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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

One of the most ubiquitous events in counseling is an attempt on the part of the counselor to influence the behavior of the client, who, subsequently, resists being influenced. Often this kind of reaction to attempted influence can be detrimental to the client's progress and damaging to the relationship between the counselor and his or her client. Some have considered the non-acceptance of counselor suggestions and interpretations as further evidence of a client's pathological state in a manner consonant with the notion of resistance found in Freudian psychoanalytic theory (e.g., Baldwin, 1977). Alternatively, research on influential communication has indicated that the success or failure of attempts at persuasion frequently are predictable from certain characteristics of the communicator, or from particular qualities of content and manner of the communication, as well as from characteristics of the audience (Hovland & Janis, 1959). In comparison with the schema provided by investigations of persuasion, the psychoanalytic approach seems relatively sterile for empirical study, though it probably does hold some relevance for the description and understanding of instances of resistance in counseling and psychotherapy. The extrapolation of social psychological knowledge to counseling is likely to be more fruitful in the explication of the phenomenon of client resistance in counseling. This presentation will be concerned with the perspective of social influence theory in its attempt to delineate the causes of resistance.

In their formulations about social influence in counseling, Strong and Matross (1973) presented a preliminary conceptualization for the forces at work when influence is attempted in a therapeutic relationship. Briefly, changes in the client's behavior can be considered a function of two factors, impelling and restraining forces. The impelling force pushes the client toward accepting influence and can be considered as a function of counselor power. Counselor power, in turn, is a function of the correspondence between counselor resources and client need or problem, all as perceived by the client. The force which restrains the client's acceptance of influence has two components, opposition and resistance. Opposition, as presented in the model, can be considered as "a label for forces which maintain A [old behavior] and oppose B [new behavior], as well as forces irrelevant to A but still opposed to B" (Strong & Matross, 1973, p. 32). Put more simply, "opposition refers to the client's anchoring in old patterns of behavior" (Merluzzi, Merluzzi, & Kaul, 1977, p. 430), for which the content of an influence attempt has implications.
Resistance forces, on the other hand, are generated by the client's perception of the counselor's characteristics and of the manner in which influence is attempted, and not by the content of the persuasive message. To the extent that the client feels that the counselor has "illicit motives," doubts the counselor's honesty and openness, or questions the counselor's social role, there will be an increase in the strength of the resistance forces due to the counselor's perceived illegitimacy (Strong & Matross, 1973). Strong and Matross also suggested that client resistance is increased when an influence attempt is perceived as illegitimate, for example, when the style of an attempt is seen as inconsistent or incongruent with the perceived resources and power of the counselor.

There seems to be some limited support for this formulation of resistance from empirical studies. Dell (1973) investigated the congruence of attempt and predominant power base in a counseling analogue. He designed interviewer roles emphasizing either expert or referent (attractive) power, and influence attempts which were based on either expert or referent power. Crossing role with attempt provided four experimental conditions. Two of these were labelled congruent and two were incongruent. Dell trained male graduate students in the portrayals and arranged for them to interview male undergraduate students who had volunteered for the opportunity to discuss their concerns about procrastination. The interviewer portrayed one of the roles for the first twenty minutes of the interview. In the last ten minutes, he tried to influence the subject to adopt a plan of action for completing a task he had been avoiding. The influence attempt was either congruent or incongruent with the role he acted out in the first part of the interview.

Dell (1973) found that the incongruent counselors produced fewer completed action plans among their interviewees than did those who were consistent in power base and attempt. It was hypothesized that subject resistance intensified when the influence attempt was incongruent with the established power base because the subject perceived the counselor's attempt as illegitimate.

Merluzzi, Merluzzi, and Kaul (1977) also hypothesized that resistance accounted for some of their results. They crossed two levels of counselor race with two types of counselor role in an interview analogue much like that in Dell (1973). The subjects were students who were concerned about procrastination as it regarded career planning. The plan of action that was the content of the influence attempt included a referral to the career library. They found that white counselors in a referent role and black counselors in an expert role were more influential in producing changes in attitude toward procrastination and trips to the career library than counselors in the other two combinations of race and role. To explain the interaction, they discussed the possibility that the black referent counselors were perceived as illegitimate sources of influence by the white subjects. Referent influence was based on counselor-expressed similarities with
the interviewees, a procedure which may have been unacceptable to the participants when the counselor was black. As defined by the sample of individuals in the study, the social role of the black counselor may not have included the stating of cross-racial similarities. Therefore, compromised by their use of referent influence, the black counselors' actions were perceived as illegitimate, and the consequent increase in resistance may account for the results.

The interpretations of the findings of Dell and Merluzzi et al. point to two sources of client resistance. One source appears to be the perceived incongruence between the style of an influence attempt and the power base established by the counselor. The other implicates the perception of the counselor as being inconsistent with the expectations held by the client regarding the counselor's appropriate role and behavior. Put in terms used by Strong and Matross, client resistance stems from the perception of the counselor or of the influence attempt as illegitimate. A formal conceptual definition of client resistance can be postulated tentatively as:

Resistance is a psychological force which restrains client compliance with an influence attempt, without reference to its content; it is generated by either of two events, (1) the perception of counselor illegitimacy, referenced by the perceived levels of altruism, honesty, and/or social role, or (2) the perception of attempt illegitimacy, through the perceived incongruence of an appropriate and developed power base and the style of an influence attempt.

This study sought further verification of the theoretical formulations of Strong and Matross (1973) by elucidating the relationship between the two sources of resistance and the phenomenon of resistance as it occurs in an instance of influence, such as counseling. This study also explored the interaction of counselor and attempt illegitimacy on compliance-with influence in a counseling analogue situation. Prior to this study, the two sources of resistance had not been compared in the same investigation.

The investigation of client resistance can provide a better understanding of the counseling process and its sequelae. Counseling clients is difficult work made increasingly more difficult as clients resist counselors' influence. As counselors come to control more sources of resistance, they will be able to promote client change more efficiently and effectively, with benefit for themselves and for their clients. This study investigated two sources of resistance which counselors potentially can manage in hopes of fostering that kind of understanding. If it is true that the perceptions of counselor untrustworthiness or of attempt incongruence lead to increased resistance in clients, then counselors can learn to avoid instances which would create those impressions.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Selected Literature

The first part of this review will include some introductory remarks about the application of social psychological theory and research to formulations and investigations about counseling. Particular reference will be made to Strong's (1968) conceptualization of counseling as an interpersonal influence process and to the model of behavior change presented by Strong and Matross (1973). The next section will present the findings of investigations of expertness and expert power and attractiveness and referent power, in order to enflesh the concept of an impelling force in the model. Theoretical and empirical statements about opposition and resistance will be proferred, leading to a brief critique of the research on resistance. On the basis of this review, the last section will explicate the hypotheses of the study more fully.

Social psychology and counseling research

The application of social psychological theory and research to the theories and practices of counseling and psychotherapy was first formally advocated by Goldstein (1966). He particularly pointed out the parallels between the work on opinion and attitude change and the process which occurs in counseling. Strong (1968) described counseling as an interpersonal influence process in which the counselor attempts to change the beliefs or behavior of the client. Extrapolating from formulations concerned with successful influence, and especially from those about communicator characteristics, he postulated a two-phase model of counseling in which the counselor first maximizes his or her power by managing the perceptions of the client and then uses that power to effect supposedly beneficial changes in the client. This paradigm proved to be fruitful in fostering numerous investigations linking social psychological and counseling theories, most of which were reviewed by Strong (1978) and by Corrigan, Dell, Lewis, and Schmidt (1979).

During several years of programmatic research, Strong developed a theory about counseling which was derived from Lewinian field theory, social power and social influence research, and attitude change investigations (Strong & Matross, 1973). A model of behavior change was presented which incorporated the assumption that "all behavior ... is caused by factors operating on the person at the time of emission of the behavior" (Strong & Matross, 1973, p. 25). This concept of systematic causality was modified by an emphasis on the role of the perceptions of the client in the events surrounding change in counseling. In other words, the process of change is a function of the psychological forces acting on the client, as they are perceived by the client.
A model of behavior change

Strong and Matross suggested that characteristics of the counselor, influence attempt, and client operate in counseling in a manner analogous to the communicator, message, and audience variables in the social power and attitude change literature (French & Raven, 1959; McGuire, 1969). A model of behavior change ($\Delta B$) as a function of counselor power ($P$), client opposition ($O$), and client resistance ($R$) was constructed. Arranged as an equation, this statement appears as:

$$\Delta B = f(P + (O + R))$$

More exactly, a change in behavior is determined by the client's perception of the impelling ($P$) and restraining ($O$ and $R$) forces at the time of an influence attempt.

Influence attempts were defined as "counselor remarks which the client perceives to imply that he change his actions, feelings, or thoughts" (Strong & Matross, 1973, p. 33). Their discussion of counseling process implied a definition of the term "counselor remarks" in this context which included non-verbal and paralinguistic cues as well as verbal statements, though most overt influence is accomplished through the sphere of language. Also, Strong and Matross did not stipulate that conscious awareness was required for an influence attempt to occur. It can happen that the participants perceive events differently; e.g., the client sees influence where none is intended, or does not perceive it despite the counselor's intentions. For purposes of discussion and investigation, however, influence attempts refer only to instances in which the counselor clearly and verbally implies that the client should change his or her actions, feelings, or thoughts.

Extrapolating from social power research, Strong (1968) hypothesized that counselor power stemmed primarily from the client's perception of the counselor's expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Strong and Matross further refined these ideas. Counselor power is derived from the correspondence of client need or problem and counselor resources. Breaking down this concept of correspondence, Strong and Matross pointed out that different "power bases" are available to the counselor, and stated that the strength of a power base is related to a specific need-resource correspondence. Drawing heavily from the classification scheme offered by French and Raven (1959), they presented a typology of power bases which has subsequently been subjected to empirical test. The primary power bases are somewhat analogous to expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, and are labelled expert, referent, and legitimate. Two other power bases, the informational and the ecological, were described by Strong and Matross, but they are not pertinent to this discussion. Brief descriptions of expertness and attractiveness, and examples of investigations of each, follow; the discussion of trustworthiness will be presented in the section on the role of counselor illegitimacy in the production of client resistance.
Research on expertness

The expert power base is grounded on the perception of the counselor as having special training, experience, and knowledge which is relevant to the client's particular need or problem. It is closely associated with the perception of counselor expertness.

Schmidt and Strong (1970) initiated the investigation of counselor expertness and expert power. They videotaped six males, whose counseling experience varied from none to five years, in a simulated counseling session with the same client. After being shown part of each videotape, undergraduate students were asked to rate the counselor's expertness and then to enumerate those behaviors or characteristics which formed their judgements. In this way, Schmidt and Strong developed descriptions of expert and inexpert counselors. The expert was characterized by greater responsiveness to the client and more evidence of logical questioning. In particular, behaviors such as an attentive sitting position, inflective and fluent speech, familiarity with facts concerning the client and with psychological knowledge, and the stating of recommendations were offered as descriptions of expert activity. Schmidt and Strong also reported that the order of the ratings of expertness was almost the reverse of the order of the levels of experience. They surmised that the performance of expert behaviors was more important than amount of experience in determining the perception of expertness.

Strong and Schmidt (1970a) condensed the descriptions of expert and inexpert counselors and developed roles to fit each category. After training two graduate students to portray both roles they arranged for the actors to interview undergraduate students concerning the latter's need for achievement. The interviewees were told that they would be talking either with an experienced, Ph. D. level psychologist or with a student who had no counseling experience. For most of a twenty minute interview, the interviewer behaved either expertly or inexpertly, and then attempted to influence the interviewee's self-rating of need for achievement. Evaluation of the interviewees' perceptions of the interviewers revealed that the expert and inexpert roles were seen differently and were more important in determining ratings of expertness than were the introductions. Also, the subjects who had been interviewed by an "expert" changed their self-ratings more than those who had talked with an "inexpert," when they completed a self-assessment one week after the interview. Strong and Schmidt (1970a) interpreted this result to support the contention that the performance of expert behaviors, and the perception of expertness, is related to the ability to influence another person.

Dell and Schmidt (1976) attempted to replicate the findings of Schmidt and Strong (1970). They videotaped 12 counselors, evenly divided by sex and three levels of experience, in simulated counseling sessions with the same client. Undergraduate students viewed ten minute segments of two interviews. They rated the counselor's expertness and completed a checklist of relevant behaviors after each tape. Once again, the
performance of certain behaviors was the most important determinant of rated expertness. In contrast to the report of Schmidt and Strong, there did not appear to be an inverse relationship between experience and perceptions of expertness; in fact, no significant relationship between the two variables was revealed.

In order to investigate the effects of presession information on the perceptions of counselors, Claiborn and Schmidt (1977) developed introductions which varied on two dimensions, power base and status. The introductions contained information emphasizing the expert or referent power base and the high or low status of the interviewer. College students watched a ten minute videotape of an interview between one of two female interviewers and the same client, after reading one of the four introductions. The interviewers portrayed roles which were not different in perceived expertness or attractiveness when no introduction was provided. The results indicated that the expert introduction led to higher ratings of expertness, regardless of status information, suggesting that status alone does not determine perceptions of expertness.

Heppner and Pew (1977) considered the effect of environmental cues such as diplomas and awards on the perception of counselor expertness. Graduate students (one male, one female), who were equated for photographic attractiveness, served as interviewers of college student volunteers. The interview concerned the subject's perception of the counseling center and lasted 10-15 minutes. The manipulation involved the covering or uncovering of diplomas and awards which hung on the wall facing the subject's seat. After the interview, the subjects who had seen the diplomas rated the counselors as more expert than did those who were not able to see the degrees. There were no differences for sex of counselor. Heppner and Pew concluded that certain environmental cues affect the judgement of expertness.

Taken together, these five studies suggest that roles containing specific behaviors, introductions referring to certain characteristics, and environmental cues relating to training can be influential in determining the perception of counselor expertness. Claiborn and Schmidt (1977), Dell and Schmidt (1976), and Schmidt and Strong (1970) provided evidence that the showing of videotaped interviews is an effective way of creating consistent impressions of the expertness or inexpertness of counselors. Heppner and Pew (1977) attached importance to the display of credentialing material. And Strong and Schmidt (1970a) demonstrated that the manipulation of expertness can be differentially influential in modifying subjects' self-ratings of need for achievement.

Research on attractiveness

The referent power base stems from two facets of the counselor-client relationship, counselor attractiveness and counselor-client co-orientation or similarity (Strong & Matross, 1973). It is most related to the perception of counselor attractiveness.
Schmidt and Strong (1971), following the general design they used in the Strong and Schmidt (1970a) study of expertness and influence, investigated the effects of counselor attractiveness on changes in subjects' self-ratings of need for achievement. They trained two male graduate students to portray attractive and unattractive counselors. The attractive role included a warm greeting, attentive and warm responding during the interview, and several self-disclosures by which the interviewer indicated the similarities between the experiences, feelings, and attitudes of himself and of the interviewee. The unattractive counselor was the converse: He was cold and aloof, and mentioned dissimilarities between the two persons. The results clearly indicated that the perceptions of the counselors after twenty minute interviews varied consistently with the role they had portrayed. However, subjects in both groups changed their ratings of need for achievement more than those in a control group who had not been interviewed. There were no differences between the two experimental conditions on influence. Schmidt and Strong (1971) also reported that subjects interviewed by unattractive counselors were more aware of the attempt to influence than were those who talked with attractive interviewers, a finding which may have implications for the long term effects of referent influence.

Murphy and Strong (1972) trained two graduate students in the expert role described by Strong and Schmidt (1970a). During twenty minute interviews with undergraduate students, the interviewers made 0, 2, 4, or 8 positive similarity self-disclosures which indicated the interviewer's sharing of the interviewee's attitudes, values, or experiences. In general, the subjects who heard similarity self-disclosures by the counselor indicated that their counselor was warm and friendly, positive and optimistic, and understanding and empathic. The effects of the condition with four self-disclosures were discontinuous with the others on a limited number of items, which Murphy and Strong attributed to the ill-timing and unnatural flow of the similarity statements in that condition. It was not made clear why the same effect was not apparent in the condition with eight self-disclosures, which may have had the same problems, given the ratio or density of counselor statements compared to client statements.

Hoffman-Graff (1977) and Hoffman and Spencer (1977) also investigated the effects of self-disclosures on the perception of counselors. Students from undergraduate classes were solicited for interviews with a counselor concerning their problems with procrastination. Ten graduate students were trained to portray the attractive role described by Schmidt and Strong (1971) and to make three positive or three negative self-disclosures. The negative self-disclosures were described in the same manner as the positive similarity self-disclosures of Murphy and Strong (1972). After twenty minute interviews, the subjects rated their counselors on several instruments. The results indicated that negative self-disclosures were related to higher ratings of warmth, empathy, and credibility than were positive self-disclosures. The expression of similarities between the interviewer and the interviewee appears to be a powerful determinant of the perceived attractiveness of the interviewer.
Greenburg (1969) investigated the effects of presession information on the perception of counselor attractiveness. He created a fifteen minute audiotape of a simulated therapy session and four introductions to it which varied on the dimensions of experienced/inexperienced and warm/cold. Undergraduate students read one of the introductions, listened to the tape, and rated their perceptions of the counselor. It was found that subjects who read about a "warm" counselor were more attracted to the counselor, more receptive to his influence, and more persuaded by what he said than were those who were told he was "cold." The experienced condition was also significantly different from the inexperienced condition on the attraction and receptivity variables, but not on persuasibility. Considering that these differential results were obtained solely from differences among the introductions, it seems that presession information can be influential in determining perceptions of counselor attractiveness.

Combining the findings of these investigations, it seems that introductions and counselor behaviors are important determinants of judgements of counselor attractiveness or unattractiveness. The use of positive similarity self-disclosures seems a particularly potent method of establishing the perception of attractiveness. The power of the referent base is attested to by those studies which reported increased influence or increased susceptibility to influence (Greenburg, 1969; Strong & Schmidt, 1971).

**Expertness and attractiveness**

In an attempt to clarify the relationship of expertness, attractiveness, and influence, Strong and Dixon (1971) devised two experiments. They hypothesized that the influence wielded and change obtained by the unattractive interviewers in the Schmidt and Strong (1971) investigation was due to the ascription of expert power to those interviewers which was not negated by the lack of referent power. The first experiment was designed to test an "additive" hypothesis between expertness and attractiveness — that expertness and attractiveness combine additively in defining power to influence. Using twenty minute interviews with attractive and unattractive counselors, Strong and Dixon found that self-ratings of subjects changed with either role, replicating the findings of Schmidt and Strong (1971). Expertness cues were held constant.

In the second experiment, two levels of expertness and two levels of attractiveness were crossed, resulting in four combinations. The expertness manipulation consisted mainly of an introduction and references to the interviewer as "Dr. ____." The attractiveness roles were the same as in the first experiment and as in the Schmidt and Strong (1971) experiment. Greater rating change was achieved with the expert introduction, regardless of level of attractiveness. With the inexpert introductions, however, attractive counselors obtained significantly more change than did unattractive interviewers. Strong and Dixon concluded that a masking hypothesis — that expertness masks the effect of referent power — was warranted and that the additive hypothesis was not.
Dell (1973) compared the relative effects of expert and referent power. He solicited male students who had procrastination problems, and each was interviewed by an interviewer acting in an expert or an attractive manner. He also supplied expert or referent introductions prior to the interviews to the subjects. In a thirty minute interview, the counselor questioned the subject about his concern and then tried to influence him to adopt a specific plan of action which would be helpful. The attempt at influence was based on either expert or referent power, and, when crossed with counselor role, there resulted two congruent and two incongruent combinations. Comparing the two congruent conditions (expert role-expert attempt and referent role-referent attempt), there was no difference in the number of subjects who had completed their plans one week later in the two groups. Dell (1973) concluded that the two power bases were not differentially influential. A manipulation check which was included revealed that the roles were perceived as they were intended. Further discussion of differences between the congruent and incongruent conditions in this study will be presented in a later section on resistance.

In summary, the research on expertness and attractiveness has provided some methodologies for the investigation of influence in counseling. Roles, introductions, and other cues have produced consistent perceptions of counselors on the dimensions of expertness and attractiveness. To some extent, the perception of expertness and attractiveness has been related to the ability to influence self-ratings by subjects. Though expertness appears to mask referent power in some instances (Strong & Dixon, 1971), the relative power of the two bases seems to be equivalent (Dell, 1973).

Opposition and resistance

The restraining forces, opposition and resistance, have been the objects of considerably less empirical investigation. As described by Strong and Matross (1973), opposition refers to forces which arise from specific suggestions for change contained in an influence attempt (i.e., from the content of the message). It is a function of two events: the anchorage of the old behavior and the motivational discrepancy between the old and the new behaviors. Anchorage, a concept borrowed from theories of attitude change (Cartwright, 1965), refers to the perceived functional value of a behavior to the client; i.e., it reflects the extent of the benefits which the client perceives he or she accrues from a particular behavior. Motivational discrepancy is the difference between the perceived functional values of the old behavior and of the new behavior. In this context, opposition arises from the importance to the client of the old behavior and the gap between its benefits and the benefits of the new, suggested behavior. Strong and Matross also described opposition as a "label for forces which maintain A [old behavior] and oppose B [new behavior], as well as forces irrelevant to A but still opposed to B" (1973, p. 32). The second part of this definition does not seem to coincide with the idea of anchorage already expressed, but it has not been determined empirically which is the more accurate description. In fact, no research on client opposition has been found.
Resistance, on the other hand, is related to the form of an influence attempt, and not to its content, according to Strong and Matross (1973). It occurs with respect to two events, the perception of inconsistency between the style of an influence attempt and an established power base, and the perception of counselor illegitimacy, through his or her characteristics or behavior. If a counselor predicates an influence attempt upon a power base he or she has not established with the client, it is likely that the client will resist such influence. Strong and Matross designated attempts of this nature as incongruent and theorized that incongruent attempts would be seen as illegitimate by clients, a perception which would then lead to an unwillingness to comply on the clients' parts, regardless of how good the suggestions were.

Dell (1973) provided some support for this hypothesis in his investigation of expert and referent power bases and influence attempts. As described above, he trained two interviewers to portray both attractive and expert roles (Schmidt & Strong, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a). He developed scripts for expert-based and referent-based influence attempts. Crossing role with attempt, Dell obtained four conditions: expert-expert and referent-referent, which were congruent in role and attempt, and expert-referent and referent-expert, which were incongruent. Prior to being interviewed subjects who were solicited from undergraduate classes read an introduction intended to emphasize either the expert or referent power of the interviewer they were about to see. The first twenty minutes of the interview involved the exploration of the subject's problems with procrastination, done in a manner which was consistent with one of the roles and with the introduction which had been given. In the last ten minutes, the counselor attempted to influence the subject in a way congruent or incongruent with his previous role. The content of the attempt referred to an important task the subject had yet to complete and enumerated a plan of action for its completion.

The results indicated that the roles were perceived as intended. There were no differences on ratings of similarity and of knowledgeable-ness between the interviewers. After one week, the subjects were asked to return for a second interview. At that time, the experimenter ascertained the degree and date of completion of the action plan decided on in the first interview. In the congruent conditions, 15 subjects had completed their plans; 9 had not. In the incongruent conditions, those numbers were reversed: 9 had, and 15 had not completed their plans. A chi-square comparison indicated a statistical value slightly higher than .05 < p < .10. Dell (1973) hypothesized that the difference in completion rate resulted from increased resistance incurred in the subjects in the incongruent groups by the inconsistency between the attempt and the predominant role. This investigation substantiated to a degree the notion of attempt incongruence as a source of resistance.

A second source of resistance suggested by Strong and Matross (1973) is the perception of counselor illegitimacy. Events which erode the legitimate power base of the counselor by casting doubt on his or her trustworthiness, role, or altruism will lead also to increased wariness.
on the client's part, thereby increasing resistance to influence. The expectations of the client concerning the "right" of the counselor to attempt influence in certain ways or to attempt influence at all are important determinants of the perception of legitimacy. Often, the violation of those expectations can lead to a negative evaluation of the legitimate power of the counselor. Feelings of limited choice and personal defeat also contribute to a client's resistance to influence by bringing into question the counselor's legitimacy.

The legitimate power base is defined by the client's perception of the counselor's "right" to suggest changes on the client's part, as determined by the client's understanding of the counselor's social role, honesty, and altruism. The perception of counselor trustworthiness is closely related to the legitimate power base.

Strong and Schmidt (1970b) used a counseling analogue to study the effects of counselor trustworthiness on influence. In a manner similar to Schmidt and Strong (1970), they obtained descriptive accounts of trustworthy and untrustworthy behavior from undergraduate students who watched short videotapes of simulated interviews. Following that, Strong and Schmidt (1970b) developed trustworthy and untrustworthy roles which incorporated the expert role of Strong and Schmidt (1970a). When the male interviewers acted out the untrustworthy role, they included two comments about their ulterior motives for doing the interview, two references, by name, to students who were psychologically disturbed or academically unfit, and one boastful comment about their own prowess in an area in which the subject had failed. These behaviors were intended to violate the subjects' expectations concerning the altruism and confidentiality of the counselor, and therefore promote the judgement of the counselor as untrustworthy. In addition, the interview was introduced as confidential or unconfidential.

Once again, subjects' self-ratings of need for achievement were the object of intended influence. Each subject read an introduction to the interview and then spoke with the interviewer for twenty minutes. The interviewers portrayed either the trustworthy or the untrustworthy role. There was a significant effect for role on subjects' perceptions of interviewer trustworthiness, indicating that untrustworthy interviewers were seen as less trustworthy, but not as untrustworthy, by the subjects. The effect of the introduction approached significance (p<.08). The effects of trustworthiness and of introduction on change in self-ratings were not significant immediately after the interview or one week later. The effect on the introduction on change in rating from immediately after to one week after the interview was significant. The subjects in the confidential conditions became more influenced in the direction of the counselor's suggestions, while those in the unconfidential group became less influenced. Strong and Schmidt concluded that the manipulation may not have worked fully, since only one interviewer in one condition was judged as even "moderately untrustworthy." Therefore, the test of the effect on influence was not sufficiently rigorous, and the "hypothesized facilitating effect of trustworthiness on influence" should not be rejected on the basis of this study (Strong & Schmidt, 1970b, p. 203).
Kaul and Schmidt (1971) further explored counselor trustworthiness and untrustworthiness. They created six scripts which represented excerpts from the initial, middle, and terminal segments of "interviews." Making distinctions between content (interviewer statements) and manner (interviewer intonation and gestures), and between trustworthy and untrustworthy versions, they devised four scenes for each script, for a total of 24 scenes. Male undergraduate students were trained to enact the scenes, which were then videotaped. Graduate and undergraduate students participated as subjects. Half of each group were given descriptions of trustworthiness and untrustworthiness before viewing the tapes.

The results indicated that graduate students were significantly more conservative in their ratings of trustworthiness than were undergraduate students. The segments yielded judgments ranging from very trustworthy to very untrustworthy. And manner cues, particularly in the segments designated as initial, were more important determinants of perceptions of trustworthiness than were counselor statements (content).

Taken together, the results of Kaul and Schmidt (1971) and Strong and Schmidt (1970b) indicate that roles which include clues of content and manner which are differentially characteristic of trustworthy and untrustworthy counselors can be constructed. Further, when presented via videotape, these roles are perceived as different from one another. Kaul and Schmidt were able to display behaviors which earned judgments of "very untrustworthy;" Strong and Schmidt found that their untrustworthy counselors were judged only as relatively less trustworthy than interviewers portraying trustworthy roles.

One other study draws upon the concept of counselor legitimacy as a function of clients' expectations. Merluzzi, Merluzzi, and Kaul (1977) trained two black and two white female graduate students to portray expert and referent interviewers. The roles were the same as used by Dell (1973). They solicited college students who were interested in discussing problems of procrastination and career planning. Each subject was introduced to the interviewer by the experimenter in a way consistent with the role she was to portray, that is, expert or referent. During the last third of the 20-30 minute interview, the counselor began an influence sequence in which she led the interviewee to the formation of a plan of action. The counselor remained congruent with her previous role during the influence attempt. Measures of attitudes toward procrastination and career planning were taken before and after the interview. The subjects' perceptions of their counselors were assessed after the interview, as was their recall of the problem solving model which formed the basis of the action plan. There was also a follow-up assessment of attitude which was done by mail.

The results indicated that the roles were perceived as intended. There was also a significant race by role interaction, which indicated that black experts were not rated as expert as were white experts. Compared to those who were interviewed by referent counselors, the subjects
of expert interviewers recalled more of the problem-solving process. The interaction of race with role also had a significant effect on changes in attitude toward procrastination. The subjects of white referent and black expert counselors became more negative toward procrastination from the time of the interview to the time of the follow-up. Those who had seen a black referent counselor changed the least of any group.

Merluzzi et al. also included two behavioral measures. One was the use of a referral to the career library, and the other was the return of the follow-up questionnaire before a deadline. The authors did not specify how many subjects used the referral, returned the questionnaire on time, or returned the questionnaire at all. Analyses of the two measures were reported which revealed no significant effects for the first and a significant race by role interaction on the second. More subjects from the black expert and white referent conditions were on time with their questionnaires than were those in the white expert group.

To interpret the finding that black referent and white referent counselors were judged as similarly referent, but that the latter was more influential, Merluzzi et al. (1977) entertained the hypothesis that the black referent counselor was perceived as illegitimate. Possibly, expressions of counselor similarity with the subjects, as is required by the referent role, violated the assumptions or expectations of the white subjects when uttered by a black interviewer. The power to influence became compromised by the counselor disclosure of similarity which the subjects judged as outside the legitimate scope of her role. Therefore, less attitude change and less compliant behavior occurred because of the intervening resistance to influence incurred by the behavior of the black referent counselors, relative to the other counselors and roles.

Some tentative assertions can be made on the basis of the reports of Dell (1973) and Merluzzi et al. (1977). Dell's paradigm of expert and referent roles crossed with expert and referent influence attempts provides portrayals of congruent and incongruent attempts, and, hence, a means to test the hypothesis that attempt incongruence is one source of client resistance, through the perception of attempt illegitimacy. The findings of Merluzzi et al. suggest that violation of subjects' expectations about the role of the counselor induces the perception of counselor illegitimacy. The scenes of Kaul and Schmidt (1971) and the roles of Strong and Schmidt (1970b) may be other ways of producing the perception of the counselor as without legitimate power by presenting him or her as untrustworthy through content and manner cues. Merluzzi et al. also provide a good measure of behavioral compliance with counselor influence, that of use of a referral to the career library, as well as a measure of attitude toward a problem relevant to many students.

The review of the literature offers both new directions and established methods for investigating client resistance. It seems clear that more support for the behavior change model of Strong and Matross (1973), particularly for the components of opposition and resistance, is needed. The findings of Dell and Merluzzi et al. concerning two possible
sources of client resistance need to be replicated. In addition, a research project which would examine the relative effects and interaction of counselor and attempt illegitimacy on resistance needs to be initiated. The further investigation of influence may be enhanced by the inclusion of an intermediate form of assessment between the poles of actual behavior and self-report of attitude change.

As for the methods, Dell (1973) developed a means to manipulate levels of attempt congruence. And the literature on trustworthiness provided ways to manipulate the perception of counselor trustworthiness, an integral part of the legitimate power base. The use of introductions and standardized roles in analogue situations to counseling has been an effective way of inducing intended perceptions in subjects. Merluzzi et al. (1977) suggested an appropriate and available population, students with concerns about procrastination and career planning. They also provided good measures of attitudinal change, behavioral compliance, and cognitive recall, which serve as dependent variables. A novel approach to evaluating the effects of influence, indices of behavioral intention on which subjects indicated their expectations of their own and a client's compliance with certain relevant suggestions was included as an intermediate measure of the effects of resistance.

Most of the studies which have tested the hypotheses of Strong (1968) and Strong and Matross (1973) have used analogues of counseling. The analogue method has provided a way to test empirically and rigorously those assertions in a controlled laboratory situation, which minimizes the ethical risks involved with exposing subjects to negative counselor roles, such as an untrustworthy counselor. While the use of an analogue limits the external validity of the results thus generated, the greater experimental control it provides is more desirable at early stages of research. The use of subjects who select themselves in terms of a concern with a particular problem was included to increase the similarity of the analogue to counseling, as were instructions to the subjects to imagine themselves as clients as they watched the simulated interview. It was anticipated that these measures would create an analogue which was experimentally sound and theoretically meaningful.

The major questions for study were:

1. Will some subjects be influenced to comply with a specific behavioral suggestion that is made in a simulated counseling interview?

2. Will influence attempts which are congruent with an established power base be more effective in promoting subject compliance with a specific behavioral suggestion than attempts which are incongruent?

3. Will counselors who are portrayed as trustworthy be more effective in promoting subject compliance with a specific behavioral suggestion than counselors who are portrayed as untrustworthy?
4. Will there be differences in effect on subject compliance with a specific behavioral suggestion which can only be accounted for by an interaction of attempt congruence and counselor trustworthiness?

Questions 2, 3, and 4 were also extended to the three other major dependent variables; e.g., are congruent attempts more effective in producing higher estimates of intended behavior, greater attitude change, or more recall than incongruent attempts?
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The basic design of the study was a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial, with two levels of counselor trustworthiness (trustworthy and untrustworthy) as one factor, two types of counselor role (expert and referent) as the second factor, and two types of influence attempt (expert and referent) as the third factor. The design yielded eight experimental conditions. The crossing of the second and third factors resulted in two congruent (expert role-expert attempt and referent role-referent attempt) and two incongruent (expert role-referent attempt and referent role-expert attempt) conditions. There were two parts to each manipulation: introductions to the interview which varied in the educational status and position of the interviewer, the voluntary nature of the client, and the setting of the interview, and videotapes which varied on the three factors.

Participants

Undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course participated in the study in order to satisfy a course requirement. There were 134 students (35 males, 99 females) who participated, 127 freshmen, 4 sophomores, 1 junior, and 2 adult students enrolled in the continuing education program. Instructions on the sign-up sheet noted that this study required students who had a personal concern about procrastination regarding career planning, and that students should not volunteer for the study if they were not concerned with this problem.

The experimental conditions were assigned to different time slots through the use of a random numbers table. Participants were assigned to conditions by volunteering for a particular time slot. It was originally intended that there would be two experimental sessions per cell, with a maximum of ten participants per session. It was decided that each cell would have a minimum of 15 subjects. Five conditions surpassed the minimum number after two sessions; the remaining three cells each required a third session to obtain 15 or more participants. The extra sessions were held on the last day of the experiment, which was conducted during a two week period during the first half of Winter Quarter, 1979.

Experimental manipulations

There were four different introductions and eight different videotapes, as described below.
Introductions. The introductions to the interview were intended to correspond with the initial role portrayed by the interviewer, and to provide information about the circumstances of the interview (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977; Greenburg, 1969). Crossing the expert (E) and referent (R) roles with the trustworthy (T+) and untrustworthy (T-) roles, the introductions are summarized below. (The numbers in parentheses refer to the number of the videotape.)

(1 & 2) T+E - a Ph. D. in counseling psychology who did his dissertation on procrastination and career planning and who is an experienced and well-trained staff psychologist at a college counseling center.

(3 & 4) T+R - a student in counseling psychology who has had some personal problems with procrastination and career planning and who is beginning a supervised practicum at a college counseling center.

(5 & 6) T-E - a Ph. D. in experimental psychology who is considered an expert in the area of procrastination and career planning and is a faculty member who writes articles based on interviews with students.

(7 & 8) T-R - a student in experimental psychology who has had some personal problems with procrastination and career planning and who is just beginning work in a peer counseling program as part of a course requirement.

For the introductions to tapes 1 - 4, the client was described as a student who felt confused about his vocational goals and who came to the counseling center of his own volition. The interview was set in a counseling center office. For the introductions to tapes 5 - 8, the client was described as a student who felt confused about his vocational goals and who was told by his undergraduate advisor to talk with the interviewer. The interview was set in the faculty member's office for the untrustworthy expert role, and in the peer counseling office for the untrustworthy referent role. In all introductions, the client was described as having put off this first interview for over a month. See Appendix for the exact wordings of the introductions.

Videotapes. Eight videotapes of fifteen minute simulated interviews were used in the experiment. There were two types of counselor role, two types of influence attempt, and two levels of counselor trustworthiness, and they are described below.

Counselor role. The portrayals of expert and referent counselor power bases were adapted from Dell (1973) and Merluzzi, Merluzzi, and Kaul (1977). Dell and Merluzzi et al. developed the roles to be consistent with the definitions of expert and referent power presented by Strong and Matross (1973). The interviewer portrayed either the expert or the referent role for the first ten minutes of each simulated interview. In the expert role, the interviewer introduced himself as "Dr. Buell" and inquired about the interviewee's personal difficulties with procrastination.
regarding career planning. The interviewer was very thorough in his inquiry, but provided no information about his own experiences. To enhance the perception of his "knowledgeability," he made three or four comments about the relationship of the experiences of the interviewee to those of other students or to research with which the interviewer was familiar during the interview. The interviewer's non-verbal behavior emphasized the distance between the participants through a distant posture and limited use of arm and hand gestures. In addition, a diploma was clearly visible on the wall behind him.

In the referent role, the interviewer introduced himself as "Greg" and inquired about the interviewee's personal difficulties with procrastination regarding career planning. The interviewer emphasized his desire to understand the interviewee's experiences and made several empathic remarks during the interview. To enhance the perception of his similarity to the interviewee, he also revealed three or four positive similarity self-disclosures, e.g., that he too had been subject to pressure from his parents because of his procrastination in planning his career. Through a leaning forward posture and extended use of hand and arm gestures, the interviewer's non-verbal behavior emphasized his animation and interest in the interviewee. There was no diploma on the wall behind him.

Influence attempts. The portrayals of expert and referent influence attempts were also adapted from Dell (1973), and were done in a fashion congruent with the analysis of Strong and Matross (1973). The attempts began after the first ten minutes of the interview and were five minutes long. In the expert influence attempt, the interviewer began by making a definitive statement about an effective solution to procrastination and career planning problems. In describing this procedure, he used the problem presented by the interviewee (need for career information) as an example. The procedure involved three parts: (1) an explicit behavioral definition of the task (or first step in the task), (2) development of a plan of action designed to accomplish the task, including a deadline, and (3) selection of an appropriate reward for completion of the task. The gathering of career information was the task, going to the career library within one week was the first step, and the purchase of a record was the reward. The expert influence attempt concluded with the interviewer statement:

So the important steps are, one, to set a specific goal, two, to make a definite plan of action, and, three, to build in some way of assuring that you will get the task done. Everything we know about solving problems such as yours convinces me that if you follow through on this plan, you will get your task done.

Following this statement, the interviewer wrote out a referral slip to the career library of the counseling center and handed it to the interviewee. During the expert attempt, the interviewer leaned back in his chair and used few arm and hand gestures.
In the referent influence attempt, the interviewer began by referring to his previous personal use of the problem-solving model, and by implying that this method would be effective for the interviewee as well. The problem-solving model and its parts paralleled the model and parts used in the expert influence attempt. He used both his own experiences and the interviewee's problem to illustrate the steps of the procedure. The task, first step, and reward were the same as in the expert attempt. The referent attempt concluded with the interviewer statement:

Setting specific goals and making action plans as well as devising rewards for completing them was very helpful to me in dealing with my own problems of procrastination and career planning. My feeling is that this method will be helpful for you too.

Following this statement, the interviewer wrote out a referral slip to the career library of the counseling center and handed it to the interviewee. During the referent influence attempt, the interviewer leaned forward in his chair and used many arm and hand gestures.

The crossing of interviewer role with influence attempt resulted in four combinations: expert-expert and referent-referent, which were labelled as congruent attempts, and expert-referent and referent-expert, which were labelled as incongruent attempts.

Trustworthiness roles. The portrayals of trustworthy and untrustworthy interviewer roles were adapted from Kaul and Schmidt (1971) and Strong and Schmidt (1970b) and were done concurrently with the interviewer roles and influence attempts already described. In the trustworthy role, the interviewer looked and spoke directly to the interviewee and was direct and candid in his comments. He used open arm and hand gestures. The manner of his communication denoted confidentiality and trust. In short, he did nothing which would detract from the expectation that a counselor should be altruistic, helpful, and trustworthy.

In the untrustworthy role, the interviewer made reference to his own interest in the interview (i.e., he said he hoped to write a paper based on what the interviewee (and others) told him). Behaviorally, the expert in this condition took written notes at seemingly inappropriate times, and the referent interviewer asked for and received permission to tape record the interview, over the objections and hesitance of the interviewee. The untrustworthy interviewer appeared closed and guarded in his posture and comments. Once, he made a global statement about the utility of work experience for making vocational choices, which he contradicted after the interviewee indicated that had not been true for him. He also named another (fictitious) student who had talked with him about a similar problem, in a breach of confidentiality. In short, this role denoted a lack of confidentiality, trust, and altruism.

The crossing of two congruent and two incongruent influence attempts with two levels of trustworthiness resulted in eight combinations,
each of which was videotaped. The $2 \times 2 \times 2$ design can be diagrammed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Trustworthiness role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Attempt</td>
<td>T+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E E</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E R</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R R</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R E</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in parentheses refer to the number of the videotape. The first and third rows were designated as congruent influence attempts and the second and fourth were designated as incongruent influence attempts.

**Interviewer training**

Two white male graduate students in counseling psychology served as actors for the videotapes in this study. Both were fourth year students who had completed their internship experience. One portrayed the interviewer in all of the roleplays, and the other acted the interviewee role.

The actors were trained in the performance of their roles. First, they read descriptions of the roles, and the experimenter modeled each role. Then they rehearsed the roles and received feedback on the accuracy of their portrayals from the experimenter. The interviewee portrayed the student described in the introductions. The general problem area was procrastination regarding career planning and the content across tapes only varied according to whether or not the interviewee was self-referred. The scenes were taped in a counseling office regularly used for counseling practica. The camera focused on the interviewer and was positioned eight to ten inches to the right of the face of the interviewee.

The eight tapes were shown to two groups of research participants to check on the credibility and accuracy of the portrayals. The first group consisted of six first year graduate students in counseling psychology who served as trained raters for all eight tapes. While viewing each tape, they recorded the specific behaviors (verbal and non-verbal) and general manner of the interviewer. Afterwards, they completed the Counselor Rating Form (LaCrosse & Barak, 1975) with regard to the role just seen. The second group consisted of 92 undergraduate students (30 males, 62 females). Each group of 10 or 12 subjects viewed one videotape and rated the interviewer on the Counselor Rating Form (CRF). They also had the opportunity to comment on the role they had seen. Their verbal reactions to the interview were also solicited.

On the basis of the information gathered by these methods, it was determined that four of the eight simulated interviews were not credible and that the requirements of the untrustworthy role had
distorted the expertness and attractiveness of the interviewer. Therefore, a second set of four interviews was rehearsed and recorded in the same manner as above. Reactions to these tapes were gathered from 35 undergraduate students via the CRF and their comments. Each group of 8 or 9 subjects viewed one videotape. It was determined that, although the ratings on all three dimensions of the CRF were relatively lower for the untrustworthy roles than the ratings for the four trustworthy simulations, these roles were both credible and accurate portrayals. The mean ratings for the trustworthy roles were 69.3 for expertness (SD = 10.3), 63.4 for attractiveness (SD = 12.4), and 71.9 for trustworthiness (SD = 10.1). For the untrustworthy conditions, the means were 53.0 for expertness (SD = 18.7), 49.7 for attractiveness (SD = 13.8), and 58.5 for trustworthiness (SD = 16.3).

Measures

The major dependent variables were behavioral compliance, behavioral intention, attitude change, and cognitive recall. In addition, an instrument which served as a manipulation check and an item for rating involvement with the analogue were included. Brief descriptions of each variable and its measure follow.

1. Attitude Toward Procrastination and Career Planning Scale (ATPCPS). Merluzzi (1974) constructed an attitude measure using a semantic differential format. Ten items from the evaluative factor (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1958) were chosen for their appropriateness in rating the concepts of "Procrastination" and "Career Planning." There were five filler items which were taken from the activity and novelty factors. Items were ordered randomly and the direction of the individual scales was randomly determined for each concept.

The score which represents the attitude measure was obtained by summing the evaluative ratings for each concept. Since the instrument contained ten such items and each had scores between "1" and "7," a score of 10 represented the most unfavorable attitude and 70 the most favorable. Participants completed the ATPCPS before viewing the videotape (PR1 and CP1) and after completing the behavioral intention scales during the post-videotape assessment (PR2 and CP2). Difference scores on the two scales were used to determine the amount of attitude change effected by the manipulation.

2. Cognitive recall. In order to determine if participants could understand and recall the problem-solving process after viewing the videotape, they were asked to indicate the three steps in the model. Scores of 0, 1, 2, and 3 were assigned to the participants' responses depending on how many of the steps they were able to recall. Cognitive scores were used to assess knowledge of the problem-solving model as a function of the independent variables. The cognitive measure was given immediately after the end of the videotape during the posttest.
3. Involvement rating. The participants completed a seven-point scale for rating their involvement in the interview from "not at all involved" to "highly involved," following the cognitive measure.

4. Client Checklist (CC). A list of ten suggestions pertinent to the career planning process was assembled. One item referred to using the career library. Participants were asked to indicate their expectations of the likelihood that the portrayed "client" would follow each of the suggestions on a seven-point scale from "not at all likely" to "highly likely." This was also done during the posttest, just after the rating of involvement.

5. Self Checklist (SC). This list was the same as the Client Checklist except for the instructions which directed the participants to indicate their expectations of their own behavior in regard to the suggestions. Participants completed the Self Checklist immediately after completing the Client Checklist. The second administration of the ATPCPS followed the completion of the Self Checklist.

6. Counselor Rating Form (CRF). The CRF consists of 36 bipolar items, one of each pair on either end of a seven-point scale. Three dimensions of perceived counselor behavior are measured by twelve items each. The possible range of scores thus varies from a minimum of 12 to a maximum of 84. LaCrosse and Barak (1975) reported reliability coefficients (Spearman-Brown method) of .87 for expertness, .85 for attractiveness, and .91 for trustworthiness. The CRF has also been shown to be capable of discriminating both between and within counselors on the three dimensions (Barak & Dell, 1976; Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977; Kerr & Dell, 1976; LaCrosse & Barak, 1975). Participants completed the CRF as a check on their perception of the portrayed interviewer role after finishing the attitude measures.

7. Behavioral compliance. Participants were given referral slips to the career library. The experimenter said to each subject, "This is a referral slip to the career library of the counseling center which you may use if you like. If you do, give it to the career librarian and she will help you." Since the referral slips were distributed with course credit for participation in the experiment, they were considered as an added benefit. The librarian collected the referral slips and noted on them the date the participants appeared. A deadline of two weeks from the day of the experimental session was written on the slip and served as the temporal limit of behavioral compliance. The experimenter picked up the slips at the end of the two-week period.

Overview

Groups of participants viewed each videotape. There were 19 groups, ranging in size from 3 to 10 persons. The experimenter asked several questions to assure that the students had understood the requirements stated on the sign-up sheet. These questions were intended to heighten the participants' immediate awareness of the problem. It
seemed that almost all had understood the requirements and most were able to verbalize some of their concerns about their own procrastination as it affected their career planning. The few subjects who had misunderstood the instructions were retained as participants.

After being provided a brief rationale for the experiment, the participants completed a biographical data sheet and the attitude scales for procrastination and career planning. They were instructed to watch the videotape closely, and actively imagine themselves as the "client" in the simulated interview. An introduction to the interview was distributed to each of the participants. After they finished reading the introduction, they were reminded again to become "actively involved" with the simulated interview they were about to see. In an individual carrel equipped with a black and white television screen and a set of headphones, each participant watched a fifteen minute videotape of an interview which centered around the client's concern with procrastination regarding career planning. For the first ten minutes, the interviewer behaved in a manner which emphasized either his expert or his referent power. In the final five minutes, he attempted to influence the interviewee to adopt a set of suggestions (a three step process for problem-solving) in a manner which was congruent or incongruent with his previous role, and ended the interview by handing a completed referral slip to the interviewee. The interviewer also acted during the entire interview in a manner which suggested either counselor trustworthiness or counselor untrustworthiness.

At the end of the videotape, the participants completed: (1) a measure of what they recalled of the problem-solving model (cognitive recall); (2) an involvement rating; (3) estimates of behavioral intention for the client on the tape and for themselves; (4) attitude measures for procrastination and career planning; and (5) the Counselor Rating Form. When all measures were completed, the participants were given referral slips to the career library of the counseling center, and were instructed to give them to the career librarian if they chose to use the referral. Then, they were given experimental credit for their participation and left the experimental area. The career librarian collected any referral slips which were given to her, and the experimenter retrieved them from her two weeks after the last experimental session.
CHAPTER 4

Results

 Several statistical analyses were completed on the data collected from the 134 participants. First, the results of a multivariate analysis of variance on scores from the Counselor Rating Form will be shown in order to assess the manipulation of counselor trustworthiness, counselor role, and influence attempt. Participants' ratings of their own involvement with the analogue were also analyzed as a manipulation check and the results will be displayed. Next, the data on the dependent variable of behavioral compliance will be presented. The results of the analyses of variance and of comparisons of means for measures behavioral intention will be proffered. Then, the analysis of the data on cognitive recall will be mentioned. Lastly, the analyses of the final dependent variable, attitude change, will be tendered. Means and standard deviations for all the dependent variables for each condition can be found in Table 1.

Manipulation check

It was expected that the interviewers portraying a trustworthy role would receive higher ratings on the trustworthy dimension of the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) than would untrustworthy interviewers. Also, it was predicted that expertness ratings on the CRF would be higher for conditions with an expert counselor role than for groups with a referent role. For the attractiveness scale, the reverse of that prediction was anticipated. If these results were borne out by the analysis of CRF scores, then it could be maintained that the roles were perceived as they were intended.

The results of the three-way multivariate analysis of variance for fixed effects on the scores from the CRF are shown in Table 2. A significant main effect for counselor trustworthiness on all the scales reflected the finding that the mean ratings for the trustworthy role were significantly higher on expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness than were the ratings for the untrustworthy role. These results indicate that the trustworthy and untrustworthy counselors were perceived in the intended order, although the effects on the attractiveness and expertness scales suggest that the manipulation of counselor trustworthiness may have affected these dimensions also. Also, the high trustworthy scores for the untrustworthy counselors indicate that that role was seen as relatively less trustworthy than the other role, and not as "untrustworthy."
Table 1
Dependent Variables: Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>CRFE</th>
<th>CRFA</th>
<th>CRFT</th>
<th>INV</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SC4</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>CC4</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>PR1</th>
<th>PR2</th>
<th>CP1</th>
<th>CP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69.79</td>
<td>63.89</td>
<td>71.05</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.58</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>54.47</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>35.63</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>62.05</td>
<td>61.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71.69</td>
<td>66.88</td>
<td>72.31</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>57.19</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.93</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.13</td>
<td>58.80</td>
<td>59.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.12</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>54.65</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>61.71</td>
<td>60.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.61</td>
<td>66.73</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>53.52</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>34.79</td>
<td>34.49</td>
<td>60.07</td>
<td>60.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R = Counselor Role; I = Influence Attempt; CRFE = expertness; CRFA = attractiveness; CRFT = trustworthiness; INV = involvement; BC = behavioral compliance; SC = Self Checklist; SC4 = item 4, Self Checklist; CC = Client Checklist; CC4 = item 4, Client Checklist; CM = cognitive measure; PR1 = attitude toward procrastination, pretest; PR2 = attitude toward procrastination, posttest; CP1 = attitude toward career planning, pretest; CP2 = attitude toward career planning, posttest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>CRFE</th>
<th>CRFA</th>
<th>CRFT</th>
<th>INV</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SC4</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>CC4</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>PR1</th>
<th>PR2</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>CP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.93</td>
<td>50.33</td>
<td>62.80</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td>62.12</td>
<td>71.53</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.06</td>
<td>61.94</td>
<td>65.78</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.53</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>67.12</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.61</td>
<td>59.40</td>
<td>67.12</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** R = Counselor Role; I = Influence Attempt; CRFE = expertness; CRFA = attractiveness; CRFT = trustworthiness; INV = involvement; BC = behavioral compliance; SC = Self Checklist; SC4 = item 4, Self Checklist; CC = Client Checklist; CC4 = item 4, Client Checklist; CM = cognitive measure; PR1 = attitude toward procrastination, pretest; PR2 = attitude toward procrastination, posttest; CPI = attitude toward career planning, pretest; CP2 = attitude toward career planning, posttest.
# Table 2

Summary of MANOVA on CRF Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Expertness</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>df&lt;sub&gt;h&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>df&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>813.8</td>
<td>8.83&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1960.5</td>
<td>15.08&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1104.8</td>
<td>11.14&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300.2</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>604.4</td>
<td>4.65&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influ (I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>192.7</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>895.1</td>
<td>6.89&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>375.4</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>248.3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>123.7</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>160.9</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>447.7</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Trust (T) = Trustworthiness; Role (R) = Counselor Role; Influ (I) = Influence Attempt.

<sup>a</sup><sub>p</sub><sup>&lt;</sup>.05

<sup>b</sup><sub>p</sub><sup>&lt;</sup>.01

<sup>c</sup><sub>p</sub><sup>&lt;</sup>.001
The differences between the average ratings for the two trustworthy conditions on the three scales were considerably smaller than the differences between the means obtained in the pilot project. This is probably due to differences in the tasks required of the subjects in the pilot and in the main investigation. The pilot subjects were instructed to be concerned primarily with their reactions to the counselor and only completed the CRF. There were more instructions for and more demands placed on the subjects in the main experiment, which lessened the emphasis on the perception of the counselor. Also, in the latter group, the CRF was the last instrument completed by the participants.

The significant main effect for counselor role on the attractiveness scale was due to the higher ratings attributed to the referent counselor role \((M = 65.0, SD = 11.6)\) over those for the expert role \((M = 61.1, SD = 12.9)\). Coupled with the trend on the expertness dimension \((\text{expert role}, M = 69.7, SD = 9.1; \text{referent role}, M = 66.5, SD = 10.7; F(1, 126) = 3.26, p = .074)\), this result supports the contention that the expert and referent roles were perceived differently and in the desired directions. In addition, the role manipulations did not affect trustworthiness ratings \((\text{expert role}, M = 69.6, SD = 10.4; \text{referent role}, M = 69.5, SD = 10.4)\).

Style of influence attempt had a significant effect on attractiveness ratings. Higher ratings on that scale were achieved when the inter­viewer used an influence attempt based on referent power \((M = 65.5, SD = 10.5)\) than when he based his attempt on expert power \((M = 60.6, SD = 13.6)\). The means on the other scales also reflected more positive perceptions of the referent attempt than of the expert attempt, though the differences were not statistically significant.

In general, these results suggest that the manipulations of counselor trustworthiness and counselor role in this study were effective in producing different perceptions for the different portrayals. The portrayals were, in the main, seen as they were intended to be seen. The disquieting findings were that the manipulation of trustworthiness affected the perceptions of attractiveness and expertness and that the referent attempt was judged more positively in general than the expert influence attempt. The interrelatedness of the dimensions, of the scales, or of the roles themselves could serve as explanation for these results.

Involvement ratings

No differences between experimental conditions were anticipated for the variable of self-reported involvement with the analogue. It was expected that the overall mean rating would be relatively high, if only due to the demand characteristics implicit in the experimental setting.

A three-way analysis of variance for fixed effects on involvement ratings revealed no significant effects. The overall mean for involvement was 5.3 \((SD = 1.2)\), which represented reports of relatively high involvement with the analogue. The means ranged from 5.8 to 4.9.
Behavioral compliance

It was hypothesized first that some subjects would comply with the suggestion to use the career library as a result of having participated in the experiment. Further, it was expected that more subjects who had seen congruent attempts or trustworthy interviewers would comply with that suggestion than would those who had viewed incongruent attempts or untrustworthy interviewers.

Of the 134 participants, 5 presented their referral slips to the career librarian within three weeks of their experimental session. One subject had viewed the videotape with the trustworthy, expert role, expert influence attempt (T+EE), one had seen the trustworthy, referent role, expert attempt (T+RE), two had viewed the trustworthy, referent role, referent attempt (T+RR), and one had seen the untrustworthy, expert role, referent attempt (T-ER). The first hypothesis was not borne out. No statistical analysis was applied to these data due to the paucity of participants who were behaviorally compliant.

Behavioral intention

The two measures of behavioral intention were the Client Check-list (CC) and the Self Checklist (SC), which measured the participants' expectations of the client's and of their own behavior, respectively, in relation to ten particular suggestions. One item from each scale referred directly to using the career library (CC4 and SC4). It was anticipated that higher scores on both scales and on both items would be obtained from those who had seen congruent attempts or trustworthy interviewers than from those who were in the incongruent or untrustworthy conditions. It was also expected that all scores would be above the expected mean for the scale.

A three-way multivariate analysis of variance for fixed effects was computed on the scores from the Client Checklist and from the Self Checklist. The results are presented in Table 3. The overall means for the two checklists were 52.2 (SD = 7.4; CC) and 53.7 (SD = 8.6; SC) and were not significantly different from one another.

The main effect of trustworthiness on CC was significant, reflecting significantly higher expectations of client behavior held by those who viewed a trustworthy counselor than for those who saw an untrustworthy counselor. Similarly, there was a significant main effect for the style of influence attempt on SC, wherein the participants who watched a referent based attempt had significantly greater expectations for their own behavior (M = 55.2, SD = 8.7) than did those who witnessed an expert based attempt (M = 52.2, SD = 8.4).

Scores on the checklists were significantly affected by the interaction of trustworthiness, role, and influence attempt (TRI). Figure 1 presents a graphic representation of this interaction on CC and Figure 2 does the same for SC. Since the three-way interaction may also be
### Table 3

Summary of MANOVA on Behavioral Intention Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Client MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Self MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df&lt;sub&gt;h&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>df&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250.8</td>
<td>4.82&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.12&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influ (I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>327.7</td>
<td>4.58&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>388.6</td>
<td>7.47&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>483.8</td>
<td>6.76&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4.37&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Trust (T) = Trustworthiness; Role (R) = Counselor Role; Influ (I) = Influence Attempt; Self = Self Checklist; Client = Client Checklist.

<sup>a</sup>p < .05
<sup>b</sup>p < .01
Figure 1. Mean Scores on Client Checklist by Three-way and Two-way Interactions.

Note. Dashed line connects overall means. T+ = trustworthy; T- = untrustworthy; C+ = congruent; C- = incongruent; E = expert; R = referent. First letter of pair represents counselor role, and second letter represents influence attempt.
Figure 2. Mean Scores on Self Checklist by Three-way and Two-way Interactions.

Note. Dashed line connects overall means. T+ = trustworthy; T- = untrustworthy; C+ = congruent; C- = incongruent; E = expert; R = referent. First letter of pair represents counselor role, and second letter represents influence attempt.
considered as an interaction of trustworthiness and congruence, and because the interests of clarity are served, the two-way interaction is also depicted in those figures.

A set of comparisons using Dunn's Bonferroni t statistic (Kirk, 1968) was performed on the means from each checklist and the results are presented in Table 4 with the means and standard deviations for each group. For the expectations of client behavior, the participants in the congruent and trustworthy conditions (T+RR and T+EE) had significantly higher scores than those in the congruent untrustworthy groups (T-RR and T-EE; p < .05). The latter two groups also had significantly lower scores than the condition which had the highest average score (T-ER; p < .05). There were no other significant differences between groups on CC scores. The order of the means shows that, generally, the trustworthy role elicited higher scores on CC; the exception was the untrustworthy, expert role, referent attempt (T-ER) portrayal which represented a marked discontinuity with the general trend.

On the checklist for expected probabilities of the participants' own behavior, the interaction was much the same. The mean scores of the trustworthy and congruent conditions (T+RR and T+EE) were higher than those of the comparable untrustworthy groups (T-RR and T-EE). For the incongruent conditions, that relationship was reversed: The untrustworthy incongruent groups (T-ER and T-RE) yielded higher estimates than did the untrustworthy congruent groups (T-RR and T-EE). Significant differences were found between the following pairs: T-ER--T-EE, T-ER--T+RE, and T+RR--T-EE (p < .05. The group with the higher mean is presented first in the pair.) The interaction appeared to be the results of the differential effect of trustworthiness on congruence. Higher estimates of participants' own behavior were obtained from those in the trustworthy and congruent, or untrustworthy and incongruent, conditions, relative to the other two combinations of trustworthiness and congruence.

In addition to the multivariate analysis, the scores from each behavioral intention scale were subjected to a stepwise multiple regression. The regression procedure was arranged so that the sources of variance from the multivariate analysis were included in the first step of the regression. In this way, results of the first step would be the same as the results of an analysis of variance on the same data. Additional steps would include the effects of the perceptions of trustworthiness, attractiveness, and expertness, as measured by the CRF, if they were significantly related to the criterion (behavioral intention scale score). The perception of trustworthiness (CRFT) was the first new variable in the regression on SC score. The effect of CRFT was significant (F (1, 125) = 18.47, p < .0001) and it increased the value of the multiple regression coefficient ($R^2$) from .085 to .203. The valence of the coefficient for CRFT was positive, indicating that higher scores on the checklist were associated with higher scores on CRFT. The perception of trustworthiness was a better predictor of score on the Self Checklist than was the manipulation of trustworthiness. Since the manipulation check revealed that the manipulation and perception of
Table 4
Summary of Comparisons for Behavioral Intention Scales

Client Checklist (CC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>T-ER</th>
<th>T+RR</th>
<th>T+EE</th>
<th>T+RE</th>
<th>T+ER</th>
<th>T-RE</th>
<th>T-EE</th>
<th>T-RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Checklist (SC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>T-ER</th>
<th>T+RR</th>
<th>T+EE</th>
<th>T+ER</th>
<th>T-RR</th>
<th>T-RE</th>
<th>T+RE</th>
<th>T-EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Groups underlined by a common line do not differ significantly; groups not underlined by a common line do differ significantly (p<.05). T+ = trustworthy; T- = untrustworthy; E = expert; R = referent. Second letter of sequence represents counselor role, and third letter represents influence attempt. The equation for the Bonferroni t statistic used in the comparisons was:

\[ d = t' \bar{D} \alpha/2, C, df_e \sqrt{MSE \left( \frac{c_i^2}{n_j} + \frac{c_i^2}{n_j'} + \ldots \right)}, \]

where \( \alpha/2 = \) experimentwise error = .05;
C = number of comparisons made = 5, for CC; 4, for SC;
df_e = degrees of freedom for error = 126.
trustworthiness were associated with each other, it appears that, in relation to participants' expectations about their own behavior on SC, CRFT score provided a more precise determinant than just membership in a particular experimental condition.

The scores on the item which most directly referred to the content of the influence attempt on the videotape (CC4 and SC4) were selected from both checklists. The item referred to using the career library. It was expected that congruence, trustworthiness, and their interaction would have the same effect on these single items as they had on the complete ten item scales. Figure 3 displays the means for the item from the Client Checklist and for the item from the Self Checklist. The means from the congruence by trustworthiness interaction are depicted in the figure, following the same logic as was presented above. The overall means for the two items were 5.47 (SD = 1.38; CC4) and 4.73 (SD = 1.85; SC4). When compared, these means were significantly different (p<.05).

The data for the two items were subjected to two stepwise multiple regression analyses. The regression analyses were done in the same manner as described above for the total scores from the checklists. For CC4, there was only a significant main effect for trustworthiness \(F(1, 126) = 3.78, p<.05\), in the first step of the regression procedure. This was a reflection of the fact that the mean score for the trustworthy groups was higher than that of the untrustworthy condition. For SC4, there were no significant effects in the first step, but the first new variable entered was the perception of trustworthiness (CRFT) and it was significant \(F(1, 125) = 7.33, p<.01\). There was an increase in \(R^2\) from .052 to .105 when CRFT was added to the regression on SC4. Since the valence of the coefficient was positive, the relationship between the two variables was positive. Higher scores on SC4 were associated with higher ratings of trustworthiness. The trend for both items was that trustworthy counselors elicited higher scores than did untrustworthy counselors.

To summarize the results of the analyses on behavioral intention, there was a trustworthiness by congruence interaction on the two checklists, a main effect for trustworthiness on the two extracted items, and relatively high estimates of intended behavior throughout. On the ten item checklists, congruence of role and attempt produced higher scores when the counselor was trustworthy than when he was untrustworthy; in the case of incongruence, that relationship was reversed. With respect to the direct suggestion of going to the career library, trustworthy counselors produced higher estimates than untrustworthy counselors. As was expected, scores on the four variables were relatively high, compared to what would be expected if responses were random.

**Cognitive recall**

It was expected that subjects who witnessed expert influence attempts would recall more of the three step problem-solving model.
Figure 3. Mean Scores on Item #4 from the Behavioral Intention Checklists by Two-way Interaction.

Note. Dashed lines connect overall means. T+ = trustworthy; T- = untrustworthy; C+ = congruent; C- = incongruent; CC4 = item 4, Client Checklist; SC4 = item 4, Self Checklist.
described in the interview than would those who saw referent influence attempts. Scores on the cognitive measure ranged from 0 to 3, or from the accurate recall of none of the steps to the accurate recall of all of the steps.

A three-way analysis of variance for fixed effects on the data for cognitive recall is presented in Table 5. The overall mean was 1.89 (SD = .80). There was a significant main effect for style of influence attempt. Participants who had seen an expert based attempt recalled more (M = 2.19, SD = .82) than those who had viewed the referent based attempt (M = 1.58, SD = .65), as was anticipated. This replicates the findings of Merluzzi, Merluzzi, and Kaul (1977) on the same variable.

There was also a significant three-way interaction (TRI). Looking at the form of the interaction, as it is depicted in Figure 4, it seems that the effect of trustworthiness changes from the congruent to the incongruent conditions. When role and attempt were congruent (EE and RR), those in the trustworthy groups had lower scores for recall than subjects in the untrustworthy groups. When role and attempt were incongruent (ER and RE), the reverse relationship was apparent. Since no relationship between cognitive recall and the interaction of trustworthiness and congruence was hypothesized, there is no theoretical explanation for the form of the interaction.

**Attitude change**

Attitudes toward procrastination and toward career planning were assessed before and after viewing the videotapes. Attitude change scores were obtained for each participant by subtracting the pretest score for each scale from the appropriate posttest score. It was expected that the attitude change on both scales produced by the trustworthy or congruent conditions would be greater than the attitude change obtained in the untrustworthy or incongruent groups. It also was anticipated that the attitude scores on the career planning scale would be markedly higher than those on the procrastination scale, reflecting a more favorable attitude toward career planning.

Three-way analyses of variance for fixed effects were performed on attitude change scores from the pre- and post-viewing administrations of the Attitude Toward Procrastination and Career Planning Scale (ATPCPS). There were no significant effects on change in attitude toward procrastination. The overall means for attitude toward procrastination were 33.9 (SD = 10.8) at the pretest and 32.9 (SD = 12.0) at the posttest. The means indicate that, overall, the participants adopted a slightly more unfavorable attitude toward procrastination after watching the simulated interview.

The analysis on change in attitude toward career planning, summarized in Table 6, revealed a significant role by influence attempt interaction. This two-way interaction will be interpreted as a main effect for congruence. The incongruent conditions (ER and RE) produced
Table 5

Summary of ANOVA on Cognitive Recall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influ (I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>25.19b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>8.01a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Trust (T) = Trustworthiness; Role (R) = Counselor Role; Influ (I) = Influence Attempt.

a_p < .01
b_p < .001
Figure 4. Mean Scores on Cognitive Measure by Three-way and Two-way Interactions.

Note. T+ = trustworthy; T− = untrustworthy; C+ = congruent; C− = incongruent; E = expert; R = referent. First letter of pair represents counselor role, and second letter represents influence attempt.
Table 6

Summary of ANOVA on Change in Attitude toward Career Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influ (I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>232.30</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Trust (T) = Trustworthiness; Role (R) = Counselor Role; Influ (I) = Influence Attempt.  

*p < .01
change in a positive direction ($\mu = 1.68$, $SD = 5.22$) from pretest to posttest on the career planning subscale, while the congruent conditions (EE and RR) produced change in the negative direction ($\mu = -0.97$, $SD = 3.73$). In short, participants who viewed an incongruent influence attempt became slightly more favorable toward career planning as a consequence of watching the videotape. And subjects who saw a congruent attempt became slightly less favorable toward career planning from the pretest to the posttest. However, a closer examination revealed that the mean attitude scores of the two groups at the pretest were further apart than they were at the posttest. Before the tape was shown, the mean attitude scores were 61.2 ($SD = 5.3$) for the congruent groups and 59.2 ($SD = 7.1$) for the incongruent conditions. Afterwards, the means were 60.2 ($SD = 6.3$) for congruence and 60.9 ($SD = 6.4$) for incongruence. The effect, therefore, may be due to the phenomenon of convergence or regression toward the mean, rather than the effect of the congruence manipulation.

Summary

On the basis of the manipulation check, it can be concluded that, in general, the videotaped counselor roles were perceived by the participants as they were intended, though there appeared to be a contamination of the expertness and attractiveness dimensions by the trustworthiness manipulation. It is not clear whether this result is related to a deficiency in the manipulation, in the theory, or in the instrument.

The analysis of behavioral compliance could not be completed due to the paucity of participants who used the referral to the career library. It would be meaningless to attempt to detect trends when only 4% of the sample complied with the behavioral suggestion. Therefore, the hypotheses concerning the effects of the experimental manipulations on behavioral compliance could not be tested.

Some of the hypotheses related to behavioral intention, however, have been supported by the analyses offered above. The two scales seemed to be sensitive to differences in judgements of the probabilities of specific behaviors on the parts of the individual and the client. The interaction of the perception of counselor trustworthiness and congruence of influence attempt and role had a significant effect on the scales, reflecting systematic differences among the contributions of trustworthiness and congruence. It appeared that trustworthy roles and referent influence attempts produced higher estimates on the two scales than did untrustworthy role and expert attempts.

The analysis of recall showed that participants who watched expert influence attempts remembered more of the problem-solving model than those who saw referent attempts. And the analysis of attitude change revealed only one significant effect, that of congruence of role and attempt on changes in attitude toward career planning, wherein incongruence of attempt and role produced changes in the positive direction, and
congruence was associated with change toward a less favorable attitude. The phenomenon of regression toward the mean was suggested as a more parsimonious explanation than the manipulation of congruence for this result. Attitudes toward procrastination became slightly more negative after viewing any of the videotapes.
CHAPTER 5
Implications, Limitations, Directions

Several important relationships were noted in the preceding chapter, and they need to be integrated in a comprehensible manner. Implications drawn from the results will be discussed in relation to the definition of resistance which was tentatively offered in the first chapter. In addition, a few comments about the relationship between assessments of behavioral intention and actual behavior will be made. The limitations of the experiment will be enumerated for the purpose of providing ideas and directions for further work in the areas of social influence in general and of client resistance in particular.

Implications

Perhaps the most important result concerned the lack of behavioral compliance generated by the experimental intervention. Five (of 134) participants followed the suggestion to use the referral to the career library within three weeks of the end of the experiment. And these subjects were scattered over four different treatment conditions. It must be concluded that the videotaped manipulation was not powerful enough to instigate a specific suggested behavior by this group of research participants.

Similar results from other studies which did not use an audiovisual presentation, however, provide evidence that characteristics of the sample may be more important than the form of the manipulation in the explanation of this result. Heppner and Dixon (1978) reported that only one (of 90) participants attended a workshop which was recommended to them in an interview analogue. O'Malley (1979) found that only two (of 94) subjects returned to a third treatment session for test anxiety when attendance was divorced from the receipt of course credit. In those two investigations, as in this one, potential participants were instructed to "self-select" in relation to a particular problem (deficits in problem-solving skills, test anxiety, or procrastination regarding career planning), in hopes of obtaining groups of subjects who would be homogeneously and highly motivated to comply with helpful suggestions. As Heppner and Dixon noted, there is some reason to doubt that the needs of research participants gathered in this fashion from among undergraduate students are related in any major way to the needs of actual clients who present themselves for counseling. The needs of the students may have more to do with course requirements than with adjustment problems.

Despite the lack of compliance with the behavioral suggestion in this study, there were several interesting and significant results which have implications for the model of client resistance. Before continuing
the discussion of the results, it would be beneficial to review the relationships among attitude, behavioral intention, and behavior.

Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) stated that the measurement of attitude and the relationship between attitude and behavior could be enhanced by specifying the action, target, context, and time of a behavior more precisely. In other words, instead of assessing a person's attitude toward "birth control," science will better be served, and strong attitude-behavior relations will be found, if one measures the person's attitude toward "using birth control pills," or, even better, "my using birth control pills." The behavioral criterion in this example would be the current use of birth control pills. As attitude measurement becomes more directly related to a behavioral criterion, it can be referred to as an assessment of behavioral intention, taking into account the belief structure and affective reaction to the behavioral action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1970). Ajzen and Fishbein's (1977) review gathered much empirical support for the hypothesis that strong attitude-behavior relations are found when there is a high degree of correspondence between the action component of a behavior and of its associated behavioral intention. In addition, distinctions were made between impersonal ("using pills") and personal ("my using pills") references, and among intervals between attitude and behavior assessments. Using personal references and shorter time intervals was advocated.

In this study, there was no apparent relationship between the assessment of behavioral intention and the performance of a behavior. Nor was there a relationship between the measurement of attitude and behavior. Though the participants indicated high estimates of going to the career library on the item from the Self Checklist which referred to that behavior, few actually engaged in that behavior within a reasonable length of time. And, despite relatively favorable attitudes toward career planning and relatively unfavorable attitudes toward procrastination, most participants chose not to use the career library within a short time after the experiment. However, as was pointed out by Ajzen and Fishbein (1977), even the best measure of behavioral intention is not isomorphic with its related behavior; other variables intervene, and these are often out of an experimenter's control. It is for this reason that the analyses of behavioral intention and of attitude change were completed, despite the apparent failure of the behavioral measure to discriminate between experimental conditions. Since they were more directly associated with the experimental situation, the measures of behavioral intention were sensitive to the effects of the experimental manipulations, and will be discussed because of their potential relationship with actual behavior.

The first important dependent variable of the remaining variables was that of behavioral intention, as measured by the Client Checklist and Self Checklist. A significant effect for trustworthiness on the Client Checklist indicated that, in general, trustworthy counselors produced higher estimates of probable behavior by the client. Similarly, for the Self Checklist, the stepwise regression revealed that the
perception of greater trustworthiness on the Counselor Rating Form was associated with greater estimates of the respondent's own behavior. These results are consistent with the theoretical explanation: Untrustworthy counselors, all else being equal, should generate more resistance which, in turn, should lead to relatively lower indications of behavioral intentions.

The hypothesis that perceived counselor untrustworthiness is related to increased resistance received further support from the analyses on the items which referred most directly to using the career library which was extracted from the two checklists. Trustworthy counselors produced generally higher scores on the items from the Client Checklist, and the perception of trustworthiness was related positively to scores on the items from the Self Checklist. Trustworthy counselors did not enhance the effects of resistance and therefore obtained higher behavioral intention scores on the item which most directly referred to the suggestion made during the influence attempt.

These results, in general, suggest that the perception of counselor trustworthiness had a substantial effect, in the anticipated direction, on participants' expectations for the performance of certain behaviors by themselves or by "clients." Consonant with the conjectures of Strong and Matross (1973), these results imply that perceptions of counselor illegitimacy tend to decrease the probability of agreement with counselor suggestions. Their theory suggests that the intervening variable is increased client resistance.

Furthermore, the interaction of trustworthiness, role, and influence attempt significantly affected both checklists of behavioral intention. (The three-way interaction also can be viewed as a trustworthiness by congruence interaction and, for ease of presentation, will be discussed in those terms.) In general, the effect of the interaction was that the congruent trustworthy and incongruent untrustworthy groups had higher scores on the two checklists than did the incongruent trustworthy and congruent untrustworthy cells. That is, subjects who viewed a congruent influence attempt by a trustworthy counselor indicated relatively higher expectations of their own and the client's behavior than did subjects who saw a congruent attempt by an untrustworthy counselor. In the groups who witnessed an incongruent attempt, on the other hand, the untrustworthy counselor elicited higher estimates of behavior. When the attempt was congruent, the effect of trustworthiness was consistent with what was anticipated from the theory and from the results already discussed. For incongruent attempts, the result was unexpected and deserves closer scrutiny.

A major part of the unanticipated effects of incongruence on the behavioral intention variables seems to be due to the extremely high scores of one cell. The condition which contained an untrustworthy, expert counselor who based his influence on referent power (T-ER) had the highest mean scores on both the Client Checklist and the Self Checklist. The other untrustworthy incongruent cell (T-RE) had the
third lowest means on the two scales. It is possible that the subjects in the T-ER condition were able to separate, cognitively, their impressions of the counselor as an expert who was untrustworthy from their perceptions of him when he changed his portrayal to that of an attractive and similar helper. Because the participants then perceived the suggestions as coming from a co-oriented other, and not from a rather suspicious seeming professional, they did not see the attempt or the counselor as illegitimate, and did not experience an increase in resistance. In fact, the combination of incongruence and untrustworthiness may have created a "boomerang" effect for this group, making them more likely to indicate high probabilities for their own and the client's behavior.

A similar process did not occur for the T-RE condition. The perception of counselor untrustworthiness may have masked the effect of the expert power exhibited during the influence sequence. Strong (1978), in his discussion of counselor "credibility," categorized expertness and trustworthiness as overlapping components of the larger concept. In this case, untrustworthiness of the counselor may have limited the potential of his being credible or his becoming an expert. This did not occur in the other situation (T-ER) because the influence was based on the counselor's personal qualities and experiences and not on his professional credibility. He retained his credibility as a person in the T-ER role; in the T-RE portrayal, the counselor did not achieve credibility as a person or as a counselor.

A more parsimonious explanation for the differences between the incongruent untrustworthy conditions also should be entertained. It may well be that the subjects in the T-ER group may have been generally more favorably disposed to the suggestions on the checklists or otherwise afflicted with some positive response bias, and therefore attained high scores on the two measures. In order to see if a response bias for this group was apparent before the manipulation, the scores for attitude toward procrastination and attitude toward career planning at the pretest were examined relative to the other groups. If there was a positive bias, it was expected that the procrastination score would be lower than most, and the career planning score higher than most, for the T-ER cell. In fact, this group had the lowest score for attitude toward procrastination at the pretest, and the fourth highest score for attitude toward career planning at the same time. For the latter, the group's score was only .22 points higher than the overall mean for that variable. No firm conclusion could be drawn about the possibility of a positive response bias on the part of the subjects in the T-ER condition, that is, a bias greater than that of participants in the other cells of the experiment.

To summarize the discussion of the effects of the manipulation on behavioral intention, it seems that the hypothesis concerning counselor untrustworthiness has been supported. The untrustworthy counselors, it seems, were seen as illegitimate sources of influence, inspired greater resistance to their influence, and engendered less
intended compliance with their influence. The perception of counselor untrustworthiness was hypothesized as one of the sources of client resistance in the definition offered in the first section of this work. The discussion of the results supports that relationship.

The results concerning the effect of attempt congruence on behavioral intention offer a less clear picture. A comparison with Dell's (1973) results can be made by looking at the effects of the congruence variable within the trustworthiness manipulation. On both checklists, the congruent condition had higher mean scores than the incongruent conditions. However, the difference between the means on either scale was not significant. As in Dell's report, there was a trend in the hypothesized direction. The postulated relationship between incongruence of influence and increased resistance was neither supported nor rejected by the results.

The form of the interaction of trustworthiness and congruence on the behavioral intention scales could not be anticipated on the basis of the theory or of the previous investigations of resistance. If anything was expected, it was expected that the incongruent untrustworthy condition would experience the most resistance to influence and therefore have the lowest expectations for their own and the client's behavior. That was not borne out by the results. However, a replication of the experiment, particularly of the result indicating the high scores of the T-ER cell, is needed before the form of the interaction can be described with much confidence. The competing hypothesis of a positive response bias for that group must be tested, before the result should be attributed to the effect of the manipulation of congruence and trustworthiness.

Limitations

The most important limitation of this study was its inability to produce behavioral compliance through the use of a videotaped interview. However, since there are similar results in the Heppner and Dixon (1978) and O'Malley (1979) investigations which used direct interview contact instead of audiovisual analogue, it is doubtful that the form of the manipulation was the major cause. Instead, the low level of motivation or need (cf. Heppner & Dixon) on the part of the research participants seems more relevant to this result. In fact, when checked at the end of the experiment, the overall mean of the self-ratings of problem severity by the participants was 3.55 (SD = 1.59) on a seven-point scale from mild (1) to severe (7). Further, when problem severity was correlated with the scores from the Client Checklist and from the Self Checklist, neither correlation was significant. Once again, the need for investigations using actual clients, or closer approximations to actual clients than undergraduate students fulfilling a course requirement, is highlighted. In this case, the use of unmotivated college students provided too conservative a test of the theoretical issues.

There also are limits to the efficacy of the analogue. While it provided experimental conditions which were consistent since those in each group were shown the identical tape, the indirect contact it offered
the participants was less than satisfactory. Dell and LaCrosse (1978), for example, found that, while perceptions of counselors in an interview were not different for the interviewees and for audiovisual observers, ratings of involvement by the former group were markedly higher than those by the latter group. While it is not certain that rated involvement of subjects is a critical variable in investigations like this one, the use of an interview analogue would move the manipulation at least one step closer to the actual counseling situation.

In general, the instruments used in this study were not very sensitive to differences resulting from the experimental manipulations. The Counselor Rating Form, the behavioral intention scales, and the attitude measures seemed to be used, for the most part, only on the positive, socially desirable, end. Therefore, untrustworthy counselors were rated only as slightly less trustworthy than trustworthy counselors, and resistance to influence was indicated by slightly smaller estimates of behavior. Perhaps by training or instructing subjects in the use of all of the scale, or by trimming the scale to include only the high end (e.g., having the low end represent 50% instead of 0% probable), the instruments can be made more sensitive to differences.

The effect of the manipulation of trustworthiness on the perceptions of expertness and attractiveness was disturbing also. Three possible explanations exist. The trustworthy role in this study detracted unintentionally from judgements of expertness and attractiveness. The Counselor Rating Form allowed for overlapping among the three dimensions. Or counselor untrustworthiness by its very nature is inexpert and unattractive. This study provided no way of testing among those explanations. Strong's conjectures about expertness, trustworthiness, and credibility may offer a partial explanation for these results also.

Directions

The most apparent direction for future research suggested by the above discussion is the use of motivated subjects. One way to do that is to use students who present themselves at college counseling centers or clients who appear at community mental health agencies. Unfortunately, the ethical issues raised by the delayed or deleterious treatment would be grave with a sample selected from such a population. For example, there would be little justification for exposing a person in distress to an untrustworthy counselor, given the expectation that the consequent increased resistance would diminish the probability that the client would be able to benefit from such a therapeutic experience. Two alternatives exist: to change the manipulation or to sample from another population.

For the first, the experimental manipulation of resistance might be modified so that its effects could be immediate and easily reversed. Instead of using a behavior outside of the interview to measure compliance with a counselor suggestion, the counselor could make a request or suggestion which could be done in the interview. Attempt congruence
could be manipulated easily in such a situation, and an immediate debriefing of the client could be undertaken if necessary. Of course, such a debriefing would have to be handled skillfully in order to prevent deterioration in the client's perception of the counselor's trustworthiness.

The second alternative seems more plausible. Instead of relying on the students to select themselves for an experiment, the experimenter could solicit the participation of persons who are particularly concerned about a specific problem. For example, the students in undergraduate classes could complete an inventory which measured level of pathology or concern with a particular problem. Then, the experimenter could select his or her sample from among those who scored in the top 15-20% of the larger sample. Though this kind of sampling procedure does not insure highly motivated and committed subjects, it does limit the population to those who report a problem on some objective criterion, rather than to those who need to participate in an experiment and are willing to say they have a problem in order to participate.

This study was a first step in the investigation of client resistance. Investigations which further refine the instruments or develop new, more sensitive measures are needed. In particular, the use of behavioral intention scales holds some promise in research concerned with social influence. Attention should be paid to the correspondence between the action, target, context, and time dimensions of such measures and of their behavioral criteria (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). General attitude measures seem to be much too imprecise and their use should be discouraged.

The results of the manipulation check concerning the contamination of two dimensions of the Counselor Rating Form by the third should be replicated for the purpose of determining whether the theory, instrument, or roles need to be revised. The Counselor Rating Form may need also a revision, given the imprecision indicated by the large standard deviations which were found in this study. One direction that revision might take would be to train subjects in the use of the scales; another would be giving subjects a common baseline from which to judge other counselors.

In summary, this investigation found that the manipulation of counselor trustworthiness and congruence of influence attempt affected, in a limited way, the perceptions and reactions of college student research participants via an audiovisual analogue of counseling. Consonant with Strong and Matross' (1973) theory about behavior change in counseling, the results were best explained by invoking the concepts of perceived counselor illegitimacy, perceived attempt illegitimacy, and their consequent, client resistance. This study, therefore, offers some support for the formulation of resistance defined in the first chapter. The evidence also suggests that the importance of the perception of counselor illegitimacy is relatively greater than the perception of attempt incongruence. However, more rigorous tests, perhaps including actual clients and actual suggestions, are needed before the model of
behavior change can be validated entirely. Also, the interaction between the two sources of resistance needs to be explored further, as do the relationships between expert, referent, and legitimate power, and congruence of influence attempt. The lack of behavioral compliance instigated by the experiment was disappointing; future researchers may want to consider the use of other, intermediate behaviors, such as the mailing of follow-up questionnaires (Merluzzi et al. 1977). Beyond that, there still remains the investigation of the concept of client opposition and the bridging of the gap between the analogue research which has been done and instances of actual counseling. It may happen that the model will be more easily verified in situations which require no great contrivances as exist in laboratory experiments.
Introduction to Interview

The counselor in this simulated interview is Dr. Buell, a staff psychologist at a college counseling center. He received his Ph.D. in counseling psychology a few years ago after writing his dissertation on the topic of procrastination as it concerns career planning. He is an experienced counselor, has been thoroughly trained, and is often helpful in his counseling of clients. The interview takes place in his office.

The client came to the counseling center because he was feeling confused about his vocational goals and pressured to make some sort of vocational decision. He had originally decided to come in Autumn Quarter, but never made it to the counseling center. This is his first interview with Dr. Buell.

Introduction to Interview

The counselor in this simulated interview is Dr. Buell, a faculty member in psychology. He received his Ph.D. in experimental psychology a few years ago, and he has read a great deal about procrastination as it concerns career planning. He is considered an expert in that area, and he occasionally interviews students with procrastination problems so that he can write about them. The interview takes place in his office.

The client came to Dr. Buell because his undergraduate advisor told him he had to do so. He is confused about his vocational goals, and feels pressured to make some sort of vocational decision. He has put off making an appointment for over a month. This is his first interview with Dr. Buell.
The counselor in this simulated interview is Greg Buell, a student in counseling psychology. He is just beginning a supervised externship at a college counseling center. He personally had to solve some problems with procrastination as it concerned his career planning, and now he feels that this experience will enable him to be helpful to others in the same situation. The interview takes place in his supervisor's office.

The client came to the counseling center because he was feeling confused about his vocational goals and pressured to make some sort of vocational decision. He had originally decided to come in Autumn Quarter, but never made it to the counseling center. This is his first interview with Greg.
Biographical Data

Date________________________

Time________________________

Name_________________________ Age_______ Sex_______(M or F)

Campus Address__________________________ Campus Phone______

Class Rank:  1  2  3  4  CED  Other_____________

Credit hours this quarter_______  Current College___________

Current (or Intended) Major__________________________________________

(Circle whether Current or Intended.)

Current Occupational Goal___________________________________________

How long have you been concerned about problems associated with procrastination as regards career planning?

___ since I read the announcement for this experiment.

___ since the beginning of this quarter.

___ since I began at Ohio State.

___ more than two years ago when_____________________

How would you rate the magnitude of your difficulties in procrastination as regards career planning?

mild  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  severe

Have you ever spoken to a professional person (advisor, counselor, etc.) about this problem?

Yes  No  If yes, did it help you to talk to this person?

Yes  No

In your opinion, is your procrastination as regards career planning due mostly to

___ not knowing how to plan your career.

___ anxiety about planning your whole life.

___ other reasons, such as procrastination in a number of areas.
I feel that Procrastination is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>meaninglessness</th>
<th>wise</th>
<th>pleasurable</th>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>negative</th>
<th>interesting</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>valuable</th>
<th>unusual</th>
<th>attractive</th>
<th>aimless</th>
<th>impulsive</th>
<th>awful</th>
<th>improbable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>:</strong><em>:</em><strong>:</strong><em>:</em><strong>:</strong><em>:</em>__ good</td>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>foolish</td>
<td>painful</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>boring</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>usual</td>
<td>unattractive</td>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>deliberate</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PR1___
Career Planning

I feel that Career Planning is:

improbable __:__:__,__ __:__,__ improbable

nice __:__,__ __:__,__ awful

important __:__,__ __:__,__ unimportant

bad __:__,__ __:__,__ good

unattractive __:__,__ __:__,__ attractive

meaningless __:__,__ __:__,__ meaningful

impulsive __:__,__ __:__,__ deliberate

aimless __:__,__ __:__,__ motivated

pleasurable __:__,__ __:__,__ painful

positive __:__,__ __:__,__ negative

wise __:__,__ __:__,__ foolish

usual __:__,__ __:__,__ unusual

boring __:__,__ __:__,__ interesting

worthless __:__,__ __:__,__ valuable

not helpful __:__,__ __:__,__ helpful
Cognitive Measure

Please indicate in the space below your best recollection of the problem-solving process mentioned by the interviewer.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Involvement Rating

Please indicate on the scale below the extent to which you felt involved in or absorbed by the interview you just watched.

not at all involved ___:___:___:___:___ highly involved

Referral Slip

Please allow _______________________________ to use the materials and services in the Career Library of the Counseling and Consultation Service, 4th Floor, Chio Union. S/he met with me concerning problems in career planning on __________.

Referral Source: __________________________
Referral Expires: ________________________
Client Checklist

Listed below are some of the suggestions offered by the "counselor" during the simulated counseling interview you saw a few moments ago. Please indicate your expectation of the likelihood that the "client" will follow each of the suggestions by placing a mark on the scale adjacent to each.

not at all likely likely (0%) ___ :___ :___ :___ :___ (100%)

I. Set a specific goal.
   1. Get information on one career area. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___
   2. Become aware of own interests and capacities. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___

II. Make a definite plan of action.
   1. Talk with a faculty member or advisor about career area. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___
   2. Investigate area at Career Library. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___
   3. Obtain volunteer experience in area. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___
   4. Take a vocational interest inventory. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___
   5. Assess your skills and abilities. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___

III. Select an appropriate reward.
   1. Do something enjoyable. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___
   2. Give yourself a reward. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___
   3. Tell yourself you did well. ___ :___ :___ :___ :___

CC
## Self Checklist

Listed below are some of the suggestions offered by the "counselor" during the simulated counseling interview you saw a few moments ago. Please indicate your expectation of the likelihood that you will follow each of the suggestions by placing a mark on the scale adjacent to each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all likely (0%)</th>
<th>highly likely (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### I. Set a specific goal.
1. Get information on one career area. [Scale: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ ]

### II. Make a definite plan of action.
1. Talk with a faculty member or advisor about career area. [Scale: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ ]
2. Investigate area at Career Library. [Scale: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ ]
5. Assess your skills and abilities. [Scale: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ ]

### III. Select an appropriate reward.

---

SC: ___
COUNSELOR RATING FORM

Listed below are several scales which contain word pairs at either end of the scale and seven spaces between the pairs. Please rate the counselor on each of the scales.

If you feel that the counselor very closely resembles the word at one end of the scale, place a check mark as follows:

fair __:__:__:__:__:_ X: unfair

OR

fair X:__:__:__:__:__: unfair

If you think that one end of the scale quite closely describes the counselor then make your check mark as follows:

rough __:X:__:__:__:__: smooth

OR

rough __:__:__:__:X:__: smooth

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

active __:__:_X:__:__:__: passive

OR

active __:__:_X:__:__: passive

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

hard __:__:_X:__:__:__: soft

Your first impression is the best answer.

PLEASE NOTE: PLACE CHECK MARKS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SPACES.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>informed</td>
<td>ignorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insightful</td>
<td>insightless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stupid</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikeable</td>
<td>likeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical</td>
<td>illogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared</td>
<td>unprepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unreliable</td>
<td>reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disrespectful</td>
<td>respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irresponsible</td>
<td>responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfless</td>
<td>selfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sincere</td>
<td>insincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skillful</td>
<td>unskillful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>unsociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceitful</td>
<td>straightforward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthy</td>
<td>untrustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genuine</td>
<td>phony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td>cold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreeable ___:____:___:___:___: ___: disagreeable
unalert ___:____:___:___:___: ___: alert
analytic ___:____:___:___:___: ___: diffuse
unappreciative ___:____:___:___:___: ___: appreciative
attractive ___:____:___:___:___: ___: unattractive
casual ___:____:___:___:___: ___: formal
cheerful ___:____:___:___:___: ___: depressed
vague ___:____:___:___:___: ___: clear
distant ___:____:___:___:___: ___: close
compatible ___:____:___:___:___: ___: incompatible
unsure ___:____:___:___:___: ___: confident
suspicious ___:____:___:___:___: ___: believable
undependable ___:____:___:___:___: ___: dependable
indifferent ___:____:___:___:___: ___: enthusiastic
inexperienced ___:____:___:___:___: ___: experienced
inexpert ___:____:___:___:___: ___: expert
unfriendly ___:____:___:___:___: ___: friendly
honest ___:____:___:___:___: ___: dishonest
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