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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Research in the area of counseling psychology has historically focused upon variables affecting the process and outcome of counseling. A multitude of variables related to characteristics of the counseling setting, the counselor, the client, their relationship, and other factors have been examined in an attempt to identify variables associated with counseling efficacy. The present study focuses upon two variables thought to be influential in counseling process and outcome—client expectancies for counselor behavior and client feminist orientation.

A number of studies have suggested that the extent to which client preferences and expectations regarding counselor characteristics and behavior are met in counseling influences counseling process and outcome (Boulware & Holmes, 1970; Frederick, 1977; Gladstein, 1969; Heilbrun, 1961, 1974; Pope, Seigman, Blass & Cheek, 1972; Ziemelis, 1974). For example, Pope et al. (1972) found that if client expectancies for counselor behavior were disconfirmed, there was reduced productivity, more hesitant speech and more superficial communication within the counseling session. Early termination by the client was an outcome of disconfirmed client expectations for counselor dominance and directiveness in studies by Heilbrun (1961, 1974). Boulware and Holmes (1970) raised the possibility that disconfirmation of client expectations and disregard for client preferences for counselor sex and age may result in
reduced therapeutic change. This sampling of research is indicative of how client expectancies and preferences for counselor characteristics and behavior may have a variety of effects on the process and outcome of counseling.

One important aspect of client expectancies for the counselor involves those expectancies and preferences resulting from sex role stereotypes in this society. The existence of such stereotypes is well-documented (Bakan, 1966; Parsons & Bales, 1955), as is their powerful influence upon interpersonal perceptions in counseling (Johnson, 1978; Myhr, 1977). The strength of this influence may be attributable to the early introduction children receive as to how a boy or girl "should" behave (Maccoby, 1966). From a young age, individuals are taught that men are the active and "instrumental" members of the community, while women are the "expressive" and emotional members (Parsons & Bales, 1955). Bakan (1966) made a similar distinction when he termed the female role as one of "communion" and the male role as one of "agency". Thus, traditional sex role stereotypes would lead to expectations that male counselors would exhibit characteristics of activity, dominance and a cognitive orientation, while female counselors would be expected to be more emotional and person-oriented. Initial support for this hypothesis was, in fact, provided in a recent study (Johnson, 1978) indicating that male counselors were expected to be more self-reliant and analytical than their more emotional female counterparts. Johnson has suggested that given the considerable influence of client expectations for counselor sex role behavior, it might be more important for the enhancement of therapy outcomes to consider matching sex role expectancies of clients...
and counselors than to consider matching them on sex as other investigators have suggested (Gardner, 1971; Rawlings & Carter, 1977).

At the same time, however, that the client enters therapy with expectancies about how his/her counselor ought to behave, the counselor enters therapy with ideas as to what therapeutic behavior involves. For example, Strong (1968) suggested that therapy is an interpersonal influence process in which the counselor tries to maximize his/her power to influence the client to move toward therapeutic change. In order to maximize his/her power, the counselor, according to Strong, must increase the client's perception of him/her as expert, attractive and trustworthy. These dimensions have been further explored and defined since Strong's article and they do seem to be important influences on the outcome of counseling (Dell, 1973; Kerr & Dell, 1976; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a,b). LaCrosse (1979) found that high levels of these three dimensions in a counselor's performance resulted in positive counseling outcomes.

In attempting to maximize the probability of a positive counseling outcome, then, it is important to consider not only the client's expectations for the counseling experience, but also the necessary behaviors of the counselor for facilitating client change. However, the counselor behaviors conveying expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness may, in many cases, be contradictory to the nature of clients' sex role expectancies. For example, counselor behaviors contributing to perceptions of expertness include behaviors correspondent with the masculine sex role, e.g., confidence, experience, logic, and intellectual ability. In contrast, counselor behaviors contributing to perceptions of
trustworthiness and attractiveness include behaviors correspondent with the feminine sex role, e.g., friendliness, cheerfulness, openness, sincerity, and warmth. Given the narrow definitions of male and female sex roles, effective counseling and adherence to appropriate sex roles may often involve contradictory characteristics and behaviors. Thus, it becomes important to know the consequences of not meeting client expectations and/or preferences for the counselor's sex role behavior.

Possible consequences of not meeting client expectations and/or preferences for counselor sex role behavior might include lowered client perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Counselor adherence to traditional sex role behavior, however, might result in differential levels of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness for masculine and feminine sex roles. A warm, supportive counselor may be seen as more feminine, and therefore more attractive and trustworthy than a rational and confrontive counselor. The latter counselor role would likely be characterized as more masculine and therefore perceived as more expert by clients than the former role. The ultimate consequences for client evaluations of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness, however, may be dependent upon the interaction of the effects of the differential perceptions of these counselor characteristics in the masculine and feminine roles and the effects of counselor out-of-sex role behavior upon them.

No evidence exists at present to indicate what the specific consequences of counselors behaving out of their sex role are for client evaluations of the expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness of the counselors. If out of role behavior does result in the client's
devaluation of the counselor on these three dimensions and if at the same time the counselor's expected sex role limits him/her from adequately displaying the therapeutic dimensions of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness, a double bind exists. The source of the double bind, the client's expectations, would then need to be confronted and dealt with before other therapy issues could be addressed.

A factor which may moderate client evaluations of the expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness of counselors behaving in and out of sex role is that of clients' feminist orientation. Individuals who are feminists have been described by researchers as more concerned and more liberal with regard to definitions of male and female sex roles (Clark & Lane, 1978; Westervelt, 1973).

Mezydlo and Betz (1980) found that students' perceptions of the ideal sex roles for men and women were organized and divided more along lines of the students' feminist orientation than their sex. More feminist students were more likely to describe the ideal male and female roles as similar, while more traditional students were more likely to make a clear and traditional distinction between appropriate male and female behaviors.

The feminist orientation of clients, then, may also mediate their evaluation of the male and female counselors who engage in out-of-sex role behavior. Feminists may be more willing to accept out-of-role behaviors than nonfeminists because of their less restrictive definitions of sex roles.

Thus, the present study was designed to investigate the extent to which different counselor styles are differentially perceived and/or
evaluated depending upon the sex of the counselor. It is hypothesized that counselors exhibiting a style incongruent with their stereotypic sex role will be given overall lower evaluations on the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Further, the occurrence of this effect is expected to be mediated by the feminist orientation of the client. More feminist clients are expected to evaluate in and out-of-role counselors similarly, while less feminist clients are expected to evaluate out-of-sex role counselors as less expert, attractive and trustworthy than counselors acting within their sex role.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study represents an extension of research findings from the research areas of sex role expectations, client expectations for counseling and their effects upon outcome, identified components of effective counselor behavior, and feminism. The following review attempts to integrate findings from each of these areas to form a rationale for this study.

Sex role expectations, client expectations for counselor behavior, and the outcomes for counseling of met and unmet client expectations have all been examined in descriptive research. The research reviewed below presents an overview of these findings. Few attempts have been made, however, to examine how indicators of counseling outcome are affected by client sex role expectations for the counselor as they interact with counselor behaviors. The present study aims to examine this question by noting how ratings of the counselor characteristics of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness vary depending upon whether client sex role expectations for the counselor are met or unmet. These three counselor characteristics have been shown in past research to be important factors in positive counseling outcomes.

As a variable of secondary interest, feminist orientation is examined for evidence of its relevance to the above process. Research has indicated it to be an influential factor in situations involving
sex role stereotypes. In these situations feminist orientation appears to be a moderator variable, and it may be in the present study.

This review of the literature attempts to show evidence for the existence of sex role stereotypes and their influence on interpersonal judgments, and also to present studies indicating the negative effects of unmet expectations, including unmet sex role expectations, on the counseling process. The counselor characteristics of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness are presented as ones which may be expected to reflect the negative effects of these unmet expectations. Feminist orientation is examined as it is expected to be an influence upon the above interaction of client sex role expectations and counselor behaviors.

**Sex Role Expectations**

Sex roles are "highly consensual norms and beliefs about the differing characteristics of men and women" (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz & Vogel, 1970, p. 1). These norms are imparted to men and women through the socialization process when they are given society's prescriptions for how each sex "should" behave (Block, Von Der Lippe & Block, 1973; Maccoby, 1966). While these norms are deeply ingrained within the individual, there seems to be evidence suggesting that they can be modified to fit the individual's life situation (Abrahams, Feldman & Nash, 1978) and are not enduring personality characteristics. Sex roles, then, are a response to social circumstances. This response is one which can have a powerful influence on behavior in interpersonal situations.

Early sex role research was of the descriptive variety. Results indicated that there are large differences in the male and female sex
roles (Fernberger, 1948; Gilbert, Deutsch & Strahan, 1978; Parsons & Bales, 1955; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman & Broverman, 1968; Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953). These researchers found the male role to be expressed through more active, directive and self-confident behaviors. The female's role was described more in terms of sensitivity, trustworthiness and nurturance. Parsons and Bales (1955) summarized these role differences with the terms "instrumental" and "expressive" to describe the male and female roles, respectively.

A common finding across many of the above studies was that the male sex role was seen to be the more positive one. Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) found that college students described the male role as being more socially-valued than the female role. Broverman et al. (1970) found that the female role seemed to be rated as less psychologically healthy than the male role by mental health professionals of both sexes. Block et al. (1973) described socialization into the male role as a positive process which gives the person many options for widening the role. Socialization into the female role, however, is a constricting of options and a more negative process.

At the same time that the male role is defined as more positive and growthful than the female role, there exist social sanctions which discourage females from deviating from their prescribed sex role. Shaffer and Wegley (1974) found that men and women judged a competent woman portrayed in a masculine role as less attractive socially and as a work partner than a similar woman who behaved within her sex role. Zeldow (1976) studied evaluations of psychiatric patients who behaved in or out of sex role. She found that female patients who behaved in a "masculine"
way were judged to be more disturbed by male judges than similar female patients acting within their sex role. Sharp and Post (1980) also examined this phenomenon by interviewing personnel officers about reactions to descriptions of applicants for role congruent or incongruent jobs. They found that officers with traditional sex role orientations were likely to negatively evaluate a qualified female applicant for a "masculine" typed job. Male applicants for "feminine" typed jobs were not similarly discriminated against.

These studies of social sanctions of sex role deviance were all performed in somewhat controlled experimental settings that, however, approached natural conditions. The Sharp and Post study (1980) is an example of a study which comes especially close to a natural setting. The results of these studies indicate, then, the extent to which women are penalized for behaving in manners deemed socially inappropriate for their sex role. The fact that these three studies examine very different situations serves to strengthen the assertion that there do exist some very broad rules for sex role behavior which are socially enforced.

One recent study has indicated that both men and women are penalized by society for deviance from their socially prescribed sex role. Tilby and Kalin (1980) described otherwise normal male and female stimulus persons as role congruent or incongruent in their jobs and interests. They found that the sex role deviant persons were characterized as significantly more maladjusted and more in need of psychological help by the college student raters. In this study, out of role males seemed to fare worse than out of role females. Tilby and Kalin suggested that this may have been because of the more positive attributions attached
to the masculine sex role. To reject this role, then, may have been seen as more negative.

This study's results present one possible consequence for a person who breaks tradition and pursues interests incongruent with his/her prescribed sex role. The stimulus persons in this study were not described in extraordinary terms in the out of role condition, and yet were still labeled in need of psychological help. This outcome reiterates the fact that there are penalties to be paid for nonconformity to society's sex role norms and gives evidence for the power of sex role expectations in judgments of persons.

The counseling setting is one which would seem likely to be affected by the sex role expectations described previously. As an interpersonal influence process, it is a situation in which client sex role beliefs and preferences may play a powerful part. Some research exists to indicate that this does occur.

For example, Boulware and Holmes (1970) examined counselor preferences and expectations as a result of problem type, client sex, counselor sex and age. They noted that female subjects preferred a male counselor for vocational problems and a female counselor for personal problems. Males preferred male counselors for all types of problems. These divisions of preference seemed to fall along the stereotypic dimensions of competence attributed to the male and female sex roles, with the male role being given somewhat more flexibility than the female role.

In another study, Vice (1975) also investigated counselor preferences of clients as a function of sex and type of presenting problem. She discovered that if the problem was of an interpersonal nature,
clients of both sexes preferred a female counselor. With an educational-vocational problem they preferred a male counselor. These results would seem to strengthen the trend noticed by Boulware and Holmes (1970) in their research. Vice suggested that these preferences were a result of the client's stereotypic sex role expectations for the counselor's expertise in different problem areas.

Vice's findings were supported in a more recent study by Lee, Hallberg, Jones and Haase (1980). They had subjects rate videotaped male and female counselors as to their performance with clients presenting either personal or vocational problems. Results indicated that female counselors were once again preferred for personal problems, while male counselors were preferred for vocational problems. These types of results provide consistent evidence that stereotyping of counselors' expertise and role by clients occurs and does so with regularity.

In a literature review by Barrett, Berg, Eaton and Pomeroy (1974), it was noted that research literature indicates that female counselors seem often to be put into the role of the sympathizer, while male counselors are put into the the role of the problem solver. The reviewers warned against such stereotyping which closely follows traditional sex roles and called such assignments limiting and unproductive for both counselor and client. Barrett et al. found no existing literature to validate such assumptions of differential areas of competency for male and female counselors. This lack of evidence that male counselors are more skilled with career concerns and female counselors are more skilled with personal problems has remained true, yet the stereotypes seem to remain, as was demonstrated in the study by Lee et al. (1980).
Sex role expectations, then, are influential beliefs which affect not only how individuals behave, but also how they view the behavior of others. These expectations are socially prescribed and agreed upon by the general population. Penalties are paid by those individuals who choose to deviate from these norms. These expectations seem to enter into the counseling setting when client sex role expectations have been shown to be an influence upon counselor evaluations and preferences. While the results of meeting or not meeting these client sex role expectations for the counselor have not been examined empirically as yet, there is research, reviewed in the next section, concerning the relationships of other aspects of client expectations to counseling outcome.

Client Expectations and Counseling Outcome

In a review article, Borden (1955) stated that client expectations may have important effects on counselor-client dynamics, and that providers of counseling services need to consider client expectations for their behavior in order to maximize the effectiveness of their counseling. These client expectations for counselor behaviors or personal characteristics have been found to have a variety of effects upon counseling outcome as well as upon evaluations of counselors. These expectations may concern counselor sex, status, race, or the client's preconceived notions about the nature of counseling.

Since Borden's (1955) article, research in the area of client expectations for counselor behavior has focused on two major themes. One path of inquiry has explored clients' evaluations of their satisfaction with their counselors and counseling as a result of their expectations being met or unmet. The assessment of counseling outcomes as a
function of met or unmet client expectations has been the second path of inquiry.

The first research area has been examined in several studies of the relationship of confirmation of client expectations to client reported satisfaction with counseling. Isard and Sherwood (1964) had clients rate their counselor's behavior in terms of how satisfied they were with counseling. They found that although all counselors were rated fairly highly, those counselors whose in-session behaviors were congruent with the personal expectations of the client during the counseling experience were rated most highly. Severinson (1966) also examined client satisfaction with counseling. He found that confirmation of the client's expectations regarding how much the counselor would focus on feelings was associated with greater satisfaction. Clients whose counselors focused more or less on feelings than was expected were less satisfied with the counseling experience.

In contrast to the above studies, Gladstein (1969) investigated client satisfaction as a function of the confirmation of the client's general expectations for counseling. He used questionnaires and found that clients were satisfied regardless of whether all their expectations had been met. Gladstein did note, however, that in cases where the client felt that none of his/her expectations had been met she/he was dissatisfied with the counseling experience.

The trend indicated by these studies, then, is generally for increased client satisfaction when the client is matched with a counselor who fulfills at least some of his/her expectations for the counseling encounter. Whether the indicated satisfaction is an important influence
upon therapeutic effectiveness, however, has not yet been clarified by researchers.

Expectations held by clients have also been found to influence other aspects of counselor evaluations. In one of the few studies to examine how sex roles affect client evaluations of counselors, Myhr (1977) compared the counselor competency evaluations of clients who heard the counselor behave in ways congruent or incongruent with his/her sex role, as it is traditionally defined. He found that when male counselors behaved in a warm, supportive manner or when female counselors behaved in a directive manner, they were judged to be less competent than counselors who engaged in sex role appropriate behaviors. This finding may indicate one limitation placed upon the counselor by the client's sex role expectations, i.e., such expectations may hinder the counselor's work in some areas of counseling. This study also bears directly upon the present research question. If a client's sex role expectations for a counselor do not allow the counselor to exhibit necessary and therapeutic characteristics, or allow these behaviors only at the risk of violation of client sex role expectancies, then it would seem likely that the therapeutic process would be crippled and therapeutic outcomes might be entirely blocked.

The second path of expectancy research focuses on what tangible effects client expectancies for counselor behavior have on counseling outcome. Frederick (1977) examined counselee return rate as a function of the counselee's expectations for counselor advice-giving behavior. She found that when the counselee's expectations for counselor advice-giving behavior were not well defined or were very rigidly defined, the
return rate was lower than when the counselee held moderately firm expectations for the counselor's advice-giving behavior. These results seem to confirm the assertion that expectations do play an important role in the counseling outcome. Frederick also found that disconfirmation of expectations tended to lead to poorer counselor-counselee communication as perceived by the counselees. Disconfirmed expectations, then, also hinder counseling process.

Heilbrun (1961), too, investigated duration of counseling as an outcome variable and the relationship of duration of counseling to client expectations for counselor dominance behavior. Heilbrun found that female clients matched with a counselor who fulfilled their expectations for dominance behaviors remained in counseling longer. In 1974, Heilbrun did a second, related study on early client termination as a result of confirmed or disconfirmed client expectations for counselor directiveness. The results of this study indicated that females low in readiness for counseling were more likely to stay in counseling if their counselor did not meet their preferences for directive behavior. This contradictory result serves as a reminder that there remain some questions and inconsistencies in this area of research that require further study.

The previously described studies of client continuance in counseling have generally been suggestive of the importance of both counselor and client characteristics in client return rates. Clients' strength of expectations, readiness for counseling, and counselors' behavior interact to influence return rates and thus need to be considered in conjunction in further research in this area.
A different outcome of disconfirmed client expectations for counselor behavior has been found to be reduced in-session productivity. Pope, Seigman, Blass and Cheek (1974) interviewed college students on two occasions and found that disconfirmation of their expectations based on previous counselor behavior resulted in less in-session work, i.e., client verbalization, and more hesitant and superficial speech when verbalizations were present. These results point once again to a hindrance of the counseling process when client expectations for counselor behavior go unmet.

The literature concerning client expectations and counseling outcome has suggested several trends for the relationships of client expectations to outcome criteria. One trend has been for both overly rigid expectations or unclear expectations to lead to negative outcomes for counseling. It seems unlikely that the strong expectations of some clients could ever be totally met, yet at the same time, a lack of expectations may leave the client with no guidelines within which to work in counseling.

A second trend suggests that the disconfirmation of client expectations results in negative outcomes. Disappointment, anger, and confusion may underlie this phenomenon. A difficulty in interpreting many of the results of the studies in this area stems from a lack of description by researchers of the parameters of their studies, such as problem type or client sex role orientation, which have been proven important in other studies. It would be helpful if researchers examined their results or put them in the context of information and findings of other researchers. Such action could help maintain the continuity of research in the area of outcome and client expectancy, and possibly lend some consistency to
the results reported from such studies.

In summary, available research suggests that client expectations for counselor behavior are important and influential variables in counseling process and outcome studies. The negative consequences of unmet client expectations for counselor behavior, especially the counselor sex role behaviors to be examined in the present study, may be reflected in ratings of counselor characteristics associated with effective counseling outcomes. The following section describes and explores three counselor characteristics suggested to be important factors in positive counseling outcomes.

**Therapeutic Conditions for Counseling**

The question of how and why the therapy process works has long been a topic of study for psychologists. In 1968, Strong characterized counseling as an interpersonal influence process in which the counselor attempts to maximize his/her power to aid the client to engage in therapeutic change. As an integral part of his theory of how counseling works, he stated that a powerful and credible counselor was difficult for a client to dismiss and that, therefore, the counselor's influence attempts were more likely to succeed. The three conditions posited by Strong to increase counselor influence were expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. The condition of expertness was defined in terms of clients' perceptions of a counselor as a skilled professional. The condition of attractiveness was defined in terms of clients' perceptions of a counselor as similar and open to them for personal contact within the counseling session. Trustworthiness was defined in terms of clients' perceptions of a counselor as sincere and ethical in the counseling relationship.
Strong's model of therapy was, then, a two stage process. The first stage consisted of the enhancement of the counselor's power base through his/her exhibiting these three dimensions. The second stage of therapeutic intervention, i.e., the facilitation of client change, occurs effectively only after the counselor's power base has been established.

Since Strong's (1968) original article, the three dimensions of counselor influence have been better described and more closely examined in connection with how their presence or absence affects counseling outcomes. Strong and Schmidt (1970a) examined expertness and its effects upon a counselor's influence power. Expert and inexpert roles were constructed for counselors to play and an attempt was made to influence the participants' need for achievement. Expert introductions for counselors were used as the method to increase client-perceived counselor expertness. Results indicated that when the counselors' expert introductions were consonant with the roles they portrayed, the participants were more likely to change in the direction urged by the counselor on a measure of need for achievement.

Other studies of the effects of client-perceived counselor expertness include those of Dell (1973) and Scheid (1976). Dell (1973) examined expertness as a mediator of counselor influence attempts by having expert and inexpert counselors make expert and inexpert influence attempts on clients. Congruence between counselor expertness and the expertness of the influence attempt resulted in more instances of behavior change by the research participants. In the second study, Scheid (1976), the status of the counselor was manipulated by the type of introduction she/he received. Scheid found that a high status (expert) introduction.
improved the counselor's credibility regardless of the behavior in which she/he engaged. High status introductions increased clients' perceptions of counselor competence and their level of comfort in the session, two conditions often associated with positive counseling outcomes. This second study, then, indicates that it may be enough to alter clients' surface impressions of counselors to improve the therapeutic conditions for facilitating client change. In certain situations actual counselor behavior may count for little in the client's perception of the counselor's expertness.

Strong and Dixon (1971) examined the influence effects of both counselor expertness and counselor attractiveness in counseling. They found these two dimensions to combine additively, i.e., the effect of an expert counselor was heightened when she/he was also attractive, to increase counselor influence power. They also found that expertness tended to mask the effects of attractiveness in cases of unattractive counselors, i.e., although a counselor was unattractive she/he did retain influence power over the client. In the case of counselors who were neither attractive nor expert, these researchers found that clients tended to devalue the counselor and that counselor's influence attempts were usually unsuccessful. A further finding of this study was that if the counselor was attractive, she/he tended to have more clients return for counseling.

In another study of expertness and attractiveness in counseling, Kerr and Dell (1976) had participants undergo an interview with a counselor who played an expert or an attractive role in professional or casual attire and/or settings. Participants then rated the interviewer on the
three facilitative dimensions. These researchers reported that, while attractiveness was affected only by counselor behavior, expertness was affected by counselor behavior and attire. Continued research in the area of counselor expertness and attractiveness, then, has suggested not only ways in which they affect counseling process and outcome, but also how these characteristics interact with one another and how client perceptions of the characteristics are affected by counselor variables such as attire.

The third counselor characteristic posited by Strong (1968) to be important in the enhancement of counselor power is that of trustworthiness. This characteristic was examined by Strong and Schmidt (1970b). These researchers trained actors to portray trustworthy or untrustworthy roles and then judged the impact of an influence attempt made upon clients. Results indicated that the manipulation was weak, and no support was given to the hypothesis that trustworthiness increases the counselor's power to influence the client. This result now seems understandable in light of a factor analysis study by Barak and LaCrosse (1975). In an analysis of the behavioral ratings of three well-known counselors, they found trustworthiness to be the weakest of the three dimensions of counselor behavior in its effect upon ratings of counselor efficacy.

A recent study by LaCrosse (1979) serves to summarize the body of research reviewed above. In this study he found high levels of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness, as measured by an instrument known as the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), to be significantly related to positive counseling outcomes. Higher ratings of counselor
expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness lead to more reports of behavior change in the clients LaCrosse studied. The levels of these characteristics as measured by the CRF were able to be used as effective predictors of counseling outcome. Results such as these in conjunction with the above studies indicate that expertness and attractiveness do influence counseling process and outcome, while the role of trustworthiness is less certain. The behaviors of a counselor which indicate to a client the presence or absence of these dimensions, then, seem important to identify for application to the counseling process.

Clear identification of the counselor behaviors indicative of expertness and attractiveness has been made by Kerr and Dell (1976). They published concise descriptions of the expert and attractive roles they constructed for their research. The expert counselor's behavior was structured, logical, complete and minimally responsive to the client. In the attractive role the counselor was highly concerned with the client, less structured and more feeling oriented. These descriptions closely resemble the separate male and female sex role expectations described earlier in the chapter. This parallel leads to the question of whether the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness are differentially contained in the traditional male and female sex roles.

Research relevant to this issue is scarce. A study by Merluzzi, Banikotes and Missbach (1978) has some implications for the question of differential possession of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness of male and female sex roles. These investigators compared the effects of disclosure levels of male and female counselors. They found that females in the expert role were distinguishable from female
nonexperts, but that this relationship did not hold for males. They also found that high disclosing females were seen as less trustworthy than low disclosing females, but that again this relationship did not hold for males. One possible explanation for these findings might take into account the sex role expectations for men and women. Men are expected to be expert in most situations, so expert behavior or the lack of it may not have been noted by the participants. Women, however, are not expected to be expert in many situations, so the presence of expert behavior was noted and reacted to by participants. The trustworthiness finding may be explained similarly. Women are often stereotyped as too talkative, so the disclosing behavior might have been seen as an indicator of a lack of confidentiality, whereas for men no such assumption or expectation was present in the minds of the participants.

These conjectures, however, have little solid data base as there are so few studies in this area. The underlying assumptions of the Merluzzi et al. (1978) study are also challenged by a study conducted by Heppner and Pew (1977). These researchers made their own comparisons of the ratings of male and female counselors in expert or inexpert roles. They reported no differences, however, in the ratings of male and female expertness. With only these two contradictory studies available, conclusions can neither be made nor ruled out at this point. It can only be suggested that more research is needed.

The lack in the literature of a systematic examination of the influence of sex and sex role differences upon clients' perceptions of Strong's (1968) counselor dimensions seems an important one to remedy. Counselor behavior in accordance with traditional male or female sex
roles may influence client perceptions of the counselor's expertness, attractiveness or trustworthiness by the very nature of the characteristics associated with each of these sex roles. Incongruities between expected sex roles and actual sex role behaviors of the counselor might also affect client perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. The present study intends to examine these questions and others by having counselors rated as to their expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness when they are in accordance with or deviant from their traditionally defined sex role. One further variable, that of feminist orientation, will also be considered as a moderator variable in the above research question. The rationale for its inclusion in the current study is presented in the remaining section of this review.

Feminist Orientation

In considering the possible effects of counselor sex on client expectations for counselor behavior, it seems important to consider the extent to which the feminist orientation of the client may influence the nature of these expectations. A major emphasis of feminism involves a rejection of traditional sex role stereotypes as prescriptions for the behaviors and characteristics of males and females and an emphasis on individualistic, role-free behaviors (Rawlings & Carter, 1977). Feminists, then, would be expected to embrace and act in accordance with a role-free, egalitarian view of human behavior.

Interest in feminist orientation as an individual difference factor in research is a recent phenomenon and may be a result of the gradual profeminist shift of attitudes and interests that has occurred in this country over the last forty years (Doyle, 1976). Feminists have attracted
the attention of researchers and have been noted by them to be especially active and verbal in the area of changing sex role expectations. The development of the feminist perspective of male and female roles has become a major research topic (Westervelt, 1973).

Research to date has also focused upon describing feminists and differentiating them from nonfeminists. These descriptive studies have been done primarily with feminist women and have found them to be more independent, achievement-oriented, active, creative, and politically and professionally ambitious than nonfeminists (Cherniss, 1972; Gump, 1972; Joesting, 1971; Stoloff, 1973; Westervelt, 1973; Wiegers & Frieze, 1977). The results of these descriptive studies portray feminists, then, as persons who actually do live out their espoused androgynous, i.e., masculine and feminine balanced, sex role ideology.

The area of research most applicable to the concerns of the present study, however, is the small body of studies on feminists' sex role orientations. Clark and Lane (1978) described feminists they studied as tending to believe strongly in equality for men and women and in an individual's right to choose his/her behaviors without reference to a prescribed sex role. A study by Mezydlo and Betz (1980) also examined the sex role beliefs of feminist and nonfeminist individuals. They found that college students' perceptions of what ideal male and female roles "should" be like in society today were mediated by the feminist orientation of the students rather than by their sex. In this study, feminists of both sexes described the ideal male and female roles as similar and slightly masculine, while the ideal male and female roles of nonfeminists were characterized by traditional sex role differentiations. The results
of this last study seem to clearly identify the existence of distinct differences in the sex role attitudes and beliefs of feminists and nonfeminists.

Studies also exist in the literature which serve to connect the self-reports of feminists concerning their beliefs in equality with their actual behavior. Ghaffaradli-Doty and Carlson (1979) examined this question by comparing women's self-report measures of liberated attitudes and behavior with the perceptions of persons who knew them. They found that women with more liberated attitudes were also reported by acquaintances to engage in more liberated behavior in the area of rights and roles for women. These results have also been extended into studies of the effects of sex role attitudes and behavior in specific experimental situations. Tilby and Kalin (1980) found that college students with more traditional sex role beliefs reacted more negatively to sex role deviant stimulus persons than did students with more liberal attitudes about sex roles. The traditional students rated these stimulus persons as significantly more maladjusted and in need of psychological help than role congruent stimulus persons.

A study by Sharp and Post (1980) explored personnel officers' employment practices as they were affected by female or male applicants for role incongruent jobs. These researchers found that personnel officers who held traditional sex role beliefs were more likely to discriminate against the applicants for the role incongruent positions than they were for the role congruent applicants.

The above research, then, provides evidence that expressed attitudes towards sex roles and/or feminism do relate in a practical way to the
actual behaviors of persons and/or their judgments of others. In investigations of variables which could be affected by sex role beliefs it may therefore be useful to consider the feminist orientation of subjects as a way to further understand responses or reactions to the experimental manipulations.

Although there exists, then, a small but relatively convincing body of literature on the relationships of feminist orientation to an individual's perceptions, beliefs and behaviors, few researchers have taken this information into account when interpreting their research results. It seems that in research involving interpersonal perceptions and attributions, especially in counseling and sex role research, it would be important to consider the variable of feminist orientation. This consideration would seem important in the present study because of the possible influence of subject feminist orientation upon the subject's sex role beliefs which, in turn, are expected to affect ratings of in and out of sex role counselors. For this reason, the variable of feminist orientation will be examined as it correlates with the dependent variable of ratings of the expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness of in or out of sex role counselors.

**Summary**

The present study has been designed in an attempt to consolidate and extend research findings in the areas of sex roles, clients' expectations for counselors, feminism, and effective components of counselor behavior. This inquiry is aimed at investigating whether or not male and female counselors are seen as less expert, attractive and trustworthy when they behave in ways incongruent with their socially prescribed
sex role.

A review of the research in these areas has indicated that negative consequences exist for both behaving out of one's prescribed sex role (Sharp & Post, 1980; Tilby & Kalin, 1980; Zeldow, 1976) and for counselor failure to behave in accordance with their clients' expectations (Frederick, 1977; Myhr, 1977; Pope et al., 1974). The present study focuses upon a combination of these two areas in examining the consequences of counselors behaving in ways incongruent with their stereotypic sex role.

The criteria to be used in determining the occurrence of the expected negative consequences are subject ratings of counselors' expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. These three factors have been chosen for their documented connection with positive counseling outcomes (Dell, 1973; LaCrosse, 1979; Strong & Dixon, 1971). If these dimensions of counselor behavior are rated as less evident in out-of-sex role counselors than in-role counselors, then a case may be made for the statement that counselors who behave in ways incongruent with their stereotypic sex role may pay a penalty of having less power to influence clients toward therapeutic change.

The above summary of this experimental design requires one further addition. Feminist orientation of subjects will be examined as a covariate and correlate of ratings of in and out of role counselors. Individuals with more feminist views have been shown to be less likely to hold and judge others by traditional sex role stereotypes (Clark & Lane, 1978; Mezydlo & Betz, 1980; Tilby & Kalin, 1980). Subjects' counselor ratings, then, may be expected to be moderated by their level of feminism.
This study was designed to examine the effects of the in- and out-of-role behaviors of male and female counselors upon ratings of their expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Feminist orientation of subjects was investigated as a moderator variable of the above ratings. Accordingly, subjects were presented with audio-taped stimulus materials which simulated a portion of a counseling interview. Following the presentation of the stimulus materials, subjects were asked to fill out an evaluation of the counselor on the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. They were also asked to complete a questionnaire to determine the extent of their feminist orientation.

Stimulus Materials

Eight seven-minute audiotapes were initially constructed for this study. Four of the tapes were of a male counselor with a female client and four were of a female counselor with the same female client. All actors were advanced counseling psychology graduate students. Each counselor enacted the role of a very warm, supportive counselor in one tape, a somewhat less warm, supportive counselor in another tape, a very confrontive, directive counselor in a third tape, and a somewhat less confrontive, directive counselor in the fourth tape.

Scripts for the four roles were constructed by the researcher and involved a client discussing with a counselor her roommate problems. In
the warm, supportive roles the counselor responded with varying degrees of reflective statements, gentle requests for information, and self-disclosure of feelings to the client. In the confrontive tapes the counselor, to different extents, confronted the client on her statements about the problem, was directive and interpretive throughout the dialogue, and did not disclose feelings to the client. Client responses for all four scripts were kept as uniform as possible. The four scripts and their instructions are contained in Appendix A.

Prior to the actual execution of the study, the eight tapes were presented to six advanced graduate students in counseling psychology who rated them on an abbreviated version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974), and also commented upon their clarity and believability. The BSRI was used to determine the extent to which the four roles differed stylistically along the stereotypic dimensions of traditional masculine and feminine sex role behavior. It was abbreviated by selecting out five items each from masculinity and femininity scales. Items were chosen for their relevance to ratings of counselor behavior and in the interest of not fatiguing raters with the requirement that they fill out the complete BSRI eight times. Scores for the BSRI items range from one to seven, with seven indicative of an item being strongly characteristic of the individual being evaluated. Difference scores, indicative of the extent to which each of the eight counselor performances was perceived as masculine or feminine in sex role orientation, were obtained by summing the five items of each scale and then subtracting the masculinity score from the femininity score. Positive difference scores indicated that the counselor performance was perceived as feminine, while negative
difference scores were indicative of the counselor's performance having been perceived as masculine. The rating form and its instructions are contained in Appendix B.

Upon completion of the BSRI ratings, means and standard deviations for male and female counselors in each of the four roles were computed. They are presented in Table 1. \( t \)-tests were performed on these means to determine whether the roles differed significantly from one another. It was noted that for both male and female counselors, the supportive and very supportive roles did not differ significantly from one another \( (t = .34, \text{n.s.}; t = 1.92, \text{n.s.}) \), although the confrontive and very confrontive roles did differ significantly from one another \( (t = 6.67, \text{p} < .05; t = 3.41, \text{p} < .05) \). It was decided, therefore, to use only the two roles most clearly differentiated along stereotypic lines of masculine and feminine sex role behavior, i.e., the mildly supportive and very confrontive roles.

As shown in Table 1, the supportive role was characterized by raters as most clearly fitting the stereotypic feminine sex role for both male and female counselors \( (\bar{X}_{\text{MC}} = 7.50; \bar{X}_{\text{FC}} = 8.50) \), while the very confrontive role was most characteristic of the stereotypic masculine sex role for both male and female counselors \( (\bar{X}_{\text{MC}} = -16.50; \bar{X}_{\text{FC}} = -18.83) \). These two roles were, therefore, chosen as ones which would most sharply characterize and reflect the effects of masculine and feminine sex roles on subject ratings of counselors' expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness in the present research design.
Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations of BSRI Difference Scores for Male and Female Counselors in Each of the Experimental Counselor Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Counselor</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female Counselor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Role</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Supportive Role</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontive Role</td>
<td>-8.33</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>-9.50</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Confrontive Role</td>
<td>-16.50</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>-18.83</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Positive scores indicate a feminine rating, while negative scores indicate a masculine rating.
Instruments

Subjects' perceptions of counselor behavior were assessed using the Counselor Rating Form (CRF; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975). The CRF consists of 36 seven-point items whose endpoints are bipolar adjectives. The 36 items are divided among three scales of 12 items each: expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness dimensions of counselor behavior. The scales were developed from factor analyzed lists of counselor-descriptive adjectives used to rate three prominent therapists.

Scores on each of the three dimensions are obtained by summing the 12 response scores; total scale scores may range from 12 to 84. Higher scores indicate the perception of a greater degree of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness by the rater.

The internal consistency reliabilities of the expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness scales, using the split half method, are estimated to be .87, .85, and .91, respectively (LaCrosse & Barak, 1976). Previous research has also shown the CRF to differentiate among relative amounts of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness present in different modes of counselor behavior (Barak & Dell, 1977; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; LaCrosse & Barak, 1976). Higher levels of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness as measured by the CRF have been found to be associated with positive counseling outcomes in a number of studies (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; LaCrosse, 1979; LaCrosse & Barak, 1976). The CRF and instructions for its administration are contained in Appendix C.

Subjects' feminist orientation was assessed using the Sex Role Ideology Scale (SRIS; Kalin & Tilby, 1978). This scale was developed to
differentiate persons with traditional versus feminist sex role ideologies. The scale consists of 30 seven-point, bipolar items pertaining to work roles, parental responsibilities, personal relationships, special roles of women, abortion, and homosexuality. Half of the items are phrased in a feminist manner and half are phrased in a traditional manner; subjects respond using a seven-point continuum of agreement to disagreement for each item.

Scores on the SRIS may range from 30 to 210, with higher scores indicative of a more feminist ideology. During its development, the scale was administered to self-proclaimed feminist and traditional women's groups. The items were found to discriminate well between these two groups. Scores for traditional women ranged from 61 to 150, with a mean of 96, while those for the feminist women ranged from 160 to 210, with a mean of 196. In a random sample of college students, the scores on the SRIS ranged from 71 to 210, with a mean of 140. The men in this sample of students were found to have a significantly lower mean score than the women.

Item-total correlations for the SRIS range from .39 to .75. The split-half reliability for the student sample was .84, while the test-retest reliability was .87 over a three week period. The SRIS and its instructions are contained in Appendix D.

Subjects were also asked to indicate their sex and their degree of previous experience in counseling on a personal data sheet. The latter information was used to determine the degree of sophistication of the subjects in the area of counseling and their degree of approximation to a sample of prospective clients. This form is contained in Appendix E.
Subjects and Procedure

The subjects for this study were 80 male and 86 female undergraduates in introductory psychology courses at the Ohio State University. Participation in the study was voluntary, but subjects did receive course credit for their participation in the experiment.

Subjects were randomly assigned within sex to one of four experimental groups: 1) supportive male counselor; 2) supportive female counselor; 3) confrontive male counselor; and 4) confrontive female counselor. Each group heard one of the above audiotapes. The experimental design and the numbers of subjects in each of the eight resulting groups are shown in Table 2.

While listening to the tape, the subjects were asked to place themselves in the role of the client on the tape. At the end of the tape, subjects completed the CRF, the personal data sheet, and SRIS, in that order.

Upon completion of these instruments, subjects were debriefed as to the rationale for the study. Any questions they had were answered and they were thanked for their participation.

Hypotheses

It was hypothesized herein that out-of-sex role behavior of counselors would result in the devaluation of them on the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness, but that this result would be attenuated by subject feminist orientation. More feminist subjects might perceive the behavior of in and out-of-sex role counselors similarly, while less feminist subjects might devalue the behavior of out-of-sex role counselors as opposed to the in-role counselors. A
Table 2
Experimental Design and Number of Subjects in Each Experimental Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Role</th>
<th>Subject Sex</th>
<th>Male N</th>
<th>Female N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>(out of role)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Confrontive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(in role)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Confrontive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of role)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
secondary hypothesis of this study was that the relative amounts of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness perceived in the masculine and feminine sex roles would differ.

Analysis of Data

Data available for each subject included: 1) experimental condition; 2) summary ratings of the counselor's expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness; and 3) score on the SRIS.

Three $2 \times 2 \times 2$ (counselor sex x counselor behavior x subject sex) analyses of variance with one covariate, i.e., feminist orientation, were performed using the three CRF scale scores as dependent variables. These analyses were performed to test the hypothesis that evaluations of the expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness of in and out-of-sex role counselors would differ. Feminist orientation was used as a covariate to evaluate its effect in the above analyses as well as to remove the effect of its variance from those analyses. The three analyses of variance were also performed to determine whether there existed any other significant main effects or interactions of the independent variables.

The interaction of counselor sex and counselor role behavior was specifically examined to evaluate whether differential expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness ratings existed for the supportive and confrontive counselor roles. Means and standard deviations were computed for all factors in each of the analyses of variance. Post hoc comparisons of significant effects identified by the analyses of variance were performed using Dunnett tests (Myers, 1972).

Pearson product-moment correlations between the SRIS scores of subjects and the three CRF scale scores were also obtained for the total
group and within the experimental groups. These correlations were computed to determine the degree and direction of any existent relationships between subjects' feminist orientation and their ratings of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

Results of the analysis of variance of expertness scores as a function of counselor sex, subject sex, and counselor role with the covariate of subject feminist orientation are presented in Table 3. These same analyses were done with attractiveness and trustworthiness scores; results are presented in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

As shown in the tables, a statistically significant main effect for subject sex was found for the expertness ($F=5.47, p<.05$) and trustworthiness ($F=12.11, p<.01$) scores. A significant main effect for counselor sex ($F=4.00, p<.05$) was also found with the attractiveness scores.

In addition to the main effects, the interaction of counselor sex and counselor role was significant for attractiveness ($F=12.05, p<.001$) and trustworthiness ($F=10.09, p<.01$) ratings. One other interaction, i.e., that between subject sex and counselor sex for the attractiveness scores, approached significance ($F=3.49, p=.06$). No other main or interaction effects were found, and the covariate of feminist orientation was not found to account for a significant amount of the overall variance.

Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations of scores on all three scales of the CRF as a function of counselor sex, subject sex, and counselor role. As shown in the table, female subjects tended to rate counselors higher in expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness.
Table 3
Analysis of Variance of Expertness Scores by Counselor Sex, Subject Sex, and Counselor Role with Subject Feminism as Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Feminism (Covariate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>231.01</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Sex (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Sex (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>566.73</td>
<td>5.47a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Role (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.32</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>246.78</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxBxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>302.85</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>103.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a_{p} < .05\)
### Table 4

Analysis of Variance of Attractiveness Scores by Counselor Sex, Subject Sex, and Counselor Role with Subject Feminism as Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Feminism (Covariate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Sex (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>497.40</td>
<td>4.00a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Sex (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>444.82</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Role (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>434.27</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1498.01</td>
<td>12.05b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxBxC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>124.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a_p < .05 \)

\( b_p < .001 \)
Table 5

Analysis of Variance of Trustworthiness Scores by Counselor Sex, Subject Sex, and Counselor Role with Subject Feminism as Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Feminism (Covariate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>225.56</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Sex (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.76</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Sex (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1139.97</td>
<td>12.11b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Role (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>949.98</td>
<td>10.09a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXBXC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>201.06</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a_{p} < .01
b_{p} < .001
Table 6
CRF Scores as a Function of Counselor Sex, Subject Sex, and Counselor Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Expertness</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>66.3 9.9</td>
<td>61.8 11.2</td>
<td>68.0 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Subject</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63.0 9.6</td>
<td>58.3 11.9</td>
<td>65.1 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.1 11.7</td>
<td>55.1 13.1</td>
<td>62.2 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65.1 6.4</td>
<td>61.6 9.6</td>
<td>68.2 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Subject</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69.4 9.1</td>
<td>65.2 9.4</td>
<td>70.9 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.9 11.3</td>
<td>63.5 11.3</td>
<td>70.2 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69.0 6.9</td>
<td>66.8 7.1</td>
<td>71.5 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67.5 11.0</td>
<td>65.2 12.0</td>
<td>69.5 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Subject</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66.0 11.6</td>
<td>64.9 10.5</td>
<td>65.9 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69.2 6.3</td>
<td>68.1 7.3</td>
<td>70.0 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63.0 14.6</td>
<td>61.9 12.2</td>
<td>62.0 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Subject</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68.7 10.4</td>
<td>65.4 13.3</td>
<td>72.6 9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Expertness</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Subject</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Subject</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Maximum scale scores for the CRF are 84 for all three scales.
than did male subjects. This difference was statistically significant for the expertness and trustworthiness ratings and was in the same direction for the attractiveness ratings.

Means and standard deviations for the significant main effect of counselor sex are also summarized in Table 6. This information indicates that the attractiveness scores for the female counselor, collapsed across subject sex and counselor role, were higher (\(\bar{X}=65.2\)) than were those for the male counselor (\(\bar{X}=61.8\)). This difference was not evident in the expertness and trustworthiness scale scores.

The interaction of counselor sex and counselor role was significant for both the attractiveness and trustworthiness scale scores. Figure 1 illustrates the mean attractiveness scores of this interaction. As shown in the figure, the female counselor who acted within her sex role, i.e., was supportive, was judged to be more attractive than the female counselor who acted out of her sex role, i.e., was confrontive. The male counselor who acted within his sex role, i.e., was confrontive, however, was rated as less attractive than the male counselor who acted out of his sex role, i.e., was supportive. A post hoc comparison of these means was made using Dunnett's test (Myers, 1972). The comparison indicated that the mean attractiveness rating of the female counselor acting within her sex role was significantly higher than that of both the female counselor acting out of her sex role (\(d=3.27, p<.05\)), and the male counselor acting within his sex role (\(d=4.32, p<.05\)). The mean attractiveness rating of the male counselor acting out of his sex role, however, was not significantly different from any of the other three means.
Figure 1

Mean Attractiveness Scores for Male and Female Counselors as a Function of In and Out of Role Behavior

(Supportive behavior is in role for female counselor and out of role for male counselor; confrontive behavior is out of role for female counselor and in role for male counselor)
Figure 2 illustrates the mean trustworthiness scale scores for the interaction of counselor sex and counselor role. As shown in the figure, the female counselor acting within her sex role, i.e., being supportive, was judged to be more trustworthy than the female counselor acting out of her sex role, i.e., being confrontive. The male counselor who acted within his sex role, i.e., was confrontive, however, was judged to be less trustworthy than the male counselor who acted out of his sex role, i.e., was supportive. Post hoc comparisons of these means were made using Dunnett's test (Myers, 1972). Results indicated that the mean trustworthiness rating of the female counselor acting within her sex role was significantly higher than that of the female counselor acting out of her sex role ($d=3.07$, $p<.05$) and the male counselor acting within his sex role ($d=3.28$, $p<.05$). Once again, the mean score of the male counselor acting out of his sex role was not significantly different from the other three means.

Figure 3 illustrates the interaction of counselor sex and counselor role for ratings of expertness. While it is not statistically significant, the pattern of these data is identical to the patterns for the significant interactions of counselor sex and counselor role for the attractiveness and trustworthