Inventory. This is a 48-item self-report measure in which respondents indicate the degree to which they mistrust
European Americans. Responses are made on a 7 point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). Higher scores reflect a greater tendency to mistrust European Americans, while lower scores reflect greater trust. They found four areas in which African Americans are mistrustful of European Americans. These areas are: educational and training settings, political and legal systems, work and business interactions, and interpersonal and social contexts. Obviously counseling situations are included under the domain of interpersonal and social contexts. Some illustrative examples of questions from the Cultural Mistrust Inventory are: “Blacks should be wary of a white person who tries to be friendly”, and “Black parents should teach their children not to trust white teachers” (Terrell, Terrell, & Taylor, 1981). It is important to understand the origins of cultural mistrust, as cultural mistrust will be shaped by, and will shape a person's world view.

When one studies the history of the African American experience in the United States of America, the origins of cultural mistrust are clearly apparent. African Americans began their existence in the U.S. as slaves. They were the targets of dehumanizing acts, racism, and discrimination, and although slavery no longer exists, racism and discrimination still do. Even after slavery ended, African Americans have had to deal with segregation, overt acts of physical violence, subtle acts of racism (racial jokes), and uneven representation and treatment in sociopolitical systems. In effect, society in the United States has in place a form of institutional racism (Thompson et al., 1990). To survive in this type of society, African Americans have learned to mistrust European Americans. They have developed a healthy cultural paranoia, which refers to “the anxiety
and suspiciousness that some African Americans develop as a result of ongoing exposure to a culture or ecosystem they cannot trust.” (Thompson et al., 1990, p163).

Asian Americans as a group have also had to undergo racist treatment in the United States. While there may not have been as pervasive or dehumanizing an institution as slavery in effect for Asians, there was the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, which basically labeled that group as traitors and untrustworthy. Similarly, in the late 1800's, Chinese individuals were harassed when they were seen as a threat to jobs for Caucasian Americans. This harassment culminated in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, a racist immigration law (Sue & Sue, 1990). In addition to these historical examples of institutional racism, many Asian Americans have to face racist situations daily in their workplaces, schools and in their communities. The racism Asian Americans face is at times more insidious; comments that are supposed to be complements such as “Oh, you must be good at math”, contribute to the model minority myth and end up hurting this group.

While some may feel that cultural mistrust is not very pervasive, studies show that it is present in very young children as well as college students and older adults (Watkins & Terrell, 1988; Poston, Craine, & Atkinson, 1991; Terrell, Terrell, & Miller, 1993). The effects of cultural mistrust have far reaching consequences. For example, Terrell, Terrell, & Miller (1993) found that African American adolescents that expected to enter less prestigious, lower paying occupations were more mistrustful of European Americans. One implication of this is that some African Americans will not choose to enter higher
level fields because they mistrust European Americans. This will perpetuate the lower economic status of African Americans and thus possibly increase their cultural mistrust level. This could result in a vicious circle of mistrust and economic deprivation.

Another area in which cultural mistrust seems to play a role is in standardized testing. Being aware of the importance of standardized testing in this society, it is important to see how cultural mistrust may affect scores. Standardized tests are used for many purposes, including advanced placement decisions in educational and employment settings, entrance to college and graduate schools, and employment selection. Two studies (Terrell, Terrell & Taylor, 1981; Terrell & Terrell, 1983) show that cultural mistrust may negatively affect scores on intelligence tests of African Americans. In both studies, African American students (17 to 19 years old, and 9 to 11 years old, respectively) were given intelligence tests administered by either a European American or African American examiner. Results showed that highly mistrustful students scored significantly higher when they were given the examination by an African American examiner.

Since cultural mistrust has such far reaching effects in areas that are not interpersonal in nature, it seem reasonable to conclude that cultural mistrust will play a major role in counseling situations. Again, most of the research in the counseling area consists of studies with European American counselors and African American clients. Although it is reasonable to assume that cultural mistrust would come into play in other client/counselor racial matchings, these assumptions have not been validated through
empirical studies. Therefore, the effects of cultural mistrust in counseling situations studied here will be limited to scenarios with European American counselors and African American clients.

Counseling is a unique endeavor in that most of the beneficial effects that a client may feel come as a result of dialogue. The dialogue then, becomes central to the process. In order for counseling to be effective, clients must trust their counselors with their most intimate thoughts and feelings. The counseling situation is characterized as a “safe space” in which clients should feel free to express themselves without fear of judgment. To attain this goal, however, is a complicated process that is affected by many variables. One of these variables becomes important even before the beginning of the first session; clients enter counseling with many different expectations about their counselors, and these expectations can have dramatic effects on the efficacy of counseling process, outcome, and the relationship between the client and the counselor (Bordin, 1955, as cited in Watkins & Terrell, 1988).

Strong’s (1968) two-stage model of counseling was based on social influence theory. The social influence model of counseling, since that time, has been an area of much psychological research (Wampold & White, 1985). The first stage of the model contends that counselors must establish themselves as expert, attractive, and trustworthy in the client’s eyes, in order to create a power base. Once the client perceives the counselor as highly expert, attractive, and trustworthy, the counselor can begin the second stage of the model, which is to influence the client through therapy (Heppner & Claiborn, 48
Because the counseling process places great importance on the client’s perceptions of the counselor, it is important to study how cultural mistrust may bias a client’s expectations about a counselor’s expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.

The field of psychology has an underrepresentation of ethnic minority counselors and therapists. This means that if a client that is a member of an ethnic minority group enters into a therapeutic relationship, there is a greater possibility of him/her seeing a Caucasian American therapist rather than a therapist from their own group (Poston, Craine & Atkinson, 1991). Watkins and Terrell (1988) performed an analogue counseling study in which they had African American college students see either a European American counselor or an African American counselor. The participants filled out the Cultural Mistrust Inventory (Terrell & Terrell, 1981), as well as the Expectations About Counseling: Brief Form (Tinsley, 1982). The Expectations About Counseling is a 66 item scale on which respondents answer questions on a 7-point Likert scale (do not expect this to be true to definitely expect this to be true) about their expectations of counseling. Results showed that highly mistrustful African Americans expected less from counseling overall, and also had significantly lower expectations of counseling when seeing a Caucasian American counselor as opposed to an African American counselor. It is quite possible that these results could be replicated when examining Asian Americans as well.

These results have varying implications. First, the Cultural Mistrust Inventory seems to reflect a generalized notion of mistrust as well as specific cultural mistrust. It is possible that strong cultural mistrust could create a greater sense of generalized mistrust.
In this case, counseling with any therapist (regardless of ethnicity) would be more difficult. Second, African American clients seem to expect the counselor to be “less accepting and trustworthy, and they have diminished expectations about the counselor’s expertise as a professional helper; they also expect that counseling will be less successful if they are seen by a White counselor.” (Watkins & Terrell, 1988, p. 196). Because of current demographics it is impossible to guarantee that all highly mistrustful ethnic minority group clients will be able to see therapists of their own ethnic minority group. It is more important to try and make Caucasian American therapists aware of possible mistrust issues and encouraging greater sensitivity regarding these issues.

Watkins, Terrell, Terrell, and Miller (1989) conducted a follow-up study that replicated the analogue study and also looked at perceived problem areas and willingness to return to counseling. The results of this study corroborated the earlier findings, with more mistrustful African Americans having lower expectations of Caucasian American counselors. Their results also pointed out four problem areas that African Americans feel a Caucasian American counselor would be less helpful for: general anxiety, shyness, dating difficulties, and feelings of inferiority. These problems are very common in college settings, and thus cultural mistrust can impact utility of college counseling centers by ethnic minority students. The results did not show any significant differences on willingness to return.

The fact that ethnic minority populations are underrepresented in psychology is problematic because studies have shown that clients who see counselors of different ethnic
backgrounds often prematurely terminate therapy (Sue, Zane, & Young, 1994). One of the variables that affects premature termination is cultural mistrust. Studies have shown that premature termination is higher when African American clients see Caucasian American therapists (Terrell & Terrell, 1984), and these findings are generalizable to other ethnic minority groups as well, including Asian Americans.

The Terrell and Terrell (1984) study found that not only are highly mistrustful African American clients more likely to prematurely terminate from counseling when seeing a European American counselor rather than an African American counselor, they are more likely to terminate prematurely in general (regardless of counselor ethnicity). One reason for this, as mentioned earlier, is that the Cultural Mistrust Inventory may reflect a generalized mistrust of all people. A second possible explanation is that the counseling setting itself connotes a European American bias, and highly mistrustful clients may see an African American counselor simply as an extension of majority held views (Terrell & Terrell, 1984). In either case, it is clear that highly mistrustful clients need to be handled in a way that will help to assuage their fears and mistrust so that they may maximally benefit from counseling.

There is another fundamental aspect of counseling that is also hindered by cultural mistrust. Many counselors can be unaware of the effects of culture on the counseling session. They see themselves as “color blind”, meaning they are either “too insecure or too arrogant to acknowledge that racial differences may affect the course of counseling” (Poston, Craine & Atkinson, 1991, p.66). Ignoring the cultural implications of the
difference in race between the counselor and client has been shown to negatively affect ratings of counselors by ethnic minority clients (Pomales, Claiborn, & LaFromboise, 1986). One of the important reasons a counselor must establish him/herself as trustworthy with a client is to allow the client to feel secure in sharing anything they want to with the counselor. Research has found that cultural mistrust can have a negative impact on a client's willingness to self-disclose (Poston, Craine, & Atkinson, 1991).

Thompson, Worthington, and Atkinson (1994) performed a similar study with a sample of only African American women. In their paradigm, the clients actually saw one of two counselors (Caucasian or African American), and their number and depth of self-disclosures were measured. Another variable was the content of the session. The counselors were instructed to either have a universal content orientation or a cultural content orientation. The results of their study give further evidence of the importance of cultural mistrust in counseling. Highly mistrustful clients self-disclosed the least with Caucasian American counselors. The study also showed that clients were more willing to self-disclose intimate aspects of their lives with counselors who addressed cultural topics than with counselors who stayed at a universal level. The clients were also more willing to self-refer with counselors who used cultural content during the session. One surprising finding was that low mistrust clients self-disclosed the most with African American counselors. The authors feel that this may have occurred because the clients (college women) were able to identify better with other African Americans who seemed to have achieved some level of success in a European American society.
The research performed to date has unequivocally shown that cultural mistrust can have a great impact on the counseling situation. Clients who are highly mistrustful will be less likely to use mental health services, will be more likely to terminate prematurely if they begin therapy, and will be less open with therapists. It is also seen that this population of clients will be less willing to trust Caucasian American counselors, will not find them credible, and will not feel that they can be helped by Caucasian American counselors (Nickerson, Helms, & Terrell, 1994).

In order to overcome these hurdles, it is important for Caucasian American counselors to acknowledge cultural differences and when necessary incorporate these differences into therapy (increase the cultural content of the sessions). Counselors who maintain a "color blind" approach to therapy will not have success with ethnic minority clients. Although research on cultural mistrust has only looked at African American populations, it is important to see how this construct may affect counseling with other minorities as well, such as Asian Americans. In the mental health field, all minorities are underrepresented and it is more likely for an ethnic minority client to see a Caucasian American counselor than an ethnic minority counselor. For this reason, it is vital that Caucasian American counselors become more aware of racial differences and incorporate more multicultural counseling content and techniques in their sessions.

**Acculturation**

Members of ethnic minority groups are often faced with many choices regarding their ethnic identities when they enter into another culture. The process by which these
changes occur is termed acculturation. “Acculturation requires the contact of at least two autonomous cultural groups; there must also be change in one or other of the two groups which results from the contact.” (Berry, 1983, p.66). Technically, cultural changes can occur in either direction, but generally the ethnic minority group is the one that adapts. Acculturation can also be studied on an individual rather than a group level, and this is termed psychological acculturation (Graves, 1967). It has been found that not all members of a group experience acculturation in the same way, and there is a need to study psychological acculturation (Berry et al., 1986). In effect, acculturation is an individual process of change and adaptation and ethnic identity is the result of the process. Models of acculturation have been suggested for specific ethnic groups (Cross, 1971; Sue & Sue, 1973; Suinn et al., 1987). Sue and Sue (1973) were one of the first to propose a model for Asian Americans, specifically Chinese Americans. They saw the acculturation process resulting in three personality types. The Traditionalist is someone who has a strong Asian identity and adheres to those values. This person does not respond aggressively to racism but works harder to overcome barriers. Marginal Man does not abide by traditional values, and instead he/she attempts to acculturate into the dominant (Caucasian) culture. This person may experience some type of identity crisis from being caught between the two cultures. Finally, the Asian American is able to retain some ethnic values and also acculturate to some degree into the majority culture. The Asian American creates a new personality that shares aspects of the Traditionalist and Marginal Man.
A model formulated by Berry (1980) also describes the process of acculturation, but for any ethnic minority group. This model suggests that individuals living with another group are confronted with two questions: "Is it considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics" and "Is it considered to be of value to maintain relationships with other groups" (Dona & Berry, 1994, p.58). Depending on the answers to these two questions the individual can be categorized into one of four modes of acculturation: integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization.

The early work done on ethnic cultural change focused on only one mode of acculturation, assimilation (Leong & Chou, 1994). The theory of assimilation assumed that the longer an ethnic minority group was in contact with a host group, the more similar the ethnic minority would become to the host. It was a bipolar view of acculturation. In Berry's model, an Assimilationist is a person who no longer values maintaining his/her own cultural identity, but does value maintaining relationships with other groups. This combination eventually results in the individual adopting the other culture's values while simultaneously moving further away from his/her own group's values (Dona & Berry, 1994). This individual is similar to the Marginal Man from Sue and Sue's model described above. Even though these individuals take on the host group's beliefs and values, it is still often difficult to become completely assimilated, especially if the groups are racially different and thus have different physical characteristics.

The separation mode is the opposite of assimilation. The individual considers it valuable to maintain their own cultural identity and characteristics, but does not value
maintaining relationships with other groups. This mode resembles the Traditionalist personality type from Sue and Sue's formulation. These individuals can have a difficult time succeeding in the dominant culture because of their refusal to adopt the other culture's value system. It is also possible that separation is forced onto the ethnic minority group, such as the slavery era in the United States and the South African policy of apartheid (Berry, 1983).

The integration mode of acculturation is similar to the Asian American from the model developed by Sue and Sue. The Integrationist values both maintaining cultural identity and characteristics as well as maintaining relationships with other groups. The individuals in this mode are able to capitalize on the benefits of both cultures, giving them an advantage over the other groups. The Integrationist is able to feel at ease in both cultures and move freely between the two. These individuals may have better mental health than persons in any of the other modes (Berry & Kim, 1988).

The final mode in Berry's scheme is marginalization, one that does not exist in the other models. The Marginalist does not value maintaining cultural identity and characteristics or maintaining relationships with other groups (Dona & Berry, 1994). This person may be in a state of identity crisis where he/she does not feel comfortable with either culture and is seeking an acceptable alternative. It is postulated that persons in this mode would have the worst mental health of the four groups (Berry & Kim, 1988). The fact that this group is not described in the other models could mean that Berry has
hypothesized a group that does not exist, or that the other models have overlooked an important outcome of acculturation (Leong & Chou, 1994). Further research is needed in this area to establish which of the above is true.

Acculturation is a very complicated because of the numerous factors that can affect the process. Among minorities there are differences at the group level (Chinese Americans vs. Hispanic Americans) as well as individual differences within the groups. Compounded with those factors is the culture into which the ethnic minority group is entering. Some cultures are more accepting of different groups and welcome diversity, while others expect the ethnic minority groups to assimilate to the new culture. Different localities in the same host country can prove to have very different attitudes as well. For example, the southern part of the United States is often thought of as more racist than the northern part. Because examining the actual process of acculturation is problematic, researchers have concentrated on outcome studies where acculturation level is used to predict some other behavior.

While considerably more work has been done with African American and Hispanic American populations, the literature on Asian Americans has been growing, aided by Sue and Sue’s (1973) and Berry’s models of acculturation and by the development of an acculturation scale for Asian Americans (Leong & Chou, 1994). The majority of the current literature on Asian Americans focuses on the effects of acculturation on career issues (Leong, 1993; Leong & Chou, 1994; Park & Harrison, 1995) and on mental health concerns (Gim, Atkinson & Whitely, 1990; Moy, 1992; Tabora & Flaskerud, 1994). This
research is beneficial in that it helps to explain the ways in which minorities deal with stressors they encounter, as well as how to help them cope with these situations. It also serves to make the psychological community more aware of ethnic differences and provide information on treating ethnic minority populations. Still, it does not increase understanding about the process of acculturation.

Measuring the acculturation level of ethnic individuals has not always been followed in a consistent fashion. One of the main reasons for this is the different definitions used to describe acculturation. Phinney (1990) states that ethnic identity has at times been used synonymously with acculturation, but they are different constructs. A person that is highly acculturated may be high or low in ethnic identity, so the two must be differentiated. Similarly, assimilation has also been used to define acculturation even though it is only one possible outcome of the process. Even recently (Caro & Ewert, 1995) acculturation level has been measured by length of residence in the U.S. This in no way accounts for the possibility of maintaining one’s own culture while resisting the dominant culture. Currently, the most accurate way to measure acculturation is to use a scale specifically constructed for that purpose.

The majority of the acculturation scales currently available have been created for Hispanic populations (Barona & Miller, 1994; Cuellar, Harris & Jasso, 1980; Olmedo, Martinez & Martinez, 1978). Many other studies have used variations of these scales, especially the Acculturation Ratings Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA) created by Cuellar et al. (1980). Although there has also been interest in how African Americans
acculturate, many of those studies focus on racial identity rather than acculturation and use scales such as the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Parham & Helms, 1980). Acculturation in Asian Americans has been associated with many factors that affect their mental health, such as willingness to seek counseling (Gim, Atkinson & Whitely, 1990). However, until recently there were no objective measures of acculturation for Asian Americans. To remedy this deficiency, the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn et al., 1987) was constructed.

The SL-ASIA was modeled on the ARSMA, the Mexican-American acculturation scale. The SL-ASIA was approached so that it would look at the multidimensionality of acculturation, the issue of bicultural development, and would assess cognitive, behavioral, and attitudinal areas (Suinn et al., 1987). The acculturation score is given as a mean score from 1 to 5. An assimilated person would score a closer to 5 while a separationist would score closer to 1. A person who retained some ethnic identity while also acculturating to the dominant society (medium acculturation) would score around a 3. There is also a question on the scale that allows the individual to identify themselves as either “very Asian”, “bicultural”, or “very Anglicized”, which can then be compared to the individual’s total score. In this scale, the term “bicultural” refers more to a person who has attained a medium level of acculturation, rather than a person who is biracial, having parents of different races.

The psychometric qualities of the scale have been studied and reliability and validity have been found to have acceptable levels. In the initial report (Suinn et al.,
1987), the Cronbach's alpha for reliability was .88, showing a high level of internal consistency. A second study (Suinn et al., 1992) measured the reliability at .91. Validity was assessed initially by comparing acculturation level to generation level, and a positive correlation was found (the later the generational level the higher the acculturation level) (Suinn et al., 1987). Concurrent validity was also found to be acceptable when acculturation level was demographic information such as: total years of schooling in the U.S., years living in the U.S., age upon arriving in U.S., and self-rating of acculturation (Suinn et al., 1992). As a measure of acculturation the SL-ASIA is psychometrically sound, simple to administer, and easy to score. It also looks at acculturation as a multidimensional process rather than a bipolar one, all of which made it an appropriate tool to use in this study.

Suinn (1999; personal communication) has modified the SL-ASIA slightly to improve its effectiveness in determining acculturation level. The version used in this study contains 5 additional questions that deal with: how much the respondent believes in Asian values, how much the respondent believes in Western values, how much the respondent fits in with other Asians, how much the respondent fits in with Westerners, and how the respondent identifies him/herself based on ethnicity. Scoring of this version can be done using the original 21 items and getting a mean score. Alternatively, one can look at questions 22/23 together and classify based on values, 24/25 together and classify based on behavioral competencies, or by question 26, their self-identification.
Self-Construal

One of the criticisms of the social influence model is that it ignores individual differences in clients, leading to the myth of client uniformity. The cultural variables discussed above are examples of how client differences may play an important role in the counseling process. Another such variable is self-construal. In some ways related to acculturation, self-construal is a construct that helps to indicate the manner in which persons define themselves and their relationships with others. The manner in which a person defines their sense of self can have a great impact on the process of counseling, and can help determine the techniques that should be used by the counselor for the most positive counseling outcome.

The basis of research on self-construal began with the notion of individualistic versus collective societies. This distinction postulated that persons in an individualistic society were more prone to give priority to personal goals over group goals. Members of a collectivistic society, on the other hand, were more likely to place importance on group goals over individual goals. In general, Western societies were regarded as individualistic in nature, while Eastern societies were regarded as collectivistic in nature. It is clear that culture can have a great impact on a person’s self-construal, but other concepts such as values and beliefs can also affect self-construal. Self-construal is conceptualized as “constellations of thoughts, feelings, and actions concerning one’s relationship to others, and the self as distinct from others.” (Singelis, 1994; pg.581).
There are two main types of self-construal. The first of these is the independent self-construal. This term relates quite closely to the concept of individualism. An independent self-construal emphasizes: internal abilities, thoughts, and feelings; being unique and expressing the self; promoting one’s own goals; and being direct in communication (Singelis, 1994). It is clear that these attributes of the self correspond well to the notion of counseling as conceptualized by Western practitioners. A person with a strong independent self-construal will do well in a Western style of therapy because they have a strong, independent sense of self, and are able to express themselves directly. The whole notion of “self-actualization” is to create a strong independent self-construal, a feeling that one is special and to be the best that one can be.

The other type of self-construal has been termed the interdependent self-construal. This type of self-construal closely resembles the notion of collectivism. An interdependent self-construal emphasizes: external, public features such as statuses, roles, and relationships; belonging and fitting in; occupying one’s proper place in society; and being indirect in communication and “reading others’ minds”. (Singelis, 1994). For a person with a strong interdependent self-construal, self-esteem arises through harmonious relationships with others. Because of this, any type of confrontation will be a negative experience. Also, this type of self-construal does not lend itself to speaking honestly about how one feels. In contrast to the independent self-construal, the goal here is not to fulfill one’s own needs, but rather to create harmony with others. Expressing oneself
honestly at all times can run counter to this goal. In Western modes of therapy, however, this lack of honesty can be seen as defensiveness or resistance, rather than an attempt to maintain harmony between the client and counselor.

An important point to consider regarding self-construal is that every person has elements of both types of self-construal; a person does not solely have an independent or interdependent self-construal. Rather, the two are seen to be continuous variables and all persons will be positioned somewhere on that continuum for both types (Singelis, 1994). In this regard, self-construal is conceptualized such that one can be strong on one and weak on the other, or equal on both. In fact, Singelis (1994) points out that the development of the two types of self-construal can be very adaptive, especially for people who find that they have to move between different types of cultures (collectivistic and individualistic). Asian Americans that identify themselves as bicultural will most likely have strong independent and interdependent self-construals for just that reason.

There has been some evidence garnered to show that the above theory (that persons can have both types of self-construals) has merit. A study by Brockner and Chen (1996) examined how self-construal and self-esteem moderated reactions to a threat to the self. The samples used were from the United States and China. As expected, the U.S. sample (high on independent self-construal) overall had a greater rate of self-protection in response to negative feedback. However, there was also a subset of the Chinese sample, formerly assumed to be collectivistic, that scored highly on independent self-construal and showed a similar reaction to the U.S. sample. This shows that culture alone does not
dictate self-construal, and that, like acculturation, it is open to individual differences.

Another study (Sharkey & Singelis, 1995) looked at the construct of embarrassability and self-construal. Their results showed that persons with more interdependent self-construal are more prone to embarrassment than those with independent self-construal. Again, this could affect how counseling may proceed with these two different types of individuals. A person with a strong interdependent self-construal will be more hesitant to disclose personal information because it could lead to embarrassment.

In an interesting study by Kashima et al. (1995) examined the construct of self-construal in relation to gender and culture. It was found that cultural differences are more related to the individualistic dimension of self, while gender differences were found to be related to the relational aspects of the self. These results are important because they show that a previous conceptualization of types of persons was not accurate. Asians were often put into one type with women, while the other type consisted of men and Westerners. The Kashima et al. (1995) study shows that cultural differences and gender differences occur with different aspects of the self. In addition, it was found that ethnicities (Korean vs. Japanese) also differed in their self-construal, showing that even societies that are both deemed to be collectivistic can differ in their manner of self-construal.

The measurement of self-construal becomes an important matter, especially since it has been shown that there can be differences in self-construal between individuals from similar cultures (Brockner & Chen, 1996). Previous research has used measures of individualism-collectivism (a cultural construct), as well as psychologically related
measures such as idiocentrism (individualism) and allocentrism (collectivism). The constructs of interdependent and independent self-construals were also measured using a paper and pencil measure (Cross & Markus, 1991). Singelis (1994) has proposed a scale to measure the constructs of interdependent and independent self-construals that he feels corrects some of the problems encountered with previous scales. Some of the problems that were addressed include: measures of individualism-collectivism were bipolar in nature and may not accurately measure self-construal; the reliabilities were often problematic (one scale showed Hong Kong students to be more individualistic than American students); some studies focused on cultural differences rather than individual differences; and lastly, the previous self-construal scale focused on values and did not adequately consider the range of behaviors and feelings that contribute to self-construal (Singelis, 1994).

The measure proposed by Singelis (1994) began with 45 items that were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). This measure was given to a sample and factor analyzed. Items that did not load significantly onto either of the two factors, or loaded equally on the two were dropped. This left a total of 24 items, 12 per type of self-construal. The sample used consisted of multiple ethnicities (African American, Caucasian American, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Korean, Samoan, and mixed) and was thus expected to represent a wide range of self-construal.

Analysis of the measure showed acceptable validity. The scale has good face validity, and also good construct validity. The sample was divided into Asian Americans
and Caucasian Americans and compared. Asians came out higher on interdependent self-construal while Caucasians showed higher independent self-construal, consistent with past studies (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Predictive validity was examined by giving each of the participants four scenarios. Each of the scenarios had three parts: a description of the people involved; a description of the setting; a verbatim dialogue containing an exchange of greetings, a request, and a reply. Two questions followed to see how much each participant felt the situation had influenced the reply to the request. Results showed that the interdependent subscale score was a better predictor than ethnic group alone. Asian Americans and those with higher interdependent scores attributed more influence to the situation than those with lower interdependence scores. These results replicate prior studies that show that individuals from collectivistic cultures make greater attributions to situational influences. Divergent validity was also shown because independence scores varied between ethnic groups but were not associated with attributions to the situation. The Self-Construal Scale seems to have adequate validity and reliability, and seems to effectively partial out independent and interdependent self-construals, thus making it an appropriate tool to use in this study.

The Self-Construal Scale used in this study was composed of 30 items, rather than the original 24 items. Singelis (personal communication, 1999) added six items to the scale (3 for the interdependent subscale, 3 for the independent subscale) in order to improve the internal reliability of the scale. For this reason, the 30-item scale will be used in this study.
Research Hypotheses

Caucasian American and Asian American Between Group Differences

Hypothesis 1: Self Construal: Asian Americans will score higher for interdependent self-construal than Caucasian Americans, and Asian Americans will score lower for independent self-construal than Caucasian Americans.

Hypothesis 2: Social Influence:
A. Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being more attractive than Asian Americans rating the same counselor.
B. Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being more expert than Asian Americans rating the same counselor.
C. Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being more trustworthy than Asian Americans rating the same counselor.
D. Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being more credible than Asian Americans rating the same counselor.

Hypothesis 3: Credibility:
A. Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having more credibility for working with Caucasian Americans than Asian Americans rating the same counselor.
B. Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having more credibility for working with Asian Americans than Asian Americans rating the same counselor.
C. Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having more credibility for working with people of all ethnicities than Asian Americans rating the same counselor.

**Hypothesis 4: Willingness to Self-Disclose:** Caucasian Americans will be more willing to self-disclose than Asian Americans.

**Asian American Within Group Differences by Acculturation**

**Hypothesis 5: Acculturation**

A. **Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust:** Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will have a greater amount of cultural mistrust than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

B. **Acculturation and Self-Construal:**
   1. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will also score lower for independent self-construal than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.
   2. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will score higher for interdependent self-construal than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

C. **Acculturation and Social Influence:**
   1. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will find the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be less attractive than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.
2. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will find the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be less expert than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

3. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will find the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be less trustworthy than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

4. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will find the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be less credible than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

D. Acculturation and Credibility:

1. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having less credibility for working with Caucasian Americans than high acculturation Asian Americans.

2. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having less credibility for working with Asian Americans than high acculturation Asian Americans.

3. Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having less credibility for working with people of all ethnicities than high acculturation Asian Americans.
E. Acculturation and Willingness to Self-Disclose: Asian Americans who are of low acculturation will be less willing to self-disclose in general, and will be willing to self-disclose in fewer situations than Asian Americans of high acculturation.

Asian American Within Group Differences by Cultural Mistrust

Hypothesis 6: Cultural Mistrust

A. Cultural Mistrust and Social Influence:

1. Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being less attractive than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust.

2. Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being less expert than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust.

3. Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being less trustworthy than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust.

4. Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being less credible than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust.
B. **Cultural Mistrust and Credibility:**

1. Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having less credibility for working with Caucasian Americans than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust.

2. Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor as having less credibility when working with Asian Americans than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust.

3. Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor as having less credibility when working with people of all different ethnicities than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust.

C. **Cultural Mistrust and Willingness to Self-Disclose:** Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will be less willing to self-disclose in general, and will be willing to self-disclose in fewer situations than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust.

**Predictive Abilities of Cultural Variables**

**Hypothesis 7: The CRF**

A. Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust, and Self-Construal will be significant predictors of counselor attractiveness on the CRF.
B. Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust, and Self-Construal will be significant predictors of counselor expertness on the CRF.

C. Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust, and Self-Construal will be significant predictors of counselor trustworthiness on the CRF.

D. Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust, and Self-Construal will be significant predictors of counselor credibility on the CRF.

**Hypothesis 8: The CCRS**

A. Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust, and Self-Construal will be significant predictors of counselor credibility for working with Caucasian Americans on the CCRS.

B. Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust, and Self-Construal will be significant predictors of counselor credibility for working with Asian Americans on the CCRS.

C. Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust, and Self-Construal will be significant predictors of counselor credibility for working with all ethnicities on the CCRS.

**Hypothesis 9: The SDSS**

A. Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust, and Self-Construal will be significant predictors of total self-disclosure on the SDSS.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter describes the sample of participants that was used in this study, as well as the procedures that were followed in conducting the study. In addition, the development, scoring, and psychometric properties of the instruments are detailed. Next, the specific hypotheses that were investigated in this study are outlined, followed by the design of the study and the statistical analyses that were used to examine the hypotheses.

Participants

Participants for this study consisted of two groups, Asian-Americans (N = 226, with usable data from 173 participants) and Caucasian Americans (N = 284). All participants were recruited from an Introductory Psychology class. Participation was on a voluntary basis and was used by the students to fulfill part of a research requirement for the course. An attempt was made to recruit similar numbers of males and females in order to make gender comparisons, and a significant number of differing ethnicities and acculturation levels in order to perform the appropriate comparisons between those levels.
All participants were given six scales to complete, as well as a demographic questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire was used to determine the participants’ age, gender, college major, place of birth, time in the U.S., immigration status and ethnicity. The scales administered were: the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Scale (SL-ASIA), the Self-Construal Scale (SCS), the Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI), the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), the Counselor Credibility Rating Scale (CCRS), the Self-Disclosure Situation Survey (SDSS), Rotter’s Interpersonal Trust Scale (RITS), and the Hope Scale (HS). Caucasian Americans were not given the SL-ASIA or the CMI; Asian Americans were not given the RITS or the HS. The scales were administered in the following order for the Asian Americans: CRF, SDSS, SCS, Demographics, CCRS, CMI, SL-ASIA.

The scales were administered in the following order for the Caucasian Americans: CRF, SDSS, SCS, Demographics, CCRS, RITS, HS. The instruments were ordered in this manner to simplify data collection. The Rotter Interpersonal Trust Scale and Hope Scale were included for two reasons. One reason was so that both groups of participants would respond to a similar number of items. Second, because the Asian Americans were filling out a questionnaire about trust (the CMI), it was felt that the Caucasian Americans should have a similar experience and thus were given the RITS. Neither the RITS nor the HS were analyzed as no hypotheses corresponding to either of these scales were proposed. In order to accommodate the total number of items from all the instruments, as well to accommodate the differing number of answer choices on the instruments (ranging
from 2 to 9), two different data collection sheets (scantrons) had to be used. Instruments were grouped such that those with five or fewer answer choices were collected on one sheet, while those with more than five answer choices were collected on the second sheet.

Procedure

The Introductory Psychology students that participated in this study were solicited through the Research Experience Program. Participants were informed at the time of sign-up that they would have to watch a video and fill out a number of inventories, and that this would not take more than sixty minutes or so to complete. Participants were also informed that the experiment was performed to study their feelings toward counseling and counselors. At the time of data collection, instructions were given on how to complete each of the surveys and participants were reminded to leave no questions unanswered. The participants were shown a 10 minute segment of video (a Caucasian male therapist in session with a Caucasian male client who is dealing with relationship issues) that demonstrates a typical counseling session. The video clip that was used was Dr. Hans Strupp with the client Richard, from “Three Approaches to Psychotherapy” (Shostrom 1987). After viewing the tape, students were asked to fill out the questionnaires, relating their answers to their impressions of the counselor on the tape. The students took the inventories in group settings with a maximum of 50 students per session. After they completed the inventories the students were given a note of debriefing that explained the purpose of the study and gave an office address and an e-mail address where the researcher could be contacted in case of questions.
**Video Stimulus**

The video segment that was used in this study was of Dr. Hans Strupp with the client Richard, from “Three Approaches to Psychotherapy” (Shostrom, 1987). The video segment was an integral part of the study, and it was determined that the segment should not portray any specific theoretical orientation, as that could have become a confounding factor in the study. The video segment that was chosen was determined to be free of any theoretical orientation, and thus appropriate for this study. The video segment used involved a Caucasian male therapist with a Caucasian male client. The subject matter of the segment concerned the client’s difficulty in relationships with women, including his recent divorce and problems with his ex-wife. It was believed that using two Caucasian males minimized any race and gender effects that may have confounded the study, and that the subject matter of the session was suitable for the present study.

After the video segment was chosen by the lead investigator, a pilot group of graduate students in counseling and clinical psychology were asked to rate the segment on a number of dimensions. The dimensions included their determination of whether a specific theoretical orientation was portrayed, how “typical” they felt the segment was of a counseling session, the appropriateness of the length of the segment, the appropriateness of the subject matter of the session, and any other comments they felt would be beneficial to improving the study. The feedback from this pilot group was that the theoretical
orientation of the therapist could not be determined, that the session was fairly representative of counseling in their experience, and that the length and subject matter of the clip was appropriate for the study.

**Instruments**

**The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale**

The original Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn et al., 1987) is a 21 item measure used to assess the level of acculturation of an individual. This measure was developed specifically to be used with Asian Americans, but was modeled after the ARSMA, a Mexican-American acculturation scale. The SL-ASIA was created because although acculturation was already accepted to have an important role in ethnic minority issues, there was no reliable and valid measure that could be used with Asian Americans (Suinn et al., 1992).

The items on the SL-ASIA are in multiple-choice format, and the acculturation score is derived by summing across the items. The summed scores can be studied as they are or a mean score can be found by dividing the total by 21. A mean score of 1 denotes low acculturation, while a mean score of 5 denotes high acculturation. A bicultural individual (medium acculturation), one who identifies with both the ethnic and majority cultures, would have a mean score of 3. The questions on the scale are divided as follows: language (4 items), identity (4 items), friendship choice (4 items), behaviors (5 items),
generation/geographic history (3 items), and attitudes (1 item). Also, since the label Asian American encompasses a number of countries, the questions were created to account for this (Suinn et al., 1987).

The initial report of the reliability and validity of the SL-ASIA (Suinn et al., 1987) was based on two small samples of college students (N=35, N=47), one from Colorado State University and one from UCLA. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for reliability was .88, suggesting a high level of internal consistency and an acceptable reliability. Two tests for validity were also conducted. One looked at generation level and the other looked at length of residence in the U.S. Both tests showed results in the expected direction, acculturation level rising with higher generational level and increasing length of residence in the U.S. Mean values of acculturation were 2.96, 3.57, 3.78, 3.78, and 3.85 for first to fifth generation levels, respectively. These were encouraging results, and a second study was done to further evaluate the scale.

Suinn et al. (1992) used a larger sample (N=324, 284 with usable data) to test the scale’s psychometric qualities. The mean age of the sample was 24.4 years and an average length of stay in the U.S. of 17.9 years, ranging from 1 to 45 years. There were 137 first generation students, 76 second, 31 third, 26 fourth, and 14 fifth generation students. This time the reliability coefficient was .91, higher than in the initial report. A factorial analysis of the scale resulted in five factors: reading/writing/cultural preference (41.5% of the variance), ethnic interaction (10.7%), affinity for identity and pride (6.6%), generational identity (5.9%), and food preference (5%). Three of these factors were also found in the
ARSMA, the model for this scale. Concurrent validity was established by comparing acculturation level with demographic information such as: total years attending school in the U.S. \( (r=0.61) \), age upon attending school in the U.S. \( (r=-0.6) \), years living in the U.S. \( (r=0.56) \), age upon arriving in the U.S. \( (r=-0.49) \), years lived in a non-Asian neighborhood \( (r=0.41) \), and self-rating of acculturation \( (r=0.62) \). These analyses supported the notion that the SL-ASIA is a psychometrically viable measure of acculturation, and was a good scale to use in the current study.

Suinn (1999; personal communication) has modified the SL-ASIA slightly to improve its effectiveness in determining acculturation level. The version used in this study contains 5 additional questions that deal with: how much the respondent believes in Asian values, how much the respondent believes in Western values, how much the respondent fits in with other Asians, how much the respondent fits in with Westerners, and how the respondent identifies him/herself based on ethnicity. Scoring of this version can be done using the original 21 items and getting a mean score. Alternatively, one can look at questions 22/23 together and classify based on values, 24/25 together and classify based on behavioral competencies, or by question 26, their self-identification. After consideration of the responses to the SL-ASIA by the Asian Americans in this study, as well as reliability statistics, it was decided to examine acculturation using the mean score obtained from responses to the first 21 items. Because this trichotomization resulted in highly unequal cell sizes, a specific check for homogeneity of variance was performed. The results showed that homogeneity of variance was not a problem in this study.
The Cultural Mistrust Inventory

The Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI; Terrell & Terrell, 1981) is a 48-item self-report measure in which respondents indicate the degree to which they mistrust European Americans. Responses are made on a 7 point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). Higher scores are reflect a greater tendency to mistrust European Americans, while lower scores reflect greater trust. Four areas were found in which African Americans are mistrustful of European Americans. These areas are: educational and training settings, political and legal systems, work and business interactions, and interpersonal and social contexts. Obviously counseling situations are included under the domain of interpersonal and social contexts. Some illustrative examples of questions from the Cultural Mistrust Inventory are: “Blacks should be wary of a white person who tries to be friendly”, and “Black parents should teach their children not to trust white teachers” (Terrell, Terrell, & Taylor, 1981).

This study used a modified version of the Cultural Mistrust Inventory. This version replaced the terms “Black” and “White” with “Asian American” and “Caucasian American”. In this way, the scale was adapted to the present population being studied. The original CMI was developed so that each item correlated significantly with one of the subscales mentioned above. In addition, items that were frequently endorsed by a majority of the subjects were eliminated. To control for social desirability effects, the CMI was administered along with a Social Desirability Scale, and any items that correlated at the .05 significance level were eliminated. The test-retest reliability of the CMI was reported.
to be .86 over a two week period (Terrell & Terrell, 1981). The external validity of the CMI was examined with its correlation to the Racial Discrimination Index (RDI; Terrell & Miller, 1980), a measure of racialistic incidents that the subject had been a victim of. The hypothesis was that those with a higher score on the RDI would also have a higher score on the CMI. Evidence was found to support this hypothesis, and thus show the external validity of the CMI.

The modified version of the CMI that was used in this study was initially given to a development sample of psychology faculty and graduate students as a pilot test. Items were scrutinized for understandability and appropriateness. This was done to eliminate items that may not be appropriate for use, or those that were judged as not understandable. The modified version of the CMI used in this study was created in order to assess whether cultural mistrust is a construct that is applicable to ethnic minorities other than African Americans. If applicable to Asian Americans as well, then this could possibly be one of the reasons why Asian Americans underutilize counseling, and terminate prematurely. It was also felt that this could help point out ways that counselors could minimize cultural mistrust in their clients, and thus increase the likelihood of positive counseling experiences.

**The Counselor Rating Form**

The Counselor Rating Form (CRF; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) was developed to measure social influence as theorized by Strong, specifically to measure the constructs of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. The scale consists of 36 adjectives that are
paired with antonyms. Each of the adjectives are supposed to be exemplars of one of the constructs mentioned above, such that each construct is represented by 12 adjectives. The participant then rates the counselor on a 7-point Likert scale for each of the adjective pairs. An example of an item pair would be “alert-unalert” or “trustworthy-untrustworthy”. Each of the three subscales could then have a score range from 12 to 84).

The CRF was initially evaluated by having 202 students evaluate three therapists (Rogers, Perls and Ellis from the film *Three Approaches to Psychotherapy*, Shostrom, 1966) (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975). The results were promising but more verification was needed to show that the three constructs were truly separate factors. LaCrosse and Barak (1976) replicated the earlier study with 127 students evaluating a single therapist (one of the three mentioned earlier). Results showed that the reliability coefficients for the scales across counselors were: .874 for expertness, .850 for attractiveness, and .908 for trustworthiness. Although the subscale intercorrelations were high for the three constructs, the authors state that “each dimension appears to have enough uniqueness to be considered a separate entity for both theoretical and practical use.” (pg. 171). They also state that the high intercorrelations may also reflect another common component of perceived counselor behavior, a component termed “persuasiveness” or “charisma”.

The CRF has also been found to have predictive validity, such that ratings on the CRF have been associated with counseling outcomes with actual clients and counselors (LaCrosse, 1980). It was found that ratings of expertness were the most powerful predictors of counseling outcome. It was also found that ratings of counselors increased
significantly from precounseling to postcounseling. The intercorrelations among constructs remained relatively high, but were lower than previous studies. Because this study took place in a field setting, it provided further evidence that the CRF may be a useful tool to assess counselor characteristics. Barak and Dell (1977) found similar results in that the three dimensions of the CRF were found to correlate positively with client willingness to self-refer to an observed counselor.

The CRF uses the social influence model as its theoretical beginning and aims to measure the constructs of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Because so much work has been done to evaluate the CRF, and because reliability coefficients and predictive validity have been shown to be in the acceptable range, the CRF is a good tool to measure the social influence of counselors. Also, because the CRF is used so often, it was helpful to see how effective it was when used by an ethnic minority population, thus attesting to its generalizability.

The Self-Construal Survey

Singelis (1994) has proposed a scale to measure the constructs of interdependent and independent self-construals that he feels corrects some of the problems encountered with previous scales. Some of the problems include: measures of individualism-collectivism were bipolar in nature and may not accurately measure self-construals; the reliabilities were often problematic (one scale showed Hong Kong students to be more individualistic than American students); some studies focused on cultural differences rather
than individual differences; and lastly, the previous self-construal scale focused on values and did not adequately consider the range of behaviors and feelings that contribute to self-construals (Singelis, 1994).

The measure proposed by Singelis (1994) was originally composed of 45 items that were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). This measure was given to a sample and factor analyzed. Items that did not load significantly onto either of the two factors, or loaded equally on the two were dropped. This left a total of 24 items, 12 per type of self-construal. The sample used consisted of multiple ethnicities (African American, Caucasian American, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Korean, Samoan, and mixed) and was thus expected to represent a wide range of self-construals.

Reliability of the scale was found to be acceptable. Reliability was assessed for both sets of items (interdependent and dependent) with two separate samples. For the interdependent items, Cronbach alpha’s of .73 and .74 were obtained respectively. For the dependent items, Cronbach alpha’s of .69 and .70 were obtained, respectively. In a second study, the interdependent items had a Cronbach’s alpha of .72, while the dependent items had a Cronbach’s alpha of .72. The second study had an N of 365 (Sharkey & Singelis, 1995).

The measure was analyzed twice to determine if validity was acceptable; the first sample consisted of 360 students, while the second consisted of 160 students. Analysis of the measure showed acceptable validity levels. The scale has good face validity for both sets of items. The items chosen focus directly on the characteristics that define the
constructs. The SCS also had good construct validity, which was assessed by comparing the Asian Americans in the two samples with the Caucasian Americans in the two samples. Asian Americans came out higher on interdependent self-construals while Caucasians showed higher independent self-construals, consistent with past studies (Singelis, 1994).

Predictive validity was examined by giving each of the participants four scenarios. Each of the scenarios had three parts: a description of the people involved; a description of the setting; a verbatim dialogue containing an exchange of greetings, a request, and a reply. Two questions followed to see how much each participant felt the situation had influenced the reply to the request. Results showed that the interdependent subscale score alone ($R^2=.033, p<.01$) was a better predictor than ethnic group alone ($R^2=.018, p<.05$). Asian Americans and those with higher interdependent scores attributed more influence to the situation than those with lower interdependence scores. These results replicate prior studies that show that individuals from collectivistic cultures make greater attributions to situational influences. Divergent validity was also shown because independence scores varied between ethnic groups but were not associated with attributions to the situation. The Self-Construal Scale seems to have adequate validity and reliability, and seems to effectively partial out independent and interdependent self-construals, thus making it an appropriate tool to use in this study.

The Self-Construal Scale used in this study was composed of 30 items, rather than the original 24 items. Singelis (personal communication, 1999) added six items to the scale (3 for the interdependent subscale, 3 for the independent subscale) in order to
improve the internal reliability of the scale. It was found that the reliability for the independent scale was improved with the addition of the 3 items (.6499 without the additional items, .7072 with the additional items). This was also true for the interdependent scale (.6543 without the additional items, .6978 with the additional items). For this reason, the 30-item scale was used in this study.

**Counselor Credibility Rating Scale**

Counselor credibility is usually operationalized as a combination of trustworthiness and expertness. In the literature, this has been accomplished by using the CRF and combining the scales that measure those two constructs. This study will assess credibility using the CRF as well. However, this is an inferred measure of credibility. A review of the literature did not reveal a scale to measure credibility directly that would be appropriate for this study. Therefore, the author developed the Counselor Credibility Rating Scale (CCRS) as a tool that could be used to directly measure credibility across different ethnic groups. This scale looked at how an individual rated a counselor’s credibility for working with clients who are members of the majority (Caucasian) group, their own group (in this case, Asian Americans or Caucasian Americans), and for all individuals, regardless of group affiliation. It was hypothesized that client attributes, such as their cultural background and ethnicity, would differentially affect how they rated the credibility of a counselor for working with different groups of people.

The CCRS is a 12-item instrument that uses a 5 point Likert scale to determine participants’ perception of a counselor as credible. The Likert scale ranged from Strongly
disagree (1), to Strongly agree (5). The items for the CCRS were generated by reviewing
the literature on trustworthiness and expertness, exploring the definition of credibility, as
well as by studying the Counselor Rating Form and the Counselor Effectiveness Rating
Scale (CERS; Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975). The items of the CCRS attempted to tap
into the construct of credibility directly, and were arranged in a manner that allowed the
person taking the scale to rate the counselor in relation to working with individuals of
differing cultural backgrounds.

The Counselor Credibility Rating Scale still needed to be assessed as to its
statistical soundness. This was accomplished by administering the CCRS to a
development sample of psychology graduate students, as well as counseling psychology
faculty who acted as experts. The items of the CCRS were scrutinized by the experts for
understandability, and for how well the items tapped into the construct of credibility. The
CCRS was also correlated with the CRF measure of credibility (the expertness and
trustworthiness scales combined).

Th reliability and validity of the CCRS were also assessed to ensure that the scale
was sound. Content validity of the CCRS was assessed by asking experts (counseling
psychology faculty) to examine the items and rate them as appropriate. Criterion-related
validity was assessed by using the CRF and correlating the results of the CCRS to the
expertness and trustworthiness scales of the CRF. Reliability was assessed by obtaining
reliability coefficients. In this manner, it was ensured that the CCRS was a valid and
reliable instrument and appropriate for use in this study.
The Self-Disclosure Situations Survey

Willingness to self-disclose has been studied for many years, but previous attempts have focused mainly on the individual. Usually, the subject is asked to self-report how willing they are to self-disclose, to whom they would self-disclose, or what they would be willing to self-disclose about (Chelune, 1976). However, other studies have pointed out that situational factors can play a major role in how much, and what topics an individual will self-disclose about. Some of these situational factors include the relationship of the persons involved (Pedersen & Higbee, 1969), verbal and non-verbal behaviors of the person being disclosed to (Jourard & Jaffe, 1970), and the topic of communication (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958).

Level of self-disclosure, then, seems to be a function of three separate but related factors: setting conditions (situation), interpersonal factors (the relationship), and intra-individual differences. The Self-Disclosure Situations Survey was developed to specifically tap into these dimensions of self-disclosure. The SDSS is a self-report measure that assesses a person’s self-disclosure across various social situations and to various target persons.

The SDSS is a twenty item self-report measure that uses a 6-point Likert scale (1 = I would be willing to discuss only certain topics, and on a superficial level only, if at all, in this situation; 6 = I would be willing to express, in complete detail, personal information about myself in such a way that the other person(s) truly understand(s) where I stand in terms of my feelings and thoughts regarding any topic) (Chelune, 1976). The items of the
SDSS are divided into 4 categories of situations, having 5 items each. The categories are: friend, group of friends, stranger, group of strangers. Each of these four target persons then has five social situations associated with it, for a total of twenty items. The five social situations vary on the level of intimacy they involve (for example, meeting someone in a library (low intimacy level) versus being on a date (high intimacy level).

Scoring of the SDSS can be performed in two ways. One can calculate a total self-disclosure score by summing across all situations. It is also possible to calculate subtotal scores by summing across situations in each respective category. In this manner one can examine the situations in which an individual may be more willing to self-disclose, as well as to whom the individual may be more willing to self-disclose.

Chelune (1976) reports acceptable levels of test reliability. Three different samples (N=79, N=74, N=56) gave reliability coefficients of .88, .89, and .80, respectively. The odd-even method of computing reliability was utilized. Test-retest reliability was also established to be .75, however the sample size used may not have been adequate (N=27). Correlations between the total self-disclosure score and each of the four target categories (friend, group of friends, stranger, group of strangers) were uniformly high (.76, .80, .82, .85), while intercorrelations between the target groups were lower (ranging from .44 to .69). The higher intercorrelations were between related variables, such as friend and group of friends, or stranger and group of strangers. Differential responding was seen
such that the most conducive situation for self-disclosure was being alone with a boy/girl friend at their house ($M=5.57$), while the lease conducive situation was being introduced to a group of strangers ($M=1.83$).

Males were found to be slightly more willing to self-disclose than females. There were also significant target differences. Friends received the highest disclosure scores, followed by group of friends, group of strangers, and strangers. The only other significant sex difference was that males were more willing to self-disclose to strangers than females.

A separate study conducted by Chelune (1976) examined the percent of variance that is explained by different factors for self-disclosure. His results indicated that only 14% of the variance was accounted for by person factors, while situation factors accounted for 49% of the variance. The elements of the social situation, the target and the setting accounted for more than three times the variance of the person factors. Because of the acceptable statistical qualities of the SDSS, as well as its utility in uncovering different variables that are seen to affect self-disclosure, it is an appropriate tool to use in the present study. It will also be beneficial to do exploratory examinations of how the SDSS performs when tested on members of differing ethnicities and acculturation levels, as will be done in the present study.

The Rotter Interpersonal Trust Scale

A key element of a successful counseling relationship is the ability of the client to be able to trust his/her counselor. Rotter defines interpersonal trust as “an expectancy held by an individual or a group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of
another individual or group can be relied upon.” (Rotter, 1967, pg. 651). The traits of the
counselor are clearly very important for establishing this trust, but there is also the
assumption that the client has the capability to trust others. To measure this capability,
Rotter (1967) constructed the Interpersonal Trust Scale (RITS).

The RITS consists of 40 statements, each of which is to be rated on a five point
Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. Of the 40 statements,
25 are used to measure interpersonal trust, and 15 are filler items used to help disguise the
purpose of the scale. Of the 25 items used to measure interpersonal trust, 12 show trust
for agreeing and 13 show distrust for agreeing, and thus are reverse scored. The scale is
an additive scale, such that a higher score shows greater trust. Some examples of items
are: “Parents usually can be relied upon to keep their promises” and “Most elected public
officials are really sincere in their campaign promises”.

Rotter (1967) reports acceptable levels of internal consistency and test-retest
reliabilities. The RITS was administered to 547 students along with the Marlowe-
Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Internal consistency reliability for the males was .77,
and for the females was .75. The overall internal consistency reliability, based on split-half
reliability, was .76. Although these are not very high for objective tests, Rotter states that
they are acceptable because the RITS is an additive scale that measures a variety of
different social objects, rather than a single object. Test-retest reliabilities were obtained
from two samples. The correlation from the first sample was .56, and for the second was
.68. The average amount of time between testings was 7 months and 3 months,
respectively. The correlation with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was .21 for males, and .38 for females (based on the original sample of 547 students). Although both of these correlations were significant, Rotter argues that while trust is a socially desirable trait, the total amount of variance accounted for by social approval is relatively small.

Validity of the RITS was obtained using natural life criterion situations, such that observations of everyday behavior were used a criterion measure. Members of two sororities and fraternities were involved in the study, with a total N of 156. Members were asked to nominate those who were high or low in interpersonal trust, dependency, gullibility, and trustworthiness. Subjects were also asked to make self-ratings of trust on a 4 point scale (high=4, low=1). Correlations were calculated using separate correlations for each group, transforming to z-scores finding the mean, and then transforming to an r for the whole group. The overall split-half reliability for trust was .87. The overall correlation of .37 for the RITS with the sociometric trust score was significantly higher than for the other variables. Overall, the studies show that the RITS has good construct and discriminant validity.

The Hope Scale

One factor that allows clients to enter into a therapeutic situation is the hope that their life will improve. Snyder (1995) defines hope as “the process of thinking about one’s goals, along with the motivation to move toward (agency) and the ways to achieve (pathways) those goals” (pg. 355). It is postulated that although external forces can have
an impact on how a person thinks about agencies and pathways, there should be an
enduring, cross-situational subjective level of hope. Using this cognitively based theory of
hope, Snyder has created a scale that can be used to measure hope.

The Hope Scale consists of 12 statements that are to be rated on a 4-point Likert
scale, ranging from “Definitely False” to “Definitely True”. Four of the items comprise
the agency subscale, four items comprise the pathways subscale, and four items were
inserted as distractors to help camouflage what the scale is measuring. The scores for the
agency and pathways subscales are found by totaling the score for the four items,
respectively. The highest possible score is 16, and the lowest is 4. The overall hope score
is found by totaling all eight items (disregarding the distractors), for a possible high score
of 32 and a low score of 8. The mean for college and non-college samples has been
found to be 24, with psychiatric inpatients and persons seeking psychological help scoring
significantly lower. No gender differences have been found for the construct of hope, and
no support has been found that persons of color may have lower hope because of possible
negative experiences.

Research using the Hope Scale have found it two have acceptable levels of
reliability and validity. Factor analyses have confirmed the two components of the scale
(agency and pathways), as well as the overall hope score. The 4 items in each of the
subscales have also been found to have high intercorrelations. The item-remainder
coefficients for each item have been significant, ranging from .23-63. The range of
Cronbach's coefficient alpha has also been high, ranging from .74-.84. Test-retest reliability for the scale, given after intervals of 3 to 10 weeks has also been acceptable, usually in the +.8 range.

Validity of the Hope Scale has also been assessed. This scale has been found to have concurrent validity, because it correlates positively with measures of self-esteem, perceived problem solving capabilities, perceptions of control in life, optimism, positive affectivity, and positive outcome expectancies. In addition, the Hope Scale has been found to correlate negatively with measures of social introversion, depression, negative affectivity, and anxiety. Along with concurrent validity, construct validity has also been measured. This was accomplished by giving two groups (high and low hope, as measured by the Hope Scale) goals that they must try and reach. Individuals rated as high for hope reported more mental energy in the pursuit of the goal as well as more pathways. This also occurred in the case where impediments to the goal were instituted. These studies have shown that the Hope Scale has acceptable levels of reliability and validity and is an appropriate tool to use in this study.

Design and Statistical Analyses

This study utilized both a between-groups and a within-groups design. The between-groups component examined differences between Asian American and Caucasian American college students. The within-groups component examined differences within the Asian American sample by acculturation level and level of cultural mistrust.
A power analysis to determine the number of participants necessary for the purposes of this study was conducted using a conventional definition of medium effect size (Cohen, 1977). It was found that to detect a population correlation of .30 (medium effect size) with a power of .99 at an alpha level of .05, approximately 194 students were necessary in each of the two ethnic groups (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). The sample size of 284 for the Caucasian group was sufficient to meet these requirements. The sample size of 172 for the Asian American group was slightly below these requirements. It was determined, however, that rather than acquiring Asian American participants from other disciplines, it was more beneficial to maintain a homogeneous sample of Psychology 100 students to minimize the chances of confounding variables.

Participants answered questions on Scantron bubble sheets, which were then scanned onto a computer disk and analyzed using the SPSS for Windows statistical package. Initially the data was examined for outliers, incorrect coding, and inappropriate responding by participants. These problems were either corrected or, if that was not possible, the participants with incorrect coding were removed from the study. Next a correlation matrix was created and the intercorrelations between constructs was examined. All descriptive statistics were assessed for discrepancies, and gender differences were examined for all groups.

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses were performed to examine the comparability of the samples, as well as to determine basic descriptive statistics and reliability scores for each of the
scales and subscales. The three acculturation groups of the Asian American sample were compared using chi-square tests to examine differences in demographic variables. Chi-square tests were also used to compare the two ethnic groups, Caucasian Americans and Asian Americans, and examine any differences in demographics.

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and reliabilities) were calculated for each ethnic group, as well as for each scale and subscales. This allowed for the detection of possible outliers in each of the groups.

A correlation matrix was also created between all independent and dependent variables in the study. This consisted of Pearson product-moment correlations, and was used to examine relationships between the variables, as well as to examine the validity of the CCRS scale as compared to the CRF credibility scale.

**Primary Analyses**

To examine the four between-groups hypotheses (Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4), Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVAs) were run to see if there were any significant differences between the two ethnic groups on each of the variables they had in common (specifically, the CRF, CCRS, SCS, SDSS, and all respective subscales). After the MANOVA was examined for significance, univariate F tests were examined for each variable. MANOVAs were also run to examine the within-groups hypotheses for the Asian American sample.

Hypothesis 5 was studied by dividing the Asian American sample into three acculturation groups, and examining differences on the variables they had in common
(specifically, the CRF, CCRS, SCS, SDSS, CMI, and all respective subscales). After examining the MANOVA and univariate F tests for any statistically significant findings, post-hoc multiple pair-wise comparisons were conducted by application of the Duncan’s multiple-range test to determine which of the three acculturation groups were significantly different. This procedure was used because the sample sizes of the three groups were highly different.

Hypothesis 6 was examined by dividing the Asian American sample into two groups: those scoring high on cultural mistrust and those scoring low on cultural mistrust. The three dependent variables (CRF, CCRS, SDSS) were then examined for within-group differences by using a MANOVA, and then examining the multivariate and univariate F tests for significance.

The three hypotheses (Hypotheses 7, 8 and 9) examining the cultural variables in the study (acculturation, cultural mistrust, and self-construal) used multiple linear regression analyses. In this manner, the three cultural variables were analyzed as to how well they performed as predictors of each of the dependent variables (CRF, CCRS, and SDSS).

Finally, T-tests were run to determine if there were any gender differences in the two ethnic groups for each of the variables being studied.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Results of this study will be presented in this chapter. First, results of the preliminary analyses will be summarized in tables and text. Second, results of primary analyses that were used to test this study’s hypotheses will be presented.

Preliminary Analyses

**Demographic Characteristics of the Samples.** Of the 225 Asian American participants from whom data was collected, it was determined that 53 of the participants were not appropriate for inclusion in this study. The 53 participants that were excluded from the study were in this country using student visas, specifically to attend university. These participants would best be characterized as “Asians” rather than “Asian Americans”. To maintain a homogeneous sample, the remaining 172 Asian Americans that were included in the study were all either U.S. citizens or permanent residents of the United States. A summary of the demographic characteristics of the Asian American and Caucasian American samples are presented in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Asian Americans (N=172)</th>
<th>Caucasian Americans (N=284)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Country</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time In U.S. (In Years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Life</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of Demographic Characteristics for Study Samples
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Medicine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Asian American sample was composed of 84 male (48.8%) and 88 female (51.2%) college students. The average age of the Asian American students was 20.13 years, ranging from 17 to 41 years of age. The Caucasian American sample was composed of 119 male (41.9%) and 165 female (58.1%) college students. The average age of the Caucasian American students was 19.07 years, ranging from 17 to 35 years of age.

In terms of citizenship, 72.1% of the Asian American sample were U.S. citizens, while 27.9% were U.S. permanent residents. In the Caucasian American sample, 98.9% were U.S. citizens, while 1.1% were U.S. permanent residents. In the Asian American sample, 55.8% were born in the U.S., 40.1% were born in an Asian country, and 4.1% were born elsewhere. In the Caucasian American sample, 98.9% were born in the U.S., while only 1.1% were born in another country. Similar differences between the two groups can be observed for amount of time they have been in the U.S. In the Asian American sample, 54.1% have spent their entire life in the U.S., 19.2% have spent over 10 years in the U.S., 25.6% have spent between 1 and 10 years in the U.S. and 1.2% have spent less than one year in the U.S. In the Caucasian American sample, 96.1% have spent their entire life in the U.S., 2.8% have spent over 10 years in the U.S., .8% have spent between 1 and 10 years in the U.S., and .4% have spent less than one year in the U.S.

In terms of level of education, 68.0% of the Asian American sample were freshmen, 17.4% were sophomores, 8.1% were juniors, 4.7% were seniors and 1.8% were
either post-baccalaureate or graduate students. In the Caucasian American sample, 80.6% were freshmen, 11.6% were sophomores, 2.8% were juniors, 4.6% were seniors and .4% were either post-baccalaureate or graduate students.

There were a range of academic majors present in both ethnic groups. In the Asian American group, of the offered choices, 19.8% were pre-med majors, 16.9% were business majors, 11.0% were computer science majors, 11.0% were engineering majors, 7.0% were biology majors, 3.5% were psychology majors, .6% were English majors, and 30.2% indicated “other” as their major. In the Caucasian American group, 10.6% were engineering majors, 10.6% were business majors, 7% were pre-med majors, 6% were psychology majors, 3.2% were biology majors, 2.5% were history majors, 2.1% were computer science majors, .7% were mathematics majors, .4% were English majors and 57% indicated “other” as their major.

When the two ethnic groups were compared in terms of demographic variables, it was determined that they did not differ significantly in terms of gender composition. They did differ significantly in terms of citizenship, place of birth, time in U.S. and academic major. These chi-square analyses are presented below.

When examining gender, the two ethnic groups were not found to be significantly different in a 2 X 2 chi-square test \(X^2(1, N=456) = 2.09, p=.149\). In both ethnic groups, there were more female respondents than males.
A 2 X 2 chi-square test comparing differences in citizenship between the two ethnic groups was significant \( X^2(1, N=456) = 77.85, p<.000 \). There were significantly more permanent residents in the Asian American than in the Caucasian American group.

Place of birth was examined using a 2 X 3 chi-square test. The two ethnic groups were found to differ significantly \( X^2(2, N=456) = 142.47, p<.000 \). There were a significant number of Asian Americans that were born either in Asian countries or another country outside of the U.S.

The amount of time spent in the U.S. was analyzed to determine if the two ethnic groups differed significantly on this variable. A 2 X 7 chi-square test was performed \( X^2(6, N=456) = 122.85, p<.000 \). While most of the Caucasian American participants had spent their entire lives in the U.S., a significant number (27%) of the Asian American group had spent less than 10 years in the U.S.

Level of education was examined using a 2 X 6 chi-square test. The two ethnic groups were found to differ significantly \( X^2(2, N=456) = 13.89, p<.05 \). In the Asian American group, there was a significantly larger proportion of students in advanced levels of study, while there were more freshmen in the Caucasian American group.

In terms of academic major, the two ethnic groups did differ significantly in a 2 X 10 chi-square test \( X^2(9, N=456) = 60.23, p<.000 \). There were proportionately more natural science and pre-med majors in the Asian American group, while there were more psychology and history majors in the Caucasian American group.
The results of these analyses were for the most part expected. The Asian American group is more heterogeneous in its composition, with a significant number being born outside the U.S., and thus having spent less time in the U.S. than the Caucasian American group. None of the differences in demographic characteristics were seen as problematic in terms of the purposes of this study.

**Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale Version Comparisons.**

Preliminary analyses were conducted on both versions (21 item vs. 26 item) of the Suinn Lew-Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA). It was found that the reliability of the 21-item scale ($\alpha = .90$) was greater than that of the 26-item version ($\alpha = .86$). Therefore, it was determined that the 21-item scale would be used for analyses in this study, and the mean score on the SL-ASIA would be utilized to divide the Asian American sample into differing acculturation levels.

**Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistency, and Intercorrelations.** All scales and subscales were scored in accordance with directions as published by the authors. Mean scores, standard deviations, and internal consistency statistics ($\alpha$) are summarized in Table 2 (Asian Americans) and Table 3 (Caucasian Americans). The mean scores and standard deviations of all the participants on the scales and subscales used in this study were comparable to those found in other published studies on university students.

Reliability analyses were conducted for each scale and subscale that was used in this study. The Cronbach's alpha for the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) expertness,
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Rating Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>.8995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>43.30</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>.8914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>.7529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>88.58</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>.9408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Disclosure Situations Survey</strong></td>
<td>54.49</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>.8763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Construal Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>58.39</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>.6853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>.6644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Credibility Rating Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.8735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.9072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ethnicities</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.9188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Mistrust Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political/Legal</td>
<td>28.63</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>.7579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.7094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Work</td>
<td>32.32</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>.8366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.6510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>.9153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity</strong></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.8997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations and Internal Consistencies of Study Variables for Asian Americans (N=172)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Rating Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>.8832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>47.81</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>.8594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>.8261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>98.01</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>.9242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Disclosure Situations Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.99</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>.8952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Construal Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>59.40</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>.7232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>53.17</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>.6915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Credibility Rating Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.8817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.8846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ethnicities</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.9005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations and Internal Consistencies of Study Variables for Caucasian Americans (N=284)
attractiveness and trustworthiness scales for the Caucasian American group were, respectively, .88, .83 and .86. For the Asian American group, the Cronbach alpha’s were .90, .75 and .89. All of these alphas are comparable to other studies that have used the CRF, such as Barak & LaCrosse (1975) and LaCrosse and Barak (1976). While these previous studies have not focused on cultural differences, it appears that the CRF is a reliable measure for use with Asian Americans.

Cronbach’s alpha for the Self-Disclosure Situations Survey (SDSS) was .90 with the Caucasian American group, and .88 with the Asian American group. These alphas are comparable with the reliability data published by the author (Chelune, 1976). Again, while the alpha for the Asian American group is lower than that for the Caucasian American group, it is well within the acceptable range.

For the Self-Construal Scale (SCS), the Cronbach’s alphas for the Caucasian sample were .72 and .69, for the independent and interdependent subscales, respectively. In the Asian American sample, the alphas were .69 and .66, respectively. Although these reliability scores are rather low, previous studies that have used the SCS (Singelis, 1994; 1995) have reported alphas that have ranged from .69-.74. Interestingly, in the previous studies the reliability coefficients for the interdependent subscale have been higher than those for the independent subscale. In this study, the opposite was true. This study utilized the newer 30-item SCS scale because the internal consistency is supposed to be improved compared to the 24-item scale. This was found to be true in this study, so all analyses utilized the 30-item scale.
The Counselor Credibility Rating Scale (CCRS) is a new scale developed by the author to measure how credible a respondent feels a counselor is when working with various ethnic groups. For the Caucasian American sample, Cronbach's alphas for the Caucasian, Asian and all ethnicities subscales were .88, .89, and .90 respectively. For the Asian American group, the alphas were .87, .91, and .92, respectively. As this was the first use of this instrument, there are no possible comparisons to previous studies. The internal consistency measures are well in the acceptable range, however, for both ethnic groups.

The version of the Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI) used in this study was adapted for Asian American respondents from the original CMI, which was created for an African American sample. Past studies have only given reliability measures for the total scale (Terrell & Terrell, 1981; Nickerson et al., 1994), which have been .86 and .89 respectively. In this study, the alpha for the total scale was .92. The alphas for the political/legal, education/training, business/work and interpersonal subscales, respectively, were as follows: .76, .71, .84 and .65. The alpha for the total scale in this study surpasses those of past studies. Although the reliability of the interpersonal subscale is quite low, because of a lack of published reliability data for each subscale separately, it is not possible to ascertain whether this is a function of the scale being adapted for Asian Americans or a drawback of the CMI regardless of the version used. In general, however, the alphas in this study suggest that the adapted CMI has acceptable levels of reliability for use with Asian Americans.
Cronbach's alpha for the SL-ASIA was .90, which was consistent with alphas reported in previous studies that have used the SL-ASIA (Suinn et al., 1987; 1992). Means and standard deviations found in this study were also comparable to other studies. The mean SL-ASIA score for Asian identified, bicultural, and Western identified participants in this study were 2.58, 3.49 and 4.17, respectively, with an overall mean of 3.21. Suinn et al. (1987) found their 1st generation Asian Americans to have a mean score of 2.96, while the 5th generation had a mean score of 3.85, comparable to the Asian and Western identified Asian Americans in this study.

All of the independent variables and dependent variables examined in this study were placed in a matrix of Pearson product-moment correlations. These intercorrelations are reported for the Asian American group in Table 4, and for the Caucasian American group in Table 5. Because of the proposed relationships between variables, it was expected that many of the variables would be significantly correlated with each other for both Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans, as was the case.

For the Asian Americans, all the subscales of the Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI) were significantly correlated with each other at the p<.01 level. The Political/Legal subscale of the CMI was significantly negatively correlated with the Trustworthiness subscale of the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) (r = -.16, p<.05). It was also significantly negatively correlated with the Asian and All Ethnicities subscales of the Counselor Credibility Rating Scale (CCRS) (r = -.17, p<.05; r = -.20, p<.05; respectively), and the Suinn Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA)
Table 4: Intercorrelations of Independent and Dependent Variables for Asian Americans (N=172); Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients
Table 4.

NOTE 1: \*p \leq .05; \**p \leq .01

NOTE 2: For all tables:

CRFE = Expertness
CRFT = Trustworthiness
CRFA = Attractiveness
CRFC = Credibility
SDSS = Self-Disclosure
SCSID = Independent Self-Construal
SCSIT = Interdependent Self-Construal
CCRC = Credibility Working with Caucasian Americans
CCRA = Credibility Working with Asian Americans
CCRE = Credibility Working with All Ethnicities
CMIP = Political/legal Mistrust
CMIE = Education/Training Mistrust
CMIB = Business/Work Mistrust
CMIT = Interpersonal Relationship Mistrust
CMIT = Total Mistrust
SLA = Acculturation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRFE</th>
<th>CRFT</th>
<th>CRFA</th>
<th>CRFC</th>
<th>SDSS</th>
<th>SCSSID</th>
<th>SCSIT</th>
<th>CCRC</th>
<th>CCRA</th>
<th>CCRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRFE</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSS</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSSID</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSIT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRE</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Intercorrelations of Independent and Dependent Variables for Caucasian Americans (N=284). Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients continued
Table 5 continued

NOTE 1: *p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01

NOTE 2: For all tables:

CRFE = Expertness
CRFT = Trustworthiness
CRFA = Attractiveness
CRFC = Credibility
SDSS = Self-Disclosure
SCSID = Independent Self-Construal
SCSIT = Interdependent Self-Construal
CCRC = Credibility Working with Caucasian Americans
CCRA = Credibility Working with Asian Americans
CCRE = Credibility Working with All Ethnicities
The Education/Training subscale of the CMI was significantly negatively correlated with the Trustworthiness subscale of the CRF ($r = -0.17, p<0.05$) and the Interdependent subscale of the Self-Construal Scale (SCS) ($r = -0.16, p<0.05$). The Business/Work subscale of the CMI was significantly negatively correlated with the Trustworthiness subscale of the CRF ($r = -0.19, p<0.05$), the Interdependent subscale of the SCS ($r = -0.19, p<0.05$) and the SL-ASIA ($r = -0.24, p<0.01$). The Interpersonal Relationships subscale of the CMI was significantly negatively correlated with the Trustworthiness subscale of the CRF ($r = -0.16, p<0.05$) and the SL-ASIA ($r = -0.26, p<0.01$). The total score on the CMI was significantly negatively correlated with the Trustworthiness subscale of the CRF ($r = -0.20, p<0.01$), the Credibility subscale of the CRF ($r = -0.15, p<0.05$), the Interdependent subscale of the SCS ($r = -0.18, p<0.05$) and the SL-ASIA ($r = -0.24, p<0.01$). The SL-ASIA mean acculturation score was significantly negatively correlated with the majority of the subscales of the CMI (as detailed above). It was not significantly correlated with any of the other variables.

In the Asian American group, all the subscales of the CRF were significantly positively correlated with each other at the $p<0.01$ level. In addition, all the subscales of the CRF were significantly positively correlated with all the subscales of the CCRS at the $p<0.01$ level. The Expertness subscale was also significantly positively correlated with the Independent subscale of the SCS ($r = 0.16, p<0.05$). The Trustworthiness subscale of the CRF was also significantly positively correlated with the Independent subscale of the SCS ($r = 0.18, p<0.05$) and significantly negatively correlated with all of the subscales of the
CMI (as detailed above). The Credibility subscale of the CRF was significantly positively correlated with the Independent subscale of the SCS ($r = .18$, $p < .05$), and significantly negatively correlated with the total CMI score as mentioned above.

The Self-Disclosure Situations Survey (SDSS) was significantly positively correlated with the both the Independent ($r = .35$, $p < .01$) and Interdependent ($r = .18$, $p < .05$) subscales of the SCS. It was not significantly correlated with any other variables. The SCS Independent subscale was significantly correlated with subscales of the CRF and the SDSS, as mentioned above. The Interdependent subscale was significantly correlated with the SDSS and subscales of the CMI, as mentioned above.

For the Caucasian group, all the subscales of the CRF were significantly positively correlated with each other at the $p < .01$ level. All the subscales of the CRF were also significantly positively correlated with all the subscales of the CCRS at the $p < .01$ level. In addition, the Expertness subscale of the CRF was also significantly positively correlated with the Independent subscale of the SCS ($r = .16$, $p < .01$). The Trustworthiness subscale of the CRF was significantly positively correlated with both the Independent subscale ($r = .18$, $p < .01$) and the Interdependent subscale ($r = .14$, $p < .05$) of the SCS. The Attractiveness subscale of the CRF was also significantly positively correlated with both the Independent subscale ($r = .16$, $p < .01$) and the Interdependent subscale ($r = .12$, $p < .05$) of the SCS. The Credibility subscale of the CRF was also significantly positively correlated with both the Independent subscale ($r = .18$, $p < .01$) and the Interdependent subscale ($r = .12$, $p < .05$) of the SCS.
The SDSS was significantly positively correlated with both the Independent and Interdependent subscales of the SCS (r = .23, p<.01; r = .22, p<.01; respectively). The SCS subscales were significantly positively correlated with each other at the p<.01 level. In addition, the Independent subscale of the SCS was significantly positively correlated with all four subscales of the CCRS (Caucasian: r = .14, p<.05; Asian: r = .12, p<.05; All Ethnicities: r = .16, p<.01;). The Interdependent subscale of the SCS was significantly positively correlated with three of the CRF subscales, the SDSS (r = .22, p<.01). Finally, all the subscales of the CCRS were significantly positively correlated with each other at the p<.01 level. All the subscales were also significantly positively correlated with the subscales of the CRF as well as other variables, as mentioned above.

**Primary Analyses**

**Between Groups Comparisons**

The results of the MANOVA and univariate F tests for between-group comparisons of Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans on the variables examined in this study are presented in Table 6. The results indicate that there were significant between-group differences on all variables except the Attractiveness subscale of the CRF, the Independent subscale of the SCS and the Caucasian subscale of the CCRS.

**Hypothesis 1:** Asian Americans will score higher for interdependent self-construal than Caucasian Americans, and Asian Americans will score lower for independent self-construal than Caucasian Americans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F^1</th>
<th>n^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Caucasian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Rating Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.30</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>47.81</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.58</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>98.01</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure Situations Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.49</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>58.99</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Construal Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.39</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>59.40</td>
<td>9.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>53.17</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Credibility Rating Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ethnicities</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01 on univariate F tests
** p < .001 on univariate F tests
Overall F ratio (Wilk’s lambda) = 11.34, p = .000, n^2 = .186
^a dfs = 1,454 for all of the univariate F tests

Table 6: Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Univariate Analyses of the Independent Variables Willingness to Self-Disclose and Self-Construal, and Dependent Variables of Counselor Social Influence and Counselor Credibility by Ethnic Group
This hypothesis was partially supported by the data in that Asian Americans did score significantly higher for interdependent self-construal than Caucasian Americans ($F(2,454) = 26.49, p<.001$) as measured by the SCS. Caucasian Americans, however, did not score significantly higher for independent self-construal than Asian Americans ($F(2,454) = 1.13, p=.287$).

**Hypothesis 2A:** Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being more attractive than Asian Americans rating the same counselor. Hypothesis 2A was not supported by the data in the area of counselor attractiveness. Caucasian Americans did not rate the counselor as being more attractive than did Asian Americans ($F(2,454) = .01, p=.934$).

**Hypothesis 2B:** Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being more expert than Asian Americans rating the same counselor. This hypothesis was supported by the data. Caucasian Americans rated the counselor as having more expertness compared to the Asian Americans ($F(2,454) = 19.18, p<.01$).

**Hypothesis 2C:** Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being more trustworthy than Asian Americans rating the same counselor. This hypothesis was also supported by the data, as Caucasian Americans did rate the counselor as being more trustworthy than the Asian Americans ($F(2,454) = 19.08, p<.001$).

**Hypothesis 2D:** Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being more credible than Asian Americans rating the same counselor. The Caucasian Americans did rate the counselor significantly higher in terms of credibility than
the Asian Americans ($F(2,454) = 21.42, p<.001$). In general, the Caucasian Americans did rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having more social influence than the Asian Americans as measured by the CRF.

Hypothesis 3 was for the most part supported by the results of the data analyses. In general, the Caucasian American group found the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be more credible than Asian Americans as measured by the CCRS.

**Hypothesis 3A:** Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having more credibility for working with Caucasian Americans than Asian Americans rating the same counselor. This part of Hypothesis 3 was not supported by the data in that Caucasian Americans did not find the counselor to have more credibility when working with Caucasian Americans than did Asian Americans ($F(2,454) = 1.37$, $p=.242$). The mean of the credibility score for working with Caucasians was higher for Caucasian Americans in comparison to Asian Americans (13.90 compared to 13.53), but not significantly so.

**Hypothesis 3B:** Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having more credibility for working with Asian Americans than Asian Americans rating the same counselor. The Caucasian American sample did rate the counselor as having more credibility when working with Asian Americans than did Asian Americans ($F(2,454) = 19.25, p<.001$).

**Hypothesis 3C:** Caucasian Americans will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having more credibility for working with people of all ethnicities than Asian
Americans rating the same counselor. The Caucasian Americans, in comparison with the Asian Americans, rated the counselor as having more credibility when working with people of all ethnicities ($F(2,454) = 11.07, p< .001$), thus supporting Hypothesis 3C.

**Hypothesis 4:** Caucasian Americans will be more willing to self-disclose than Asian Americans. This hypothesis was supported by the data. The Caucasian American group was more willing to self-disclose than the Asian American group as measured by the SDSS ($F(2,454) = 9.90, p<.01$).

**Within-Group Comparisons**

**Acculturation**

To examine within-group differences by acculturation level in this study, the Asian American sample was trichotomized into three groups: Asian identified (low acculturation), Bicultural, and Western identified (high acculturation). This was accomplished using the strategy suggested by the scale’s author (Suinn, personal communication, 1999). A mean score was obtained for each respondent. Then, all respondents with a mean score of 1-3 were placed in the Asian identified group, those with a mean score of 3-4 were placed in the Bicultural group, and those with a mean score of 4-5 were placed in the Western identified group. The means and standard deviations of each of the three groups for all variables examined in this study are presented in Table 7.

The results of the MANOVA and univariate F tests for within-group comparisons of Asian Americans by acculturation level on the variables examined in this study are presented in Table 7. The results indicate that there were some significant within-group
Table 7: Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Univariate Analyses of the Study Variables for Asian Americans by acculturation Level.
Table 7 continued

NOTE 1: * $p<.01$ on univariate $F$ tests   ** $p<.001$ on univariate $F$ tests

NOTE 2: Overall $F$ ratio (Wilk's lambda) = 14.46, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .57$

$df_s = 2,169$ for all of the univariate $F$ tests
differences on variables between the Asian identified, Bicultural and Western identified acculturation level groups. For those variables that were significant in the MANOVA and univariate F tests, post-hoc multiple pair-wise comparisons were conducted by application of the Duncan's multiple-range test to determine which of the three acculturation groups were significantly different from each other. Hypothesis 5 was only partially supported, as the three acculturation level groups only differed significantly on some of the study variables. The overall F ratio (Wilk's lambda) = 14.46, \( p = .000 \).

**Hypothesis 5A:** Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will have a greater amount of cultural mistrust than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation. This hypothesis was for the most part supported by the data. There were significant differences between the three groups on the Business/Work subscale of the CMI (\( F(2,169) = 4.77, p < .001 \)), the Interpersonal Relationships subscale of the CMI (\( F(2,169) = 5.40, p < .001 \)), and the total score on the CMI (\( F(2,169) = 4.30, p < .001 \)). Post-hoc comparisons on the Business/Work subscale revealed that Western identified group (\( M = 27.2 \)) was significantly different from the other two groups, but that the Asian identified (\( M = 34.19 \)) and Bicultural (\( M = 31.88 \)) groups were not significantly different. For the Interpersonal Relationships subscale, the Asian identified group (\( M = 32.62 \)) was significantly different from the other two groups, but the Western identified (\( M = 28.73 \)) and Bicultural (\( M = 29.64 \)) groups were not significantly different. In terms of the total
CMI score, the Western identified (M = 91.47) and Asian identified (M = 108.37) groups were significantly different, but the Bicultural group (M = 101.38) did not differ significantly from either of the other two.

**Hypotheses 5B-1:** Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will also score lower for independent self-construal than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

**Hypothesis 5B-2:** Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will score higher for interdependent self-construal than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation. neither of these two hypotheses were supported. None of the three acculturation groups differed significantly in terms of self-construal. For the Independent subscale, the Bicultural group had the highest mean score, not the Western identified group as was hypothesized. For the Interdependent subscale, the Asian identified group had the highest mean score as hypothesized, but it was not significantly different from the other two groups.

**Hypothesis 5C-1:** Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will find the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be less attractive than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

**Hypothesis 5C-2:** Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will find the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be less expert than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.
Hypothesis 5C-3:  Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will find the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be less trustworthy than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

Hypothesis 5C-4:  Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will find the counselor from the videotaped vignette to be less credible than Asian Americans who score high on acculturation.

The data did not support any of the hypotheses regarding social influence. The three acculturation groups did not differ on any of the subscales of the CRF (Expertness, Trustworthiness, Attractiveness and Credibility). Surprisingly, the means for the Western identified group were lower than those for the other two groups on all the subscales. This finding is in the opposite direction of what was hypothesized.

Hypothesis 5D-1: Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having less credibility for working with Caucasian Americans than high acculturation Asian Americans. Hypothesis 5D-1 was partially significant, but not in the hypothesized direction. The three acculturation groups differed significantly ($F(2,169) = 3.22, p < .01$) on how much credibility they felt the counselor possessed when working with Caucasian American clients. However, it was the Bicultural group ($M = 13.99$) that differed significantly from the Western identified group ($M = 11.73$). The Asian identified group did not differ from either of the other two groups. It was also seen that the Asian identified group mean ($M = 13.29$) was also higher than that of the Western identified group, opposite of what was expected.
Hypothesis 5D-2: Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having less credibility for working with Asian Americans than high acculturation Asian Americans.

Hypothesis 5D-3: Asian Americans who score low on acculturation will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having less credibility for working with people of all ethnicities than high acculturation Asian Americans. The data did not support any of the hypotheses in this study regarding differences by acculturation level on the CCRS. The analysis of Hypothesis 5D-1 showed some significant differences among the three groups, but not in the hypothesized directions.

Hypothesis 5E: Asian Americans who are of low acculturation will be less willing to self-disclose in general, and will be willing to self-disclose in fewer situations than Asian Americans of high acculturation. There was no support from the data for this hypothesis. Although the findings were not significant, the mean scores displayed by the three groups did follow in the direction that was hypothesized (Asian identified: $M = 52.79$; Bicultural: $M = 55.04$; Western identified: $M = 58.13$).

Cultural Mistrust

To examine within-group differences in this study by level of cultural mistrust, the Asian American sample was divided into two groups: High Cultural Mistrust and Low Cultural Mistrust. This was accomplished by using the mean score of respondents on the CMI (Total). Those respondents scoring in the top 25% of the sample were placed in the High Cultural Mistrust group, while those scoring in the bottom 25%
of the sample were placed in the Low Cultural Mistrust group. The results of the MANOVA and univariate F tests with the two groups on the CRF, CCRS and SDSS are given in Table 8.

There were some significant results to support Hypothesis 6. The overall F ratio (Wilk's lambda) = 2.83, p=.000, showing that the two groups differed significantly on some of the variables studied. Hypothesis 6A, examining the CRF, was partially supported by the data (F(2,88) = 7.45, p< .01).

Hypothesis 6A-1: Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being less attractive than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust. This hypothesis was not supported by the data, as there were no differences on the Attractiveness subscale.

Hypothesis 6A-2: Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being less expert than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust. Although this hypothesis was not supported by the data, the means displayed by the two groups (Low Mistrust: M = 48.52; High Mistrust: M = 44.98) did follow in the direction that was hypothesized.

Hypothesis 6A-3: Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being less trustworthy than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust. The high and low cultural mistrust groups
### Cultural Mistrust Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Low Cultural Mistrust (N = 46)</th>
<th>High Cultural Mistrust (N = 44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Rating Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>48.52</td>
<td>12.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>47.39</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>33.28</td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>95.91</td>
<td>22.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Disclosure Situations Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.72</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Credibility Rating Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ethnicities</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 on univariate F tests  
** p < .01 on univariate F tests

Overall F ratio (Wilk's lambda) = 2.83, p = .000, η² = .24

dfs = 1, 88 for all of the univariate F tests

Table 8: Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Univariate Analyses of Asian Americans by Level of Cultural Mistrust for Willingness to Self-Disclose, Counselor Social Influence and Counselor Credibility
did differ significantly on the Trustworthy subscale of the CRF. The low cultural mistrust group ($M = 47.39$) found the counselor to be more trustworthy than the high cultural mistrust group ($M = 40.57$), as was hypothesized.

**Hypothesis 6A-4**: Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as being less credible than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust. The two groups also differed significantly on the Credibility subscale of the CRF ($F(2,88) = 4.36, p<.05$). The low cultural mistrust group ($M = 95.91$) found the counselor to have more credibility than the high mistrust group ($M = 85.55$). The two groups did not differ significantly on the other two subscales of the CRF. Hypothesis 6B, which examined the CCRS, received only partial support from the data.

**Hypothesis 6B-1**: Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor from the videotaped vignette as having less credibility for working with Caucasian Americans than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust. This hypothesis was not supported by the data, but the mean scores of the low cultural mistrust group were higher than those of the high cultural mistrust group, as hypothesized, but not significantly higher.

**Hypothesis 6B-2**: Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor as having less credibility when working with Asian Americans than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust. This hypothesis also was not supported by
the data, but again the mean scores of the low cultural mistrust group were higher than those of the high cultural mistrust group, as hypothesized, but not significantly higher.

**Hypothesis 6B-3:** Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will rate the counselor as having less credibility when working with people of all different ethnicities than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust. The two groups did differ significantly on how much credibility they felt the counselor possessed for working with people of all ethnicities. The low cultural mistrust group (M = 13.11) felt the counselor possessed more credibility than the high mistrust group (M = 11.45), as was hypothesized.

**Hypothesis 6C:** Asian Americans who score high on cultural mistrust will be less willing to self-disclose in general, and will be willing to self-disclose in fewer situations than Asian Americans who score low on cultural mistrust. The results did not support this hypothesis. The two groups did not differ on their willingness to self-disclose. Again, the mean scores of the two groups did differ in the hypothesized direction (Low Mistrust: M = 55.72; High Mistrust: M = 54.11), but not significantly so.

**Regression Analyses**

Linear regression analyses were conducted to examine which cultural variables accounted for significant portions of the variance in the ratings of the dependent variables for Asian Americans. Linear regressions were also conducted to examine how the predictive ability of independent and interdependent self-construals compared between
the Asian American and Caucasian American groups. A summary of whether the cultural variables were significant predictors of the dependent variables is provided in Table 9. Summaries of the regression analyses for each dependent variable are presented in Tables 10-17.

**Ethnicity, Self-Construal and the Counselor Rating Form**

**Hypothesis 7A:** Self-Construal will be a significant predictor of counselor attractiveness on the CRF. Models using independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal to predict the attractiveness ratings component of social influence were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 10. For Asian Americans, Independent self-construal was not found to be a significant predictor of counselor attractiveness \( F(1,170) = 1.50, p = .223 \), and neither was interdependent self-construal \( F(1,169) = 1.23, p = .269 \). For Caucasian Americans, Independent self-construal was a significant predictor of counselor attractiveness \( F(1,282) = 7.54, p < .01 \), and accounted for 2.6% of the variance. Interdependent self-construal \( F(1,281) = 3.45, p = .064 \) was not a significant predictor, but did approach significance, accounting for 1.2% of the variance.

**Hypothesis 7B:** Self-Construal will be a significant predictor of counselor expertness on the CRF. Models using independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal to predict the expertness ratings component of social influence were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 11. In the Asian American group, Independent self-construal was found to be a significant predictor of counselor expertness \( F(1,170) = 4.59, p < .05 \), and accounted for 2.6% of the variance. Interdependent self-construal was
### Cultural Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Self-Construal</th>
<th>Acculturation</th>
<th>Cultural Mistrust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Rating Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Credibility Rating Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Caucasian Clients</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Asian Clients</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Clients of All Ethnicities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Disclosure Situations Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AA = Asian Americans  CA = Caucasian Americans

Table 9: Summary of Whether Cultural Variables Significantly Predicted Counselor Social Influence, Counselor Credibility and Participants’ Willingness to Self-Disclose
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Asian Americans (N = 172)</th>
<th>Caucasian Americans (N=284)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R² change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Construals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Mistrust</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05      ** p< .01

Table 10: Regressions for Predictors of Social Influence: Attractiveness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Asian Americans (N = 172)</th>
<th>Caucasian Americans (N=284)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R²change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Construals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Mistrust</strong></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05  ** p< .01

Table 11: Regressions for Predictors of Social Influence: Expertness
not seen as a significant predictor of counselor expertness [F(1,169) = .06, p = .809]. For Caucasian Americans, Independent self-construal was a significant predictor of counselor expertness [F(1,282) = 7.80, p < .01], and accounted for 2.7% of the variance. Interdependent self-construal [F(1,281) = 1.65, p = .200] was not a significant predictor.

**Hypothesis 7C**: Self-Construal will be a significant predictor of counselor trustworthiness on the CRF. Models using independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal to predict the trustworthiness ratings component of social influence were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 12. For Asian Americans, Independent self-construal was found to be a significant predictor of counselor trustworthiness [F(1,170) = 5.36, p < .05], and accounted for 3.1% of the variance. Interdependent self-construal was not observed to be a significant predictor of counselor trustworthiness [F(1,169) = .20, p = .654]. For the Caucasian American sample, Independent self-construal [F(1,282) = 8.90, p < .01] and interdependent self-construal [F(1,281) = 4.71, p < .05] were both significant predictors of counselor trustworthiness, accounting for 3.1% of the variance and 1.6% of the variance, respectively.

**Hypothesis 7D**: Self-Construal will be a significant predictor of counselor credibility on the CRF. Models using independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal to predict the credibility ratings component of social influence were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 13. In the Asian American group, Independent self-construal was a significant predictor of counselor credibility [F(1,170) = 5.45, p < .05], and accounted for 3.1% of the variance. Interdependent self-construal
| Predictor       | Asian Americans (N = 172) | | | | | | Caucasian Americans (N = 284) | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                 | r  | R² change | F  | β  | t  | r  | R² change | F  | β  | t  |
| Self-Conceptuals |    |            |    |    |    |    |            |    |    |    |
| Independent     | .18 | .031       | 5.36 | .17 | 2.31* | .18 | .031       | 8.90 | .17 | 2.84** |
| Interdependent   | .05 | .001       | .20  | -.01 | -.09 | .14 | .016       | 4.71 | .13 | 2.17* |
| Acculturation    | .01 | .000       | .00  | -.05 | -.65 |    |            |    |    |    |
| Cultural Mistrust| -.20 | .038       | 6.87 | -.21 | -2.62** |    |            |    |    |    |

* p<.05      ** p<.01

Table 12: Regressions for Predictors of Social Influence: Trustworthiness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Asian Americans (N = 172)</th>
<th>Caucasian Americans (N = 284)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R²change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Construals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Mistrust</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  ** p<.01

Table 13: Regressions for Predictors of Social Influence: Credibility
[ $F(1,169) = .13, p = .721$ ] did not significantly predict counselor credibility. For Caucasian Americans, Independent self-construal [ $F(1,282) = 9.51, p < .01$ ] was a significant predictor of counselor credibility, accounting for 3.3% of the variance. The other variable, interdependent self-construal [ $F(1,281) = 3.34, p = .069$ ], was not a significant predictor of counselor credibility, although it did approach significance, accounting for 1.1% of the variance.

Ethnicity, Self-Construal and the Counselor Credibility Rating Scale

**Hypothesis 8A:** Self-Construal will be a significant predictor of counselor credibility for working with Caucasian Americans on the CCRS. Models using independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal to predict counselor credibility ratings when working with Caucasian American clients were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 14. For Asian Americans, Independent self-construal was not found to be a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with Caucasian American clients [ $F(1,170) = .69, p = .407$ ], and neither was interdependent self-construal [ $F(1,169) = .73, p = .394$ ]. For Caucasian Americans, Independent self-construal was a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with Caucasian Americans [ $F(1,282) = 5.76, p < .05$ ], and accounted for 2.0% of the variance. Interdependent self-construal [ $F(1,281) = 3.75, p = .054$ ] was not a significant predictor, but did approach significance, accounting for 1.3% of the variance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Asian Americans (N = 172)</th>
<th>Caucasian Americans (N=284)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R² change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Construals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Mistrust</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05  ** p< .01

Table 14: Regressions for Predictors of Counselor Credibility: Caucasian Clients
Hypothesis 8B: Self-Construal will be a significant predictor of counselor credibility for working with Asian Americans on the CCRS. Models using independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal to predict counselor credibility ratings when working with Asian American clients were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 15. Again, for Asian Americans, independent self-construal was not found to be a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with Asian American clients \( F(1, 170) = .01, p = .938 \), and neither was interdependent self-construal \( F(1, 169) = .08, p = .775 \). For Caucasian Americans, Independent self-construal was a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with Asian Americans \( F(1, 282) = 3.95, p < .05 \), and accounted for 1.4% of the variance. Interdependent self-construal \( F(1, 281) = 2.39, p = .123 \) was not a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with Asian Americans.

Hypothesis 8C: Self-Construal will be a significant predictor of counselor credibility for working with all ethnicities on the CCRS. Models using independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal to predict counselor credibility ratings when working with clients of all ethnicities were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 16. For Asian Americans, independent self-construal was not found to be a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with clients of all ethnicities \( F(1, 170) = .002, p = .965 \), and neither was interdependent self-construal \( F(1, 169) = .02, p = .883 \). For the Caucasian American group, again, independent self-construal was a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with clients of all ethnicities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian Americans (N = 172)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Construals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Mistrust</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caucasian Americans (N = 284)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05  ** p< .01

Table 15: Regressions for Predictors of Counselor Credibility: Asian Clients
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Asian Americans (N = 172)</th>
<th>Caucasian Americans (N=284)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>R² change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Construals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Mistrust</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05    ** p<.01

Table 16: Regressions for Predictors of Counselor Credibility: Clients of All Ethnicities
Hypothesis 9: Self-Construal will be a significant predictor of total self-disclosure on the SDSS. Finally, models using independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal to predict willingness to self-disclose were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 17. For Asian Americans, in the case of willingness to self-disclose, both types of self-construal, independent \[ F(1,170) = 23.61, p < .001 \], accounting for 12.2% of the variance, and interdependent \[ F(1,169) = 4.57, p < .05 \], accounting for 2.3% of the variance, were significant predictors. With the Caucasian American group, both the independent variables were significant predictors. Independent self-construal \[ F(1,282) = 16.02, p < .001 \] accounted for 5.4% of the variance and interdependent self-construal \[ F(1,281) = 12.30, p < .001 \] accounted for 4.0% of the variance.

Between-Group Differences in Regressions

The cultural variable of self-construal was examined in both the Asian American and Caucasian American groups. For this reason, analyses were conducted to compare the relative predictive abilities of independent and interdependent self-construals between the two ethnic groups. A multiple linear regression was run that included both groups, with race, self-construal, and interaction terms as predictors for each of the dependent variables in the study. In this manner, it was possible to examine the construct of
Table 17: Regressions for Predictors of Willingness to Self-Disclose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Asian Americans (N = 172)</th>
<th>Caucasian Americans (N=284)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>$R^2_{\text{change}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Construals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Mistrust</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05     ** p< .01
self-construal to determine whether independent or interdependent self-construal was a better predictor for either of the ethnic groups. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 18. The results of the analyses showed no significant differences between the predictive abilities of either independent or interdependent self-construal for the Asian American and Caucasian American groups.

Also, it was possible to compare the independent and interdependent self-construal Betas of both groups for each of the dependent variables of perceived social influence, perceived counselor credibility and willingness to self-disclose. The formula used to compare independent Betas was found in Cohen and Cohen (1983):

\[ z = \frac{\beta_1 - \beta_2}{\sqrt{SE_1^2 + SE_2^2}} \]

The results of the analyses also showed no significant differences between the predictive abilities of either independent or interdependent self-construal for the Asian American and Caucasian American groups. Independent self-construal came close to being significantly different in two cases (the All Ethnicities subscale of the CCRS and the SDSS).

Asian American Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust and the Counselor Rating Form

**Hypothesis 7A:** Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust will be significant predictors of counselor attractiveness on the CRF. Models using cultural mistrust and acculturation to predict the attractiveness ratings component of social influence were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 10. Acculturation did not significantly predict counselor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>CRFA</th>
<th>CRFE</th>
<th>CRFT</th>
<th>CRFC</th>
<th>CCRC</th>
<th>CCRA</th>
<th>CCRE</th>
<th>SSDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>37.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
<td>2.50**</td>
<td>2.65**</td>
<td>2.73**</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.64**</td>
<td>3.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>16.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*SCSID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*SCSIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05  ** p< .01

Table 18: Multiple Linear Regression of Race and Self-construal types as Predictors of Study Dependent Variables
attractiveness $[F(1, 168) = 3.31, p = .071]$. The final cultural variable, cultural mistrust, also was not seen as a significant predictor of counselor attractiveness $[F(1, 167) = .09, p = .769]$. Although none of the cultural variables were significant predictors of counselor attractiveness, acculturation came close to significance, accounting for 1.9% of the variance.

**Hypothesis 7B:** Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust will be significant predictors of counselor expertness on the CRF. Models using cultural mistrust and acculturation to predict the expertness ratings component of social influence were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 11. Acculturation did not significantly predict counselor expertness $[F(1, 168) = .056, p = .813]$, and unlike counselor attractiveness, did not approach significance in this case. Cultural mistrust also was not seen as a significant predictor of counselor expertness $[F(1, 167) = 1.89, p = .171]$. 

**Hypothesis 7C:** Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust will be significant predictors of counselor trustworthiness on the CRF. Models using cultural mistrust and acculturation to predict the trustworthiness ratings component of social influence were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 12. Acculturation again did not significantly predict counselor trustworthiness $[F(1, 168) = .001, p = .975]$. Cultural mistrust was found to be a significant predictor of counselor trustworthiness $[F(1, 167) = 6.87, p < .01]$, and accounted for 3.8% of the variance.

**Hypothesis 7D:** Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust will be significant predictors of counselor credibility on the CRF. Models using cultural mistrust and acculturation to
predict the credibility ratings component of social influence were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 13. Similar to the cases of the other components of counselor social influence, acculturation was not seen as a significant predictor of counselor credibility \( F(1, 168) = .01, p = .909 \). Cultural mistrust, however, was seen as a significant predictor of counselor credibility \( F(1, 167) = 4.23, p < .05 \) and accounted for 2.4% of the variance.

**Asian American Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust and the Counselor Credibility Rating Scale**

**Hypothesis 8A:** Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust will be significant predictors of counselor credibility for working with Caucasian Americans on the CCRS. Models using acculturation and cultural mistrust to predict counselor credibility ratings when working with Caucasian American clients were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 14. Acculturation did not significantly predict counselor credibility when working with Caucasian American clients \( F(1, 168) = .46, p = .501 \). The final cultural variable, cultural mistrust, also was not seen as a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with Caucasian American clients \( F(1, 167) = .03, p = .865 \).

**Hypothesis 8B:** Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust will be significant predictors of counselor credibility for working with Asian Americans on the CCRS. Models using acculturation and cultural mistrust to predict counselor credibility ratings when working with Asian American clients were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 15.
Acculturation was not seen to significantly predict counselor credibility when working with Asian American clients \[F(1, 168) = .01, p = .945\]. Cultural mistrust also was not seen as a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with Asian American clients \[F(1, 167) = 1.78, p = .184\].

**Hypothesis 8C:** Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust will be significant predictors of counselor credibility for working with all ethnicities on the CCRS. Models using acculturation and cultural mistrust to predict counselor credibility ratings when working with clients of all ethnicities were analyzed. These results are summarized in Table 16. Acculturation did not significantly predict counselor credibility when working with clients of all ethnicities \[F(1, 168) = .13, p = .718\]. Cultural mistrust was not seen as a significant predictor of counselor credibility when working with clients of all ethnicities either, but did approach significance \[F(1, 167) = 3.36, p = .069\], and accounted for 2.0% of the variance.

**Asian American Acculturation, Cultural Mistrust and the Self-Disclosure Situations Survey**

**Hypothesis 9:** Acculturation and Cultural Mistrust will be significant predictors of total self-disclosure on the SDSS. Finally, models using acculturation and cultural mistrust to predict willingness to self-disclose were analyzed. These results are
summarized in Table 17. Acculturation \(F(1,168) = 1.56, p = .213\) was not seen as a significant predictor of willingness to self-disclose, and neither was cultural mistrust \(F(1,167) = .08, p = .777\)

Predictive Abilities of Cultural Variables in the Asian American Sample

The preceding results provide some support for Hypothesis 7, which examined how well the cultural variables could predict counselor social influence as measured by the CRF. The results did not support Hypothesis 7A, as none of the cultural variables were significant predictors of the attractiveness component of counselor social influence. In the case of Hypothesis 7B, however, independent self-construal was seen as a significant predictor of the expertness component of counselor social influence. Two of the cultural variables provided support for Hypothesis 7C, as both independent self-construal and cultural mistrust were seen as significant predictors of the trustworthiness component of counselor social influence. Similarly, Hypothesis 7D also received support from the same two cultural variables, and independent self-construal and cultural mistrust were seen as significant predictors of the credibility component of counselor social influence.

There was no support from the data for Hypothesis 8, which examined the CCRS. None of the cultural variables were significant predictors for any of the counselor credibility ratings. The only variable that approached significance was cultural mistrust when predicting ratings of counselor credibility for working with clients of all ethnicities.
Hypothesis 9, which examined the SDSS, was partially supported. Two of the cultural variables were significant predictors of willingness to self-disclose, independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal. However, the other two cultural variables, cultural mistrust and acculturation, did not approach significance when predicting willingness to self-disclose.

Comparisons Between Male and Female Participants

Asian Americans

The results of the T-Tests for comparisons by sex of the Asian American and Caucasian American samples on the variables examined in this study are presented in Tables 19 and 20, respectively. The results indicate that there were significant differences between males and females in the Asian American group, but not the Caucasian group.

The results of the T-Tests for comparisons by sex of the Asian American group indicate that the two groups only differed significantly on one variable, the SL-ASIA \( t = 2.03, p < .05 \). The Asian American females (\( M = 3.13 \)) as a group were less acculturated than the Asian American males (\( M = 3.31 \)).

Caucasian Americans

The results of the T-Tests for comparisons by sex of the Caucasian American group indicated that the two groups did not differ significantly on any of the variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Asian American Males (N = 84)</th>
<th>Asian American Females (N = 88)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Rating Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>44.60</td>
<td>45.93</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>42.41</td>
<td>44.16</td>
<td>-.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>32.60</td>
<td>33.53</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>90.09</td>
<td>-.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Disclosure Situations Survey</strong></td>
<td>56.29</td>
<td>52.77</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Construal Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>58.46</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>57.74</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Credibility Rating Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ethnicities</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Mistrust Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political/Legal</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Work</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>31.89</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>31.32</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.39</td>
<td>100.86</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation Scale</strong></td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05 **p<.01

Table 19: T-Tests of the Study Variables for Asian Americans by Sex.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Caucasian American Males (N = 119)</th>
<th>Caucasian American Females (n = 165)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Rating Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>10.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>98.08</td>
<td>18.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure Situations Survey</td>
<td>60.08</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Construal Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>59.32</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>9.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Credibility Rating Scale</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05 **p<.01

Table 20: T-Tests of the Study Variables for Caucasian Americans by Sex.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In this final chapter, the purpose of the study is reviewed. Following this, the results are discussed and the study's findings are summarized. Next, possible implications of the study for the field of counseling psychology are presented, along with limitations of the present study. Finally, directions for future research in this area are discussed.

Review of the Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study was to critically examine the social influence model of counseling in terms of its applicability to ethnic minority populations. Specifically, a number of cultural variables were examined in relation to an Asian American student population, and how these variables mediated the Asian Americans' perceptions of a counselor in comparison to a Caucasian American population. The main question posited by this study was: "Will the social influence a counselor is able to exert over a client be affected by the client's ethnicity?", a question not adequately addressed by the social influence literature. It was hypothesized that cultural background would affect
the social influence of a counselor, and so a follow-up question was asked: “Which
cultural variables may help explain the differences in perceptions of a counselor between
Asian and Caucasian Americans?” For this study the cultural variables of self-construal,
acculturation and cultural mistrust were examined as to their effects on Asian Americans’
perceptions.

The dependent variables in this study were social influence (operationalized by the
constructs of attractiveness, expertness and trustworthiness), credibility and willingness to
self-disclose. It was hypothesized that the two ethnic groups (Asian American and
Caucasian American) would differ on their ratings of a counselor in terms of social
influence and credibility, and that they would also differ in their willingness to self-disclose
in a counseling situation. The cultural variables mentioned above were examined to
determine whether they contributed to the differential ratings by the two groups.

Also, within-group comparisons were designed to address differences in the Asian
American sample. The cultural variables of acculturation and cultural mistrust were
examined to see if they differentially affected counselor ratings and willingness to self-
disclose. Specifically, it was hypothesized that higher acculturated Asian Americans
would respond in a manner different than lower acculturated Asian American. In addition,
Asian Americans with greater amounts of cultural mistrust were hypothesized to answer
differently than Asian Americans with lesser amounts of cultural mistrust.

Finally, all of the cultural variables were examined in terms of their respective
abilities to predict the dependent variables. Specifically, it was hypothesized that self-
construal, acculturation and cultural mistrust would all significantly predict counselor social influence, counselor credibility and willingness to self-disclose. Acculturation was included as one of the cultural variables in this study because it taps into within group differences, and allows one to examine the heterogeneous nature of the group labeled as Asian American. Self-construal was included in this study for a similar reason. Past research has shown acculturation to be an important theoretical variable, but one that is difficult to operationalize. Self-construal is another cultural variable that can be used to explore within group differences, and current research suggests that it may be easier to operationalize than acculturation. The final cultural variable, cultural mistrust, has provided robust results when used to study within group differences in African Americans. It was included in this study to explore how well this construct may apply to other ethnic minority groups. It was particularly salient to this project because trust is a very important component of the social influence model, and cultural mistrust was hypothesized to affect the establishment of social influence.

**Discussion of Results**

The results of this study provided at least partial support for all hypotheses concerning between-groups comparisons (Hypotheses 1-4). Hypothesis 1 examined differences in self-construal between the two ethnic groups, and was partially supported. Asian Americans were found to score higher for interdependent self-construal than
Caucasian Americans. However, Caucasian Americans did not score higher for independent self-construal than Asian Americans, as hypothesized. The two groups did not differ on the measure of independent self-construal.

These results support other findings that Asian Americans are more likely to exhibit aspects of interdependent self-construal than Caucasian Americans (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). This follows the theoretical formulation of interdependent self-construal being similar to the notion of collectivism. Asian cultures in general are more collectivistic in nature than Western cultures, and thus it stands to reason that Asian Americans would be more interdependent than Caucasian Americans.

The second finding, that the two groups did not differ in terms of independent self-construal, while counter to what was hypothesized, is not very surprising. Brockner and Chen (1996) found that a subset of a sample from China scored high for independent self-construal, similar to a sample from the United States. The present study supports Brockner and Chen's conclusion that self-construal is open to individual differences, and not based on culture alone. That the present sample of Asian Americans did not differ from the Caucasian American sample is even more understandable when one refers to the high number (55%) of Asian Americans identified as "Bicultural" on the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA). Singelis (1994) suggests that the development of both types of self-construal is adaptive for individuals who may have to
move between two different types of cultures. Since the Western culture they are in is dominant for independent self-construal, the Asian Americans may have developed that aspect of their personalities in order to better integrate into their surroundings.

The second set of hypotheses examined differences between the two ethnic groups in their ratings of the perceived attractiveness, expertness, trustworthiness and credibility of the counselor from the video segment, with the Caucasian American group being hypothesized to rate the counselor higher than the Asian American group on all components. Caucasian Americans rated the counselor from the video clip to be more expert and trustworthy than the Asian Americans, as was hypothesized. These findings lend further support to other studies (Atkinson et al. 1978; Gim et al., 1991) that have found race to be an important factor in perceived expertness. The counselor on the video clip was a Caucasian American male engaged in therapy with a Caucasian American male client. The preference, or at least higher perceived expertness, for same race counselors has been demonstrated in ethnic minority groups as well as Caucasian American samples.

In addition to race, it also possible that the counselor's therapeutic style affected ratings of expertness. Although the clip was chosen because it did not demonstrate any particular theoretical orientation, it is possible that the therapist's mannerisms and behaviors caused the Asian Americans to question his expertness.

In the case of trustworthiness, this study provides support for the proposition that members of ethnic minority groups may not trust Caucasian American therapists. These results are different from other studies that have examined African-American,
Native-American and Mexican-American samples, in which no significant differences were found (Roll et al., 1972; LaFromboise & Dixon, 1981; Acosta & Sheehan, 1976). It is assumed that the counselor role carries with it a certain inherent level of trustworthiness (Rotter & Stein, 1971) and perhaps that is why no differences were found in perceived trustworthiness. This study’s results suggest that, for Asian Americans, the role of counselor may not hold as much inherent trustworthiness as it does for other groups, and thus significant group differences were found. Again, it is possible that the counselor’s manner may have affected perceived trustworthiness, as was found in previous studies (Kaul & Schmidt, 1971).

The results of this study did not show between group differences for perceived attractiveness. In general, there is a dearth of research examining the effects of ethnicity on perceived counselor attractiveness. Cash & Kehr (1978) proposed that unattractiveness may be a more relevant factor than attractiveness. In this study, the counselor was an older male, and both groups rated him rather low on attractiveness, suggesting that he was perceived as unattractive. Other studies (Goldberg & Tidwell, 1990) have shown that ethnicity may not be as relevant a factor in perceived counselor attractiveness as attitudes and non-verbal behaviors. The results of this study may support this conclusion, but no other variables were manipulated so the support is not definitive.

The third set of hypotheses examined differences between the two ethnic groups and their ratings of counselor credibility, again with the Caucasian American group being hypothesized to rate the counselor as having more credibility when working with
Caucasian American clients, Asian American clients, and clients of all ethnicities. It was found that the Caucasian Americans found the counselor to possess more credibility when working with Asian American clients and clients of all ethnicities than the Asian Americans did. While very little research has examined the role of Asian American ethnicity on perceived counselor credibility, a few studies have found that Asian Americans rate counselors as more credible when they are introduced as Asian rather than Caucasian (Gim et al., 1991). The results of this study further support this finding. The therapist in this study was introduced as "Caucasian", and since this was a video clip the participants could see the counselor’s physical characteristics rather than simply listening to an audio tape, which may have further affected ratings.

The video segment was of a first session, and much of the interaction was information gathering. The counselor was not overtly directive or non-directive in session, but was asking many questions, which could be construed as directive. Atkinson et al. (1978) demonstrated that Asian Americans rated a counselor with a directive style of therapy as being more credible than one with a non-directive style. This study did not support this finding, and it is possible that the counselor’s race was seen as a more important factor than his therapeutic style. Littrell et al. (1987) found that behavioral cues may be salient for credibility ratings, and the Asian Americans may have reacted differently than the Caucasian Americans to the counselor’s behaviors in this study.

An interesting finding of this study was that both groups rated the counselor highest on credibility for working with Caucasian clients, and did not significantly differ on
these ratings. In other words, the Asian Americans thought the counselor would work well with Caucasian clients, but would not work as well with Asian American clients or clients of all ethnicities. The Caucasian Americans rated the counselor highly for working with all groups. One may conclude that the Asian American participants can acknowledge credibility in a Caucasian American therapist, but differentially depending on the type of client he/she is working with. The Caucasian Americans however, may see credibility as more of an all or none type of trait, such that counselors who possesses credibility possess it regardless of whom they are working with. This finding accentuates one of the main criticisms of the social influence model, that it ignores the importance of client characteristics and “perpetuates the myth that the counseling process is uniform for all clients” (Heppner & Claiborn, 1989, pg. 381).

These findings suggest that client ethnicity could be a very important factor in how a client perceives his/her counselor. Specifically, Asian Americans may perceive a Caucasian American counselor as credible only when working with Caucasian American clients. The same counselor’s credibility may diminish when working with clients of other ethnicities. Caucasian Americans that perceive a counselor as credible, may, on the other hand, perceive him/her as credible regardless of the ethnicity of the client. This suggests that ethnicity may be seen as an important factor by Asian Americans, but not by Caucasian Americans. There could be many reasons for this, including the conceptualization of the United States as a “melting pot” and all its inhabitants as simply “Americans”, regardless of ethnicity. It is also possible that some Caucasian Americans
consider themselves “color blind” and don’t feel that ethnicity should ever be made into an issue, for fear that making ethnicity an issue may be construed as racist thinking. Some Caucasian American counselors may, for similar reasons, disregard ethnicity as a factor to be taken into consideration during therapy. This study shows, however, that ethnicity is an important issue to ethnic minority members and should not be overlooked. If ethnic minority clients think that Caucasian American counselors will not address ethnic differences, these counselors will not be seen as credible, and the clients may forego therapy with them, preferring to search for an ethnic minority counselor.

This study operationalized the construct of credibility in two ways: using a combination of the expertness and trustworthiness subscales of the CRF, and by using the CCRS, a new scale developed specifically for this study. The reasons for this were twofold. First, the CRF offers an inferred measure of credibility, while the CCRS taps directly into the construct. Second, the CCRS allows for the measurement of credibility across different ethnic groups by asking about how a counselor would perform with clients of different ethnicities.

A comparison of the two scales shows that the reliability coefficients of the CCRS subscales were slightly lower than, but comparable to the CRF. Also, although the two scales were highly significantly correlated with each other, the CCRS was significantly correlated with the political/legal subscale of the CMI and the CRF was not. This provides some support for the notion that the two scales are tapping into slightly different constructs. In addition, there were differences by acculturation level on the CCRS, but
not with the CRF. Again, this shows that the CCRS may be tapping into a cultural component of credibility that the CRF is unable to do. These findings suggest that future research may need to re-examine how credibility is operationalized, especially in terms of the cultural differences of respondents.

Hypothesis 4 proposed that Caucasian Americans would be more willing to self-disclose than Asian Americans, and this final between-groups hypothesis was also supported by the data. This finding supports previous research that has found Asian Americans to be reluctant to self-disclose in general (Sue & Morishima, 1982). The Asian culture highly stigmatizes mental illness, and this promotes the reluctance to self-disclose about personal matters. Past research has found an overall effect that ethnic minority group members are less willing to self-disclose than Caucasian Americans. Poston et al. (1991) found that African Americans were less willing to self-disclose to Caucasian American counselors, and proposed that the counselor’s lack of ascribed credibility with that population could have been a reason for this. The counselor in this study was also seen to have low credibility in the eyes of the Asian American participants, and this could have affected their ratings of willingness to self-disclose.

Ridley (1984) explains this effect in a different manner. He states that for most ethnic minority members, self-disclosure is accompanied with an inherent sense of risk. Self-disclosure by ethnic minority members can have negative consequences in many situations, and can lead to racist attacks and disparagement. He labels the reluctance to self-disclose as cultural paranoia, and sees it as a healthy psychological reaction to past
racist encounters. While his formulation is specific to the African American population, it would also help to explain the reluctance in the Asian American population, as that population is also targeted for racism by some Caucasian Americans.

The within-group comparisons that were conducted in this study (Hypotheses 5 and 6) were for the most part unsupported in terms of acculturation level. There were no differences between the high and low acculturation groups in terms of self-construal, willingness to self-disclose or perceived counselor social influence. There were some group differences when examining cultural mistrust and perceived counselor credibility.

Hypothesis 5A proposed that the lower acculturated Asian Americans would have greater amounts of cultural mistrust than the higher acculturated Asian Americans. This hypothesis was supported by the data, and the acculturation groups did differ on the amount of cultural mistrust they had. The higher acculturated group had lower levels of cultural mistrust than the low acculturation group, as was hypothesized. It is surprising that these differences in cultural mistrust did not translate into differences in perceived social influence, especially on the trustworthiness subscale of the Counselor Rating Form (CRF). While the construct of cultural mistrust has almost exclusively been applied to the African American population (Terrell & Terrell, 1981), this study provides some support for the notion that the construct may be generalizable to other ethnic minority populations as well. It also provides support for a negative relationship between acculturation and
cultural mistrust in the Asian American population. This finding could help to shed light on what specific components of acculturation lead to differently held attitudes between groups.

Hypothesis 5B proposed that lower acculturated Asian Americans would score lower for independent self-construal and higher for interdependent self-construal than higher acculturated Asian Americans. This hypothesis was not supported by the data. The lack of within-group differences in terms of self-construal may be explained by examining the sample that was used in this study, as well as Singelis's (1994) propositions about self-construal. First, because of the scoring method used with the SL-ASIA, there was a dearth of Western identified Asian Americans (9%), and a majority of Bicultural Asian Americans (55%). Theoretically, it stands to reason that Bicultural Asian Americans would have well developed independent and interdependent self-construals. In addition, the sample collected was in Columbus, Ohio, which does not have a large Asian influence. For the Asian identified participants to be able to function well in this locale, it would help them to have both self-construals well developed as well. As Singelis (1994) suggests, having both types of self-construal is adaptive for individuals who may have to move between two different types of cultures.

In terms of social influence, hypothesis 5C proposed that the lower acculturated Asian Americans would rate the counselor from the video segment as being less attractive, trustworthy, expert, and credible than the higher acculturated Asian Americans. This hypothesis was not supported by the data, as there were no differences between the
acculturation groups in perceived social influence of the counselor. Although there is little existing research specifically examining the role of acculturation in the social influence process with Asian Americans, many studies have shown attitudinal differences between high and low acculturation Asian Americans (Leong et al., 1995; Gim et al., 1991). These attitudinal differences were not seen in this study with respect to social influence. Again, one reason for this could be that the Asian American sample was not heterogeneous enough in terms of acculturation level. Eighty-five percent of the sample was either Asian identified or Bicultural, and this could have affected the possibility of finding significant results. Another possible reason is that all three acculturation groups did exhibit some level of cultural mistrust. It is possible that the cultural mistrust was prevalent enough throughout the entire sample that it affected their ratings of perceived social influence.

The findings concerning perceived counselor credibility were contrary to what was proposed in hypothesis 5D, that the lower acculturated Asian Americans would rate the counselor as having less credibility when working with Caucasian American client, Asian American clients, and clients of all ethnicities than higher acculturated Asian Americans. The findings were also contrary to theoretical expectations. The acculturation groups only differed on their ratings of the counselor when the client was proposed to be Caucasian American. However, it was the Western identified group that rated the counselor as least credible, opposite to what was expected. Another study found no main effects for acculturation in relation to credibility (Gim et al., 1991), but this does not explain the current finding. The between-groups comparison showed that both groups found the
counselor to have relatively high credibility when working with a Caucasian American client. It is possible, then, that the Asian identified group differentially rated the counselor’s credibility, thinking he had credibility when working with Caucasians, but not other groups. The Western identified group, however, may have rated him more like the Caucasian American sample did, in an all or none fashion, and found him to be lacking credibility. This may help explain why the Western identified mean scores were lower than the Asian identified mean scores for all subscales of the Counselor Credibility Rating Scale (CCRS).

There is another possible explanation for this finding which concerns the response styles of Asian Americans. Some research has shown that Asians, when compared to Caucasians, tend to use the midpoints on Likert scales, rather than the two extremes (Chen et al., 1995). In this study, the lower acculturated Asian Americans may have responded similar to other Asian populations, while the higher acculturated Asian Americans may have responded more like Caucasian Americans. Similarly, Asians often respond in a manner that allows others to save “face”; in a manner that does not make another person look bad. This type of response style is non-confrontational, and more susceptible to social desirability. In the case of credibility in this study, lower acculturated Asian Americans may have rated the counselor higher than they actually felt he deserved as a way of maintaining “face”. The higher acculturated group, however, may not have
been affected by these concerns, were less susceptible to the effects of social desirability, and were able to respond more truthfully, which resulted in a lower credibility rating of the counselor.

Hypothesis 5E stated that lower acculturated Asian Americans would be less willing to self-disclose than higher acculturated Asian Americans, and was not supported by the data. This finding was somewhat surprising. It was hypothesized that acculturation would be a moderating variable such that the high acculturation group would be more willing to self-disclose than the low acculturation group. However, it is possible that the cultural paranoia described by Ridley (1984) is so firmly established in the minds of all ethnic minority members, regardless of level of acculturation, that they are all somewhat reluctant to discuss personal matters. In addition to cultural paranoia, there is also the specifically Asian stigma against self-disclosure (Sue & Morishima, 1982). These two factors together may be so entrenched that even high acculturation Asian Americans cannot overcome their reluctance to self-disclose.

The within-group comparisons concerning level of cultural mistrust (Hypothesis 6) were only partially supported. Hypothesis 6A proposed that Asian Americans who scored highly for cultural mistrust would find the counselor from the video clip to have less social influence than Asian Americans who scored low for cultural mistrust. Specifically, they would rate the counselor as being less attractive, expert, trustworthy and credible. There were some difference between high and low cultural mistrust groups in terms of perceived social influence. Unlike acculturation, cultural mistrust level did have an effect on ratings
of counselor trustworthiness. As hypothesized, the high mistrust group rated the
counselor as being less trustworthy than the low mistrust group. Because this construct
has not been previously studied in relation to Asian Americans, this was more of an
exploratory finding. However, these results do corroborate with similar findings with
African American samples (Watkins & Terrell, 1988).

Hypothesis 6B proposed that highly mistrustful Asian Americans would rate the
counselor as having less credibility when working with Caucasian American clients, Asian
American clients, and clients of all ethnicities. The high and low cultural mistrust groups
did differ in ratings of counselor credibility in terms of the counselor's working with
clients of all ethnicities. Credibility is often conceptualized as a combination of expertness
and trustworthiness, so it stands to reason that since the two groups differed on perceived
trustworthiness they would also differ on perceived credibility. It was surprising,
however, that they did not differ in their ratings of the counselor when working with Asian
American clients. It was expected that cultural mistrust would be strongest in a situation
where a member of one's own group was working with a Caucasian counselor. One
possible explanation for this finding is that both groups did have a certain level of cultural
mistrust, and this level may have been high enough that neither of them found the
counselor to be credible when working with members of their own group. Then, in the
case of working with clients of all ethnicities, the low mistrust group level of mistrust may
have been low enough for them to differentially rate the counselor as credible for working with clients of all ethnicities. The high mistrust group, however, may not have felt him to have very much credibility when working with any clients.

Hypothesis 6C proposed that highly mistrustful Asian Americans would be less willing to self-disclose than Asian Americans with low cultural mistrust. The two groups did not differ on their willingness to self-disclose. Again, the fact that both groups had some level of mistrust may have been enough to make them reluctant to self-disclose. Ridley’s (1984) cultural paranoia would be present to some degree in all persons with any level of cultural mistrust. In this situation, both groups did have some cultural mistrust, and thus both may have been unwilling to self-disclose.

All of the cultural variables were examined as to their ability to predict perceived social influence, counselor credibility and willingness to self-disclose (Hypotheses 7-9). Acculturation did not significantly predict any of the dependent variables. While acculturation was hypothesized to be a significant predictor for all of the dependent variables, these results are not wholly unexpected. Much research has been performed using acculturation as a predictor variable, and results have been far from definitive. Some results have been positive: Atkinson and Gim (1989) found acculturation to be a significant predictor of attitudes toward help seeking in Asian Americans, as did Tata and Leong (1994) with a Chinese-American sample; Ying and Miller (1992) found acculturation to be positively related to openness in discussing problems with a counselor (willingness to self-disclose).
However, many studies have been unable to show acculturation to be a significant predictor variable: Huang et al. (1994) found highly acculturated Chinese-American children who are more socially competent to report more dysphoria, opposite to what they hypothesized; Gim et al. (1990) found acculturation to be negatively correlated to willingness to see a counselor, opposite to what would be theoretically expected; Atkinson et al. (1995) found no main effects for acculturation. While theoretically acculturation has been posited to be a very important factor in many aspects of the lives of Asian Americans, empirical research has not been able fully support theoretical propositions. There are a number of possible reasons for this, including ineffective measures, differences in samples from study to study, and, most likely, acculturation being an extremely complex construct that cannot easily be measured and will behave differently depending on the sample studied, the context of the study, and what variables are trying to be predicted.

The hypotheses that proposed that cultural mistrust would significantly predict the dependent variables in this study were not fully supported by the data. Cultural mistrust was a significant predictor for the trustworthiness and credibility components of perceived social influence, but did not significantly predict credibility in terms of specific ethnicities or willingness to self-disclose. That cultural mistrust was able to predict perceived trustworthiness fits in well with the theoretical formulations of both constructs. Some of the components of trustworthiness as conceptualized by Strong (1968) were: a lack of motivation for personal gain, reputation for honesty, sincerity and openness. Cultural mistrust taps into an ethnic minority member's suspiciousness of Caucasian Americans,
operationalized on the Cultural Mistrust Inventory with questions such as “Blacks (or other ethnic minority group) should be wary of a white person who tries to be friendly.” It stands to reason then, that persons high on cultural mistrust will not perceive Caucasian American counselors to be trustworthy. It must be noted that almost all the research on cultural mistrust has been performed with African American clients, so interpretations of the results in this study will be extrapolated from that body of work.

Perceived counselor credibility, as measured by the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), was also significantly predicted by cultural mistrust. This finding supports similar findings from past research. Watkins et al. (1989) found a negative correlation between cultural mistrust and perceived counselor credibility in an African American sample of clients paired with Caucasian American counselors. Poston et al. (1991) found similar results with African American clients that support the notion that cultural mistrust is negatively related to perceived counselor credibility, when the counselor is Caucasian American. Terrell and Terrell (1984) found cultural mistrust to be a significant predictor of premature termination in African American clients. When these findings are related to Sue and Sue’s (1990) propositions about the importance of counselor credibility for the use of mental health services by Asian Americans, one can see how cultural mistrust could be related to perceived credibility in this population.

Credibility, as measured by the Counselor Credibility Rating Scale (CCRS) was not predicted by cultural mistrust. There could be many reasons for this, the simplest of which is that although the CCRS and the CRF are significantly correlated with each other,
the CCRS may measure some aspects of credibility that the CRF does not. Similarly, despite their overlap, the CRF may measure aspects of credibility that the CCRS does not. The CCRS’s statements are presented in generalities, such as “I believe that this counselor would be able to help Asian Americans with their psychological problems”. The CRF is more individualized, asking the participants for their personal impressions of the counselor. Perhaps this discrepancy in wording allows for participants to make differential credibility ratings depending on which scale is used, even when rating the same counselor. In addition, it is possible that the construct of cultural mistrust when applied to African Americans may be qualitatively different from how it applies to Asian Americans. While both groups have undergone mistreatment in this country, the way they experience cultural mistrust may be different, and the CMI may not adequately tap into cultural mistrust as experienced by Asian Americans.

Based on Ridley’s propositions about cultural paranoia and that not self-disclosing may actually be a positive adaptive trait for minorities, it is surprising that cultural mistrust was not a significant predictor of willingness to self-disclose. However, previous research has had conflicting results when examining the constructs of cultural mistrust and willingness to self-disclose. Plasky and Lorion (1984) found that Caucasian Americans were more willing to self-disclose in general than African Americans. In that study, all the interviewers were Caucasian Americans, opening the possibility that the reason for the difference may have been cultural mistrust. Thompson et al. (1994) found that lower levels of cultural mistrust were related to a greater number of self-disclosures in African Americans.
American women, opposite to what was expected. This study found no significant main effects for cultural mistrust and willingness to self-disclose. It seems that more research needs to be done in this area to reach more definitive conclusions.

The hypotheses concerning the predictive abilities of self-construal and the dependent variables of the study were partially supported by the data. Self-construal was the most significant of the cultural variables in terms of ability to predict the dependent variables, especially in the case of independent self-construal. Independent self-construal was a significant predictor for the expertness, trustworthiness and credibility components of perceived social influence, and of willingness to self-disclose. These results fit the theoretical basis of the construct. Independent self-construal is related more to a Western, individualistic way of thinking (Singelis, 1994). In other words, Asian Americans with more independent self-construals would perceive the counselor in a manner similar to Caucasian Americans, having higher levels of social influence. In this study, independent self-construal was a significant predictor of perceived social influence for the Caucasian American group as well.

Willingness to self-disclose was also significantly predicted by independent self-construal. This finding also fits the theoretical basis of the construct, and receives support from other studies. For example, Okazaki (1997) found that self-construal was related to social anxiety in Asian American students such that lower levels of independent self-construal were predictive of greater social anxiety. One can assume that persons high in social anxiety would be less willing to self-disclose personal matters to others. Higher
levels of independent self-construal are related to lower levels of social anxiety, and thus may also be related to a greater willingness to self-disclose. Similarly, Singelis and Sharkey (1995) found support for a negative relationship between independent self-construal and embarrassability, and a positive relationship between interdependent self-construal and embarrassability. It stands to reason that, like social anxiety, persons who are easily embarrassed would be less likely to self-disclose to others. Therefore, since higher levels of independent self-construal are related to lower levels of embarrassability, it is follows that they would also be positively related to willingness to self-disclose.

Interdependent self-construal was also found to be a significant predictor of willingness to self-disclose in the Asian American group. However, it was positively correlated to willingness to self-disclose, which seems contrary to the previous studies outlined above. Considering the theoretical basis of the construct, it was expected that interdependent self-construal would be negatively correlated with willingness to self-disclose. Although self-construal types significantly predicted some dependent variables for the Caucasian American group and not the Asian American group, the predictive abilities of the types were not significantly different between the two groups.

Summary of Findings

This study provided support for significant differences between Asian American and Caucasian American students’ perceptions of the social influence and credibility of counselors. In addition, there were significant differences between the two groups in their
willingness to self-disclose to others. In general, Asian American students rated the Caucasian American counselor lower than the Caucasian American students on all the dependent variables, and were less willing to self-disclose than the Caucasian Americans.

Somewhat surprisingly, there were not many significant differences within the Asian American sample when examining the sample in terms of level of acculturation and level of cultural mistrust. The different acculturation levels showed the most differences in their levels of cultural mistrust, in the hypothesized direction. There were no differences in perceived social influence, however. In terms of cultural mistrust level, there were also few differences in perceived social influence and credibility between high and low mistrust groups.

In addition, only the cultural variable of independent self-construal was seen as a significant predictor of perceived social influence and willingness to self-disclose. Acculturation was not a significant predictor for any of the variables in the study, and cultural mistrust only predicted the trustworthiness and credibility components of perceived social influence. Because this was one of the first studies to apply the construct of cultural mistrust to the Asian American population, these should be regarded as preliminary findings and this construct needs to be studied further with this group.

Despite the many significant group differences between the Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans, neither acculturation nor cultural mistrust were very strong
predictors of perceived social influence or counselor credibility. Neither were significant predictors of willingness to self-disclose. The strongest predictor of perceived social influence in this study was independent self-construal.

The most robust findings of this study were seen in the between group differences between Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans. These findings allow for some conclusions. It is clear that counselors are perceived differently by clients dependent on their cultural background. The social influence model of counseling would more effectively explain the counseling process if it included the client’s cultural variables along with the counselor’s attractiveness, expertness and trustworthiness as significant components of the model. The between group findings suggest that although a counselor may be seen as an expert in his/her field, that ascribed credibility is not sufficient to attract and retain all clients. The counselor may have to prove him/herself to clients from different cultural backgrounds in order to have a successful therapy encounter.

One of the most interesting findings in this study was that although there were significant differences between the two ethnic groups, neither acculturation nor cultural mistrust seemed to be important factors in explaining the differences. The question that arises from these findings is: “What is it about being Asian American that leads to a perception of a counselor that is different from Caucasian Americans?” In other words, which cultural variables would best enhance the social influence model?
Implications for Counseling

The results of this study allow for the proposal of some implications for Caucasian American counselors and other mental health service providers who may find themselves working with members of ethnic minority groups. In general, the results of this study support the notion that regardless of how much social influence a counselor may possess with one group, that social influence may not translate to another ethnic group. This suggests that for counseling centers to attract ethnic minority students, they must somehow portray themselves as having the expertise to work with those ethnic minority students. From the results of this study, an important way to show this expertise may simply involve having a staff that is composed of counselors with different cultural backgrounds. In other words, there may be support for the notion of trying to provide clients with counselors of the same ethnicity.

For example, the Caucasian Americans in this study rated the Caucasian counselor as being more credible than the Asian Americans. While the Asian Americans were able to show that they felt the counselor had credibility for working with Caucasian clients, they doubted his ability to work with clients with other cultural backgrounds. With this in mind, it is not surprising that Asian Americans underutilize mental health services (Cheung & Lau, 1982). Most mental health centers are staffed with an overwhelming majority of Caucasian American counselors, and most ethnic minority members who go for services will end up seeing a Caucasian American counselor (Poston et al, 1991). Knowing this to be the case, potential Asian American clients may be reluctant to enter the center.
In the case of perceived counselor expertness, again there were between-groups differences, with the Asian Americans rating the counselor as being less expert than the Caucasian Americans. Similar to credibility, one can understand why Asian Americans may not utilize mental health services if they feel they will be forced to see a counselor who they feel won't be able to understand their problems, and thus won't be able to help them. To increase utilization of services by this population, it may be necessary to have Asian Americans on staff. This would be especially true in areas with large Asian populations. Regardless of whether there is an Asian American on staff or not, the fact remains that in many instances Caucasian counselors will be seeing Asian American clients. It becomes especially important for that counselor to establish him/herself as an expert during the first counseling session, keeping in mind that this may require modifications to the way they normally achieve this with their other clients.

An especially important finding in this study was the significant difference in how trustworthy the two groups found the counselor to be. One of the hallmarks of successful therapy is the therapeutic relationship, sometimes defined as the mutual feelings of liking, respect and trust that the client and counselor hold toward each other (Kanfer & Goldstein, 1991). Without a sense of trust, clients cannot share their most intimate thoughts, and this will greatly impede therapy. One of the other findings in this study, that Caucasian Americans are more willing to self-disclose than Asian Americans, shows that this reluctance to share oneself in therapy is likely to occur with ethnic minority populations. Again, the sense of trust and willingness to self-disclose may increase if an
Asian American client is seen by an Asian American counselor. However, if this is not possible, it again falls upon the Caucasian American counselor to show the Asian American client that he/she is trustworthy. This must also be established very early in therapy, optimally during the first session, to minimize the chance of premature termination.

Although there were no differences in ratings of attractiveness in this study, attractiveness has been found to be significantly related to how helpful clients perceive a counselor to be (Cash et al, 1975). Attractiveness in this case referred to physical attractiveness. As discussed earlier, the counselor used in this study was an elderly, male Caucasian, whom neither group found very attractive. It is quite possible, however, that between groups differences may have been found if the video segment had used a more attractive Caucasian counselor. For mental health professionals in this country who may work with ethnic minority populations, it is important to discover what factors are salient to attractiveness to those populations, and to portray themselves as such.

Perhaps the most important implication of these findings for counselors is that they must be aware that cultural differences exist, and be willing to modify their techniques to accommodate clients of different ethnicities. This is especially true in light of this study’s findings that Asian Americans can differentially rate counselors depending on the ethnicity of the client they are seeing. Past research has already established that counselors who see themselves as “color blind” or ignore cultural implications of race differences are rated lower by ethnic minority clients (Pomales et al., 1986). For example, in the case of
willingness to self-disclose, a culturally unaware counselor may simply feel the client is being resistant or difficult, and not realize that the counselor has failed to establish him/herself as expert or trustworthy. Being unaware of this, the counselor will most likely not change tactics, and therapy will come to a standstill. The most likely result of this type of session is premature termination. The burden is on the counselor to use proper techniques to increase his/her social influence very early in the therapy process. By doing this, the counselor can best lay the groundwork for a successful therapy encounter.

A surprising but important finding of this study was the lack of significant differences on measures of social influence, credibility and willingness to self-disclose among the high and low acculturation level groups in the Asian American sample. Past studies have found significant differences between the two groups on: recognizing the personal need for professional psychological help and willingness to self-disclose (Atkinson & Gim, 1989) as well as attitudes toward help-seeking (Tata & Leong, 1994). This study did not find similar differences. For mental health professionals, this means that assumptions should not be made about a client’s perceptions of a counselor or counseling based on the fact that they may seem highly acculturated.

For example, just because an Asian American client comes to therapy in very Western styled clothing and speaks without any trace of an accent does not mean that they will want to be treated like other Caucasian clients. This is an important finding because therapists may often accurately gauge an Asian American client’s acculturation level based on those outward indices, but then inaccurately assume that high acculturation is
equivalent to holding Caucasian American views of counseling and counselors. In this study, acculturation level did not differentiate the Asian American sample in terms of perceived social influence, credibility or willingness to self-disclose.

Similar results were found when the Asian American sample was examined in terms of cultural mistrust level. Although there were a few differences in ratings of the counselor between high and low cultural mistrust level groups, the overall effect was minimal. The implication for counselors based on these findings is that although they may have to work harder to establish social influence and credibility with highly mistrustful clients (ones who may have experienced more racism), even clients who are low on cultural mistrust still do not look very favorably upon Caucasian American counselors. Rather than trying to determine cultural mistrust level, Caucasian American counselors should be more aware of the fact that they will have to work harder in general to establish their credibility when working with ethnic minority clients.

An interesting finding of this study was that self-construal was a better predictor of social influence, credibility and willingness to self-disclose than both acculturation and cultural mistrust. This implies that counselors that are curious as to how an ethnic minority client may perceive them are better off trying to assess their self-construal type rather than their level of acculturation or level of cultural mistrust. In this study, independent self-construal was an especially significant predictor for both Asian and Caucasian Americans. Little to no empirical research has been done examining the
construct of self-construal and its relationship to counseling preferences (as evidenced by a search of the Psychinfo Research Database), but in light of these results it seems to be a construct worthy of more intensive study.

In summary, the results of this study have practical implications for mental health agencies and Caucasian American counselors who may work with Asian American clients. One of the major implications is that there is a great need for more ethnic minority psychologists. More importantly, more ethnic minority psychologists are needed to work in the field as therapists. This has overarching implications for psychology in general. For example, there needs to be a greater effort to recruit ethnic minority students into the field of psychology, first as undergraduate majors and then into graduate schools. Perhaps this recruitment effort should be focused in the professional schools of psychology, since their graduates are more likely to become practitioners, and their graduating classes are much larger than those of traditional Ph.D. programs. Mental health agencies need to recruit more ethnic minority psychologists as well, especially in areas where there are large ethnic minority populations, if they wish to reduce premature terminations and increase the utilization of mental health services by ethnic minority populations.

Finally, there has to be an increased awareness in the mental health field that cultural background is an extremely important client variable that must be addressed in some manner. This will involve many changes, both in the structure of mental health agencies (i.e. adding more ethnic minority staff) and in the behavior of the counselors who work in these agencies. Explaining underutilization of treatment and premature
termination as a function of acculturation level or cultural mistrust still in some ways puts the burden of making therapy work on the client. Instead, the burden should be on counselors to figure out how best to reduce these problems. One way to do this is to determine how to increase one's social influence and credibility with ethnic minority clients, and how to establish oneself as having social influence and being credible in as short a time frame as possible.

**Directions for Future Research**

There are many areas for future research that can be inferred from the results of this study. For instance, this study found significant group differences between Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans and their perceptions of a Caucasian counselor. A logical question that arises from these findings is “What characteristics of the counselor did the Asian Americans find unappealing?” and perhaps more importantly, “What characteristics would they find appealing in a counselor?”. The implications for counselors mentioned above included quickly establishing their social influence and portraying themselves as credible to work with ethnic minority populations. Finding out what Asian Americans would find appealing in a counselor would help to accomplish these goals.

A further question that arises from this study is whether Asian American clients would be satisfied with another ethnic minority group counselor. For example, would an Asian American rate a Hispanic American or African American counselor as having more social influence and credibility than a Caucasian American counselor, or is there a distinct
preference for a counselor of their own ethnic group. This is an important practical question, for if any ethnic minority counselor would be acceptable, then the burden on mental health agencies to hire counselors of many different backgrounds lessens. If a distinct preference is found such that Asian American clients only wish to see an Asian American counselor, another question arises. Since the term Asian American comprises a very heterogeneous group, it would be helpful to determine if a Chinese American client would be satisfied seeing an Indian American counselor, or would they only rate another Chinese American as having the social influence and credibility to work effectively with them? In effect, this question would examine the importance of client-counselor matching, and the degree of similarity necessary for the match to be effective.

Some of these questions could be answered by running studies similar to this one, but changing the counselor's characteristics that are seen in the video segment. For example, replacing the Caucasian American counselor with an ethnic minority counselor. Similarly, one could examine differences in ratings for counselors of different ethnic minority groups, such as Korean American or African American. In this manner one would be able to compare differential ratings, and see if there were significant differences in preferences between counselors of different ethnic minority groups, and between counselors of different Asian ethnicities.

An important area for future research is to examine the role of acculturation in ratings of social influence and credibility. First, studies must be performed comparing the effectiveness and utility of different theories of acculturation (Sue & Sue, 1973; Berry,
1980) to help decide the best way to measure acculturation. The SL-ASIA’s unidimensional measure may not capture all the complexities of the construct, and thus may not be the best scale to use to measure acculturation. In part, this may be due to the fact that the SL-ASIA is not an orthogonal measure of acculturation. In addition, artificially trichotomizing acculturation, rather than treating it as a continuous variable, may detract from its ability to provide significant effects, and may actually result in conflicting findings. However, there is a lack of other scales that have been constructed specifically for Asian Americans, so by default one turns to the SL-ASIA. The construction of alternate scales to use with Asian Americans, two dimensional scales that tap into Berry’s formulation of the construct, may be more useful. A two dimensional scale (one dimension measuring how Western and individual is, one dimension measuring how Asian an individual is) may better capture the different stages of acculturation, and thus be more useful in research. The utility of another measure of acculturation becomes more evident when one examines the many contrary findings of past studies examining the role of acculturation in counseling (Huang et al., 1994; Gim et al., 1990; Atkinson et al., 1995).

This study used the variable of cultural mistrust in relation to an Asian American sample as opposed to the African American population with whom it is usually applied. In effect this was an exploratory study to examine the effectiveness of this construct with another ethnic minority population, and to test the generalizability of the Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI) with other ethnic minority populations. The results of this study did not
show cultural mistrust to be a very strong predictor variable in this population. This study needs to be replicated, however, to better determine whether cultural mistrust could be an important cultural variable for Asian Americans. That there were a few significant finding using this variable makes it more important to study this construct further. It would be useful to examine the statistical properties of the CMI to determine whether it is adequately measuring cultural mistrust with Asian Americans, or whether another scale needs to be developed to better tap into this construct. Cultural mistrust may be a qualitatively different construct for different minorities, so group specific instruments may be necessary.

Finally, one of the questions raised by this study mentioned earlier was “What is it about being Asian American that leads to a perception of a counselor that is different from Caucasian Americans?”. The results of this study point away from some of the more researched constructs such as acculturation and cultural mistrust. Instead, the construct of self-construal was a better predictor than either of the other two cultural variables. To help answer the question posed above, future research needs to focus on self-construal and its relationship to counseling. In addition, researchers need to discover other cultural variables and examine their effects on counseling preferences. The question of what factors lead to differential ratings of counselors is extremely important if one wishes to better deliver mental health services to all populations. Rather than simply replicating prior studies, there needs to be a drive for more original research that will construct new and better measures, and examine yet unstudied cultural variables.
Limitations of this Study

The results of this study, as well as the generalizability of its findings, must be examined with care due to various limitations in its design. First, this study utilized samples of ethnic groups from a college student population. Immediately, one must conclude that this study can at best be generalized to other college student populations, and may not be representative of the greater community samples of Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans. Since only a minority of the general population attends college, the generalizability of these findings will need to be cross-validated with non-college student samples.

A second point concerning the population used is that Asian Americans of all ethnicities were included in the study. For greatest utility, it would be ideal to focus on one ethnic group rather than a heterogeneous mixture of different ethnicities. However, the lack of substantial numbers of Asian American students of any one ethnic group at the university where this sample was collected would make this difficult. Sue (1994) has stated that more research needs to be done comparing commonalities and differences among the various Asian groups, but practical considerations make it difficult to collect adequate sample sizes, and thus hinder this effort.

A final consideration about the samples in this study deals with their motivation to participate in the study. Participation fulfilled a research requirement for an introductory psychology course, and did not in any way reflect interest in the actual study being conducted. One must then question the seriousness and care with which participants filled
out the questionnaires, and how well the responses mirrored their true feelings and
attitudes. An actual client rating his/her counselor may be more invested, but that design
creates for other problems, discussed below.

A second major limitation of this study was its analogue design. The participants
in this study were not actual counseling clients, and the person they were rating was not
their therapist. Some would argue that a better study would examine the social influence
model of counseling utilizing actual clients who would rate their counselor at the
beginning of therapy, and later on at the close of therapy. While for some types of
counseling research this would be an ideal situation, for this type of study it would be even
more problematic.

Using actual counselor-client pairs would be very expensive and time-consuming.
Also, it would be almost impossible to have a high enough number of participants to
provide satisfactory power for the study. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, in an
actual therapy setting the researcher would have no control over what was said in session,
and this would obviously be highly relevant to ratings of the social influence and credibility
of the counselor. Comparisons of counselor ratings would be meaningless without having
a standardized script that the counselor would use, and using a standardized script would
be impossible in a true therapy situation. Heppner and Claiborn (1988) addressed the
issue of the inadequacy of analogue studies and provide justifications for their use,
including the notion that the theoretical importance of the study goes beyond the practical
relevance. It is also true, however, that after larger studies have been conducted that establish the need for further studies, the way is paved for smaller studies to be conducted using actual clinical samples.

In addition to the limitations discussed above, this analogue study was also flawed because its design was not complete. Ideally, in addition to the video segment of the Caucasian American counselor that was shown, participants would also have been asked to rate an Asian American counselor. This would have allowed for additional analyses that may have further highlighted the importance of ethnicity in the establishment of social influence. In fact, a truly ideal study would have also incorporated gender as an independent variable, and four video segments would have been used: 2 male counselors (one Caucasian American, one Asian American), and 2 female counselors. In this manner gender and ethnicity interactions could be examined. Limitations of time and resources, however, made it feasible to only utilize one video segment, that of a male, Caucasian American counselor. Future researchers may be able to replicate this study, substituting the other counselor race/gender combinations.

A fourth limitation of this study was the instruments that were used to assess both the dependent and independent variables, especially in the case of the Asian American sample. There have been very few (if any) studies examining the cross-cultural validity of the scales used in this study. One of the purposes of this study was to do just that, but then one must question how well the scales tapped into the constructs they were designed to with this sample. For example, the original CMI was created for use with an African
American sample. Although adapted for use with Asian Americans, more studies need to utilize this CMI to determine its appropriateness with this group. It is possible that Asian Americans do experience cultural mistrust that would affect their perceptions of mental health workers, but it is qualitatively different than that of African Americans and is not being adequately measured by the CMI.

Similarly, the Counselor Credibility Rating Scale (CCRS) was constructed specifically for this study. It has not been validated with other samples. Although the reliability measures for this scale were very high as evidenced by Cronbach alphas, further research is necessary to fully establish the statistical soundness of this scale. It is promising, however, that the Asian American sample was able to differentially rate the counselor dependent on the ethnicity of the client he was seeing, and shows that the scale may have some merit as a cross-cultural tool. The SL-ASIA, on the other hand, did not perform as it had been predicted to in the current study. Some of the results concerning acculturation were in the opposite direction as what was hypothesized. As mentioned earlier, acculturation is a very complex construct, and one that is difficult to operationalize. This was only a single study, however, and future research needs to explore why acculturation was not related to the social influence model as it was operationalized in this study. There may be aspects of acculturation that are significantly related to social influence, but these aspects may not be adequately tapped into by the SL-ASIA.
Finally, it is important to examine the results of this study with care. In some instances, although the statistical analyses provided significant results, the effect sizes that were obtained were only small to moderate. It is possible that significance was achieved because a large sample was used, rather than actually having a robust result. For example, analysis of hypothesis 2B found that Caucasian Americans rated the counselor as more expert than Asian Americans. Although the F statistic was highly significant (19.18, p<.001), the eta squared, or effect size, was relatively low (.04). Therefore, the question remains as to whether these statistically significant results would translate to significant effects when examined in “real world” counseling situations.

It should be remembered, however, that all research will require some fine tuning. A study has not yet been published that did not suffer from some limitations. The goal of this study was to shed light on an area that has not received a lot of attention: the applicability of the social influence model of counseling with an ethnic minority population. Whenever a research study endeavors to examine uncharted territory, one must expect that there will be methodological problems. If researchers abandoned studies because of some research design or sampling limitations, very little new knowledge would be discovered. The goal of future research is to refine the techniques used, help solve some of the methodological problems, and shed even more light on the area under study.
APPENDIX A

SOLICITATION STATEMENT
INTRODUCTION

Thank you for choosing to complete this questionnaire! Your input will provide useful information to health care workers so that they may offer the best possible services to college students. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationships between certain cultural variables and factors that may affect a person’s feelings about counseling and counselors. This is a straightforward study with several different types of scales. Please complete the questionnaire honestly and carefully.

Please note that you will be using two different scantron sheets, one green and one purple. The items on the first few scales are to be answered on the green sheet, while the rest of the items are to be answered on the purple sheet. Make sure to match the items in the questionnaire with the item numbers on the scantron sheets, as well as to make sure that you are using the appropriate color scantron sheet for the scale you are working on.

Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely anonymous. No one will have access to your responses other than myself. Do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire. Furthermore, when I receive the completed questionnaire, I will combine all the responses together so that no individual answers to the questions can be identified.

THANK YOU!!
APPENDIX B

COUNSELOR RATING FORM
INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are several scales which contain word pairs at either end of the scale, and seven spaces (with corresponding numbers) between the pairs. Please rate the counselor you just saw on the video on each of the scales. Please fill in your answers on the GREEN answer sheet, from #’s 1 to 36.

If you feel that the counselor very closely resembles the word at one end of the scale, fill in the circle on the green sheet corresponding to "6" or "0" for that scale.

If you think that one end of the scale quite closely describes the counselor, fill in the circle on the green sheet corresponding to "1" or "5" for that scale.

If you think feel that one end of the scale only slightly describes the counselor, fill in the circle on the green sheet corresponding to "2" or "4" for that scale.

If both sides of the scale seem equally associated with your impression of the counselor, then fill in the circle on the green sheet corresponding to "3" for that scale.

NOTE: YOUR FIRST IMPRESSION IS THE BEST ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. agreeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. unalert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. analytic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diffuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. unappreciative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unattractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. casual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. vague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. compatible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompatible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. suspicious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. undependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. indifferent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRF continued...

15. inexperienced 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 experienced

16. inexpert 0 1 2 3 4 5 expert

17. unfriendly 0 1 2 3 4 5 friendly

18. honest 0 1 2 3 4 5 dishonest

19. informed 0 1 2 3 4 5 ignorant

20. insightful 0 1 2 3 4 5 insightless

21. stupid 0 1 2 3 4 5 intelligent

22. unlikeable 0 1 2 3 4 5 likeable

23. logical 0 1 2 3 4 5 illogical

24. open 0 1 2 3 4 5 closed

25. prepared 0 1 2 3 4 5 unprepared

26. unreliable 0 1 2 3 4 5 reliable

27. disrespectful 0 1 2 3 4 5 respectful

28. irresponsible 0 1 2 3 4 5 responsible

29. selfless 0 1 2 3 4 5 selfish

30. sincere 0 1 2 3 4 5 insincere

31. skillful 0 1 2 3 4 5 unskillful

32. sociable 0 1 2 3 4 5 unsociable

33. deceitful 0 1 2 3 4 5 straightforward

34. trustworthy 0 1 2 3 4 5 untrustworthy

35. genuine 0 1 2 3 4 5 phony

36. warm 0 1 2 3 4 5 cold
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APPENDIX C

SELF-DISCLOSURE SITUATIONS SURVEY
INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of situations. Imagine yourself in each of the situations and then indicate, using the numbered scale, the degree to which you would be willing to disclose. Please be sure to answer all items. Please fill in your answers on the GREEN answer sheet, from #’s 37 to 56.

1  2  3  4  5  6

I would be willing to discuss only certain topics, and on a superficial level only, if at all, in this situation.

I would be willing to express, in complete detail, personal information about myself in such a way that the other person(s) truly understand(s) where I stand in terms of my feelings and thoughts regarding any topic.

37. You are on a blind date.
38. You are having dinner at home with your family.
39. You are sightseeing with a tour group in Europe.
40. You are sitting next to a stranger on an airplane.
41. You are with the family of a friend.
42. You are in a coffee shop with some casual friends.
43. You are being introduced to a group of strangers.
44. You are a member of an encounter/sensitivity group.
45. You are at a party with some friends.
46. You are in the library with a friend.
47. You have picked up a hitch-hiker while driving.
48. It’s evening and you are alone with your boy or girl friend in his or her home.
49. You are applying for a job as a public relations consultant.
50. You are in a discussion group on human sexuality.
51. You are at a restaurant with your date.
52. You are meeting your girl or boy friend’s parents for the first time.
53. You are eating lunch alone and a stranger asks if he (she) may join you.
54. You are taking a walk in a park with your girl or boy friend.
55. You and a friend are driving to San Francisco.
56. You are on a picnic with friends.
APPENDIX D
SELF-CONSTRUAL SCALE
INSTRUCTIONS: This is a questionnaire that measures a variety of feelings and behaviors in various situations. Listed below are a number of statements. Read each one as if it referred to you. Please respond to every statement. Mark the number that best matches your agreement or disagreement on the GREEN answer sheet, from #’s 57 to 86. Thank you.

1= STRONGLY DISAGREE
2= DISAGREE
3= SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
4= DON’T AGREE OR DISAGREE
5= AGREE SOMEWHAT
6= AGREE
7 = STRONGLY AGREE

57. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
58. I feel comfortable using someone’s first name soon after I meet them, even when they are much older than I am.
59. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.
60. I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.
61. I do my own thing, regardless of what others think.
62. I respect people who are modest about themselves.
63. I feel it is important for me to act as an independent person.
64. I will sacrifice my self interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
65. I’d rather say “No” directly, than risk being misunderstood.
66. Having a lively imagination is important to me.
67. I should take into consideration my parents’ advice when making education/career plans.
68. I feel my fate is intertwined with the fate of those around me.
69. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I’ve just met.
70. I feel good when I cooperate with others.
71. I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.
72. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.
73. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
74. Speaking up during a class (or a meeting) is not a problem for me.
75. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor (or my boss).
76. I act the same way no matter who I am with.
77. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
78. I value being in good health above everything.
79. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I am not happy with the group.
80. I try to do what is best for me, regardless of how that might affect others.
81. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
82. It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.
83. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.
84. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
85. I act the same way at home that I do at school.
86. I usually go along with what others want to do, even when I would rather do something different.
APPENDIX E

COUNSELOR CREDIBILITY RATING SCALE
INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following statements based on your impressions of the therapist you saw in the preceding video clip. Use the scale provided to show how much you agree or disagree with the statements. Please answer all items. Please fill in your answers on the PURPLE answer sheet, from #1 to 12.

1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE
2 = DISAGREE
3 = DON'T AGREE OR DISAGREE
4 = AGREE
5 = STRONGLY AGREE

1. I believe that this counselor would be able to help White Americans with their psychological problems.
2. I have confidence in this person’s counseling skills in regards to helping White Americans.
3. I believe that this counselor would have empathy toward the problems of White Americans.
4. This counselor would have a great deal of credibility in working with White Americans.
5. I believe that this counselor would be able to help Asian Americans with their psychological problems.
6. I have confidence in this person’s counseling skills in regards to helping Asian Americans.
7. I believe that this counselor would have empathy toward the problems of Asian Americans.
8. This counselor would have a great deal of credibility in working with Asian Americans.
9. I believe that this counselor would be able to help people of all different ethnicities with their psychological problems.
10. I have confidence in this person’s counseling skills in regards to helping people of all different ethnicities.
11. I believe that this counselor would have empathy toward the problems of people of all different ethnicities.
12. This counselor would have a great deal of credibility in working with people of all different ethnicities.
APPENDIX F

CULTURAL MISTRUST INVENTORY, MODIFIED
CMI

INSTRUCTIONS: The following statements concern beliefs, opinions, and attitudes about Asian Americans and White Americans. Read each statement carefully and give your honest feelings about the beliefs and attitudes expressed. Use the scale provided to show how much you agree or disagree with the statement. There are no right or wrong answers, only what is right for you at this time. Please answer all items. Please fill in your answers on the PURPLE answer sheet, from #’s 13 to 60.

1. Not in the least agree
2. Slightly agree
3. Moderately agree
4. Very much agree
5. Entirely agree

13. White Americans are usually fair to all people regardless of race.
14. White American teachers teach subjects so that they favor White Americans.
15. White American teachers are more likely to slant the subject matter to make Asian Americans look inferior.
16. White American teachers deliberately ask Asian American students questions which are difficult so that they will fail.
17. There is no need for an Asian American person to work hard to get ahead financially because White Americans will take away what you earn anyway.
18. Asian Americans can rely on White American lawyers to defend them to the best of their abilities.
19. Asian American parents should teach their children not to trust White American teachers.
20. White American politicians will promise Asian Americans a lot but deliver little.
21. White American policemen will slant a story to make Asian Americans appear guilty.
22. White American politicians usually can be relied on to keep the promises they make to Asian Americans.
23. Asian Americans should be suspicious of a White American person who tries to be friendly.
24. Whether you should trust a person or not is not based on his/her race.
25. Probably the biggest reason White Americans want to be friendly with Asian Americans is so they can take advantage of them.
26. An Asian American person can usually trust his or her White American co-workers.
27. If a White American person is honest in dealing with Asian Americans, it is because of fear of being caught.
28. An Asian American person can not trust a White American judge to evaluate him or her fairly.
29. An Asian American person can feel comfortable making a deal with a White American person simply by a handshake.
30. White Americans deliberately pass laws designed to block the progress of Asian Americans.
31. There are some White Americans who are trustworthy enough to have as close friends.
32. Asian Americans should not have anything to do with White Americans since they cannot be trusted.
33. It is best for Asian Americans to be on their guard when among White Americans.
34. Of all ethnic groups, White Americans are really the ones who take back whatever they give.
35. White American friends are least likely to break their promises.
36. Asian Americans should be cautious about what they say in the presence of White Americans since White Americans will try to use it against them.
37. White Americans can rarely be counted on to do what they say.
38. White Americans are usually honest with Asian Americans.
39. White Americans are as trustworthy as members on any other ethnic group.
40. White Americans will say one thing and do another.
41. White American politicians will take advantage of Asian Americans every chance they get.
42. When a White American teacher asks an Asian American student a question, it is usually to get information which can be used against him or her.
CMI continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not in the least agree</td>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>Very much agree</td>
<td>Entirely agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. White American policemen can be relied on to exert an effort to apprehend those who commit crimes against Asian Americans.

44. Asian American students can talk to a White American teacher in confidence without fear that the teacher will use it against them later.

45. White Americans will usually keep their word.

46. White American policemen usually do not try to trick Asian Americans into admitting they committed a crime which they didn’t.

47. There is no need for Asian Americans to be more cautious with White American businessmen than with anyone else.

48. There are some White American businessmen who are honest in business transactions with Asian Americans.

49. White American store owners, salesmen, and other White American businessmen tend to cheat Asian Americans whenever they can.

50. Since White Americans can’t be trusted in business, the old saying “one in the hand is worth two in the bush” is a good policy to follow.

51. White Americans who establish business in Asian American communities do so only so that they can take advantage of Asian Americans.

52. Asian Americans have often been deceived by White American politicians.

53. White American politicians are equally honest with Asian Americans and White Americans.

54. Asian Americans should not confide in White Americans because they will use it against you.

55. An Asian American person can loan money to a White American person and feel confident that it will be repaid.

56. White American businessmen usually will not try to cheat Asian Americans.

57. White American business executives will steal the ideas of their Asian American employees.

58. A promise from a White American is about as good as a three dollar bill.

59. Asian Americans should be suspicious of advice given by White American politicians.

60. If an Asian American student tries, he/she will get the grade he/she deserved from a White American teacher.
APPENDIX G

SUINN-LEW ASIAN SELF-IDENTITY ACCULTURATION SCALE
**INSTRUCTIONS:** The questions which follow are for the purpose of collecting information about your historical background as well as more recent behaviors which may be related to your cultural identity. Please fill in your answers on the PURPLE answer sheet, from #’s 61 to 86.

61. What language do you speak?
   a. Asian only (For example Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, Korean etc...)  
   b. Mostly Asian, some English  
   c. Asian and English equally well (bilingual)  
   d. Mostly English, some Asian  
   e. Only English

62. What language do you prefer to speak?
   a. Asian only (For example Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, Korean etc...)  
   b. Mostly Asian, some English  
   c. Asian and English equally well (bilingual)  
   d. Mostly English, some Asian  
   e. Only English

63. How do you identify yourself?
   a. Oriental  
   b. Asian  
   c. Asian-American  
   d. Chinese-American, Indian-American, Japanese-American, etc...  
   e. American

64. Which identification does (did) your mother use?
   a. Oriental  
   b. Asian  
   c. Asian-American  
   d. Chinese-American, Indian-American, Japanese-American, etc...  
   e. American

65. Which identification does (did) your father use?
   a. Oriental  
   b. Asian  
   c. Asian-American  
   d. Chinese-American, Indian-American, Japanese-American, etc...  
   e. American

66. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had as a child, up to age 6?
   a. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals  
   b. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals  
   c. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups  
   d. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Latinos, or other non-Asian ethnic groups  
   e. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Latinos, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

67. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had as a child, from 6 to 18?
   a. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals  
   b. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals  
   c. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups  
   d. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Latinos, or other non-Asian ethnic groups  
   e. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Latinos, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
68. Whom do you now associate with in the community?
   a. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
   b. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
   c. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
   d. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Latinos, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
   e. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Latinos, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

69. If you could pick, whom would you prefer to associate with in the community?
   a. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
   b. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
   c. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
   d. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Latinos, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
   e. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Latinos, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

70. What is your music preference?
   a. Only Asian music (For example Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, Korean etc...)
   b. Mostly Asian
   c. Equally Asian and English
   d. Mostly English
   e. English only

71. What is your movie preference?
   a. Asian language movies only
   b. Asian language movies mostly
   c. Equally Asian and English speaking movies
   d. English language movies mostly
   e. English language movies only

72. Where were you born?
   ______ U.S.A. ______ Asian country ______ Other - Where____________________

Where was your father born?
   ______ U.S.A. ______ Asian country ______ Other - Where____________________

Where was your mother born?
   ______ U.S.A. ______ Asian country ______ Other - Where____________________

Where was your father’s father born?
   ______ U.S.A. ______ Asian country ______ Other - Where____________________

Where was your father’s mother born?
   ______ U.S.A. ______ Asian country ______ Other - Where____________________

Where was your mother’s father born?
   ______ U.S.A. ______ Asian country ______ Other - Where____________________

Where was your mother’s mother born?
   ______ U.S.A. ______ Asian country ______ Other - Where____________________

On the basis of the above answers, circle the generation that best applies to you:

1 1st Generation = I was born in Asia or other
2 2nd Generation = I was born in U.S., either parent was born in Asia or other
3 3rd Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents born in U.S., and all grandparents born in Asia or other
4 4th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents born in U.S., and at least one grandparent born in Asia or other and one grandparent born in U.S.
5 5th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents and all grandparents also born in U.S.
73. Where were you raised?
   a. In Asia only
   b. Mostly in Asia, some in U.S.
   c. Equally in Asia and U.S.
   d. Mostly in U.S., some in Asia
   e. In U.S. only

74. What contact have you had with Asia?
   a. Raised one year or more in Asia
   b. Lived for less than one year in Asia
   c. Occasional visits to Asia
   d. Occasional communications (letters, phone calls, etc...) with people in Asia
   e. No exposure or communication with people in Asia

75. What is your food preference at home?
   a. Exclusively Asian food
   b. Mostly Asian food, some American/European
   c. About equally Asian and American/European
   d. Mostly American/European
   e. Exclusively American/European

76. What is your food preference in restaurants?
   a. Exclusively Asian food
   b. Mostly Asian food, some American/European
   c. About equally Asian and American/European
   d. Mostly American/European
   e. Exclusively American/European

77. Do you
   a. Read only an Asian language
   b. Read an Asian language better than English
   c. Read both Asian and English equally well
   d. Read English better than an Asian language
   e. Read only English

78. Do you
   a. Write only an Asian language
   b. Write an Asian language better than English
   c. Write both Asian and English equally well
   d. Write English better than an Asian language
   e. Write only English

79. If you consider yourself a member of an Asian group (Asian-American, Indian-American, etc..., whatever term you prefer), how much pride do you feel toward this group?
   a. Extremely proud
   b. Moderately proud
   c. Little pride
   d. No pride, but do not feel negatively toward the group
   e. No pride and do feel negatively toward this group

80. How would you rate yourself?
   a. Very Asian
   b. Mostly Asian
   c. Bicultural
   d. Mostly Westernized
   e. Very Westernized
81. Do you participate in Asian occasions, holidays, traditions, etc...?
   a. Nearly all
   b. Most of them
   c. Some of them
   d. A few of them
   e. None at all

82. Rate yourself on how much you believe in Asian values (e.g., about marriage, families, etc...)
   1  2  3  4  5
   (do not believe) (strongly believe in Asian values)

83. Rate yourself on how much you believe in American (Western) values:
   1  2  3  4  5
   (do not believe) (strongly believe in American values)

84. Rate yourself on how well you fit when with other Asians of the same ethnicity:
   1  2  3  4  5
   (do not fit) (fit very well)

85. Rate yourself on how well you fit when with other Americans who are non-Asian (Westerners):
   1  2  3  4  5
   (do not fit) (fit very well)

86. There are many different ways in which people think of themselves. Which ONE of the following most closely describes how you view yourself?

   1. I consider myself basically an Asian person (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc...). Even though I live and work in America, I still view myself basically as an Asian person.
   2. I consider myself basically as an American. Even though I have an Asian background and characteristics, I still view myself basically as an American.
   3. I consider myself as an Asian American, although deep down I always know I am an Asian.
   4. I consider myself as an Asian American, although deep down I view myself as an American first.
   5. I consider myself as an Asian American. I have both Asian and American characteristics, and I view myself as a blend of both.
APPENDIX H

ROTTER INTERPERSONAL TRUST SCALE
INSTRUCTIONS: The following statements concern beliefs, opinions, and attitudes about trust. Read each statement carefully and give your honest feelings about the beliefs and attitudes expressed. Use the scale provided to show how much you agree or disagree with the statement. There are no right or wrong answers, only what is right for you at this time. Please answer all items. Please fill in your answers on the PURPLE answer sheet, from #’s 13 to 37.

1 Strongly agree 2 Mildly agree 3 Agree and Disagree equally 4 Mildly disagree 5 Strongly disagree

13. Hypocrisy is on the increase in our society
14. In dealing with strangers one is better off to be cautious until they have provided evidence that they are trustworthy.
15. This country has a dark future unless we can attract better people into politics.
16. Fear and social disgrace or punishment rather than conscience prevents most people from breaking the law.
17. Using the honor system of not having a teacher present during exams would probably result in increased cheating.
18. Parents usually can be relied on to keep their promises.
19. The United Nations will never be an effective force in keeping world peace.
20. The judiciary is a place where we can all get unbiased treatment.
21. Most people would be horrified if they knew how much news that the public hears and sees is distorted.
22. It is safe to believe that in spite of what people say most people are primarily interested in their own welfare.
23. Even though we have reports in newspapers, radio, and t.v., it is hard to get objective accounts of public events.
24. The future seems very promising.
25. If we really knew what was going on in international politics, the public would have reason to be more frightened than they now seem to be.
26. Most elected officials are really sincere in their campaign promises.
27. Many major national sports contests are fixed in one way or another.
28. Most experts can be relied upon to tell the truth about the limits of their knowledge.
29. Most parents can be relied upon to carry out their threats of punishment.
30. Most people can be counted on to do what they say they will do.
31. In these competitive times, one has to be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.
32. Most idealists are sincere and usually practice what they preach.
33. Most salesmen are honest in describing their products.
34. Most students in school would not cheat even if they were sure of getting away with it.
35. Most repairmen will not overcharge even if they think you are ignorant of their specialty.
36. A large share of accident claims filed against insurance companies are phony.
37. Most people answer public opinion polls honestly.
APPENDIX I

HOPE SCALE
The Future Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: The following statements concern beliefs, opinions, and attitudes about hope. Read each statement carefully and give your honest feelings about the beliefs and attitudes expressed. Use the scale provided to select the number that best describes you. There are no right or wrong answers, only what is right for you at this time. Please answer all items. Please fill in your answers on the PURPLE answer sheet, from #’s 38 to 49.

1 2 3 4
Definitely false Mostly False Mostly True Definitely True

38. I can think of many ways to get out of a jam.
39. I energetically pursue my goals.
40. I feel tired most of the time.
41. There are lots of ways around any problem.
42. I am easily downed in an argument.
43. I can think of many ways to get the things in life that are most important to me.
44. I worry about my health.
45. Even when others get discouraged, I know I can find a way to solve the problem.
46. My past experiences have prepared me well for my future.
47. I’ve been pretty successful in life.
48. I usually find myself worrying about something.
49. I meet the goals that I set for myself.
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Respond to the following questions about yourself. Please fill in your answers on the GREEN answer sheet, from #’s 87 to 94 .

87. SEX: 0=Male 1=Female

88. CITIZENSHIP: 0=U.S. Citizen 1=U.S. Permanent Resident 2=In process of becoming a U.S. citizen 3=International Student Visa (F-1 or J-1) 4=Other

89. ETHNIC BACKGROUND: 0=Caucasian American 1=Cambodian American 2=Chinese American 3=Filipino/a American 4=Indian American 5=Japanese American 6=Korean American 7=Middle Eastern American 8=Vietnamese American 9=Other

90. PLACE OF BIRTH: 0=United States 1=Asian Country 2=Other

91. TIME IN U.S.: 0=Less than one year 1=1-3 Years 2=4-6 years 3=6-8 4=8-10 years 5=over 10 years 6=Entire Life

92. EDUCATION LEVEL: 0=College First-Year Student 1=College Sophomore 2=College Junior 3=College Senior 4=College Graduate 5=Post-Baccalaureate Student

93. COLLEGE MAJOR: 0=Biology 1=Business 2=Computer Science 3=Engineering 4=English 5=History 6=Mathematics 7=Pre-Medicine 8=Psychology 9=Other

For the following three questions, 0= TRUE 1=FALSE

94. I have felt the need for counseling for a personal / emotional problem in the past and sought out such counseling from a mental health professional.

95. I have felt the need for counseling for a personal / emotional problem in the past or present but have never sought out such counseling from a mental health professional.

96. I have never felt the need for counseling for a personal/emotional problem.

PLEASE ENTER YOUR BIRTH DATE ON THE GREEN ANSWER SHEET IN THE LOWER LEFT HAND CORNER OF THE FRONT PAGE
APPENDIX K

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Purpose of the Research Project

The study you have just participated in was designed to investigate the relationships between personality and cultural variables, and counseling preferences and behaviors. The personality and cultural variables examined in this study are: acculturation level; cultural mistrust; independent versus interdependent views of the self; level of interpersonal trust; and level of hopefulness. The counseling preferences and behaviors are: rating of counselors in terms of attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness; rating of counselor credibility; and comfort level with self-disclosure.

Participant's Contribution

Your participation has contributed by helping psychologists research factors that may influence whether a person will use counseling services when needed. It is hoped that the results of this study will help mental health practitioners learn how best to work with clients that seek help, especially if those clients are members of a minority group. If the process of participating in this study has led you to think about seeking counseling for yourself, this service is available to you at little or not cost through the Counseling and Consultation Service center on campus. Their number is: 292-5766.

Your help with this study is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions about the study, you may contact me at bhagwat.3@osu.edu or 614-688-3697.

Sincerely,

Aditya Bhagwat, M.A.
Graduate Student
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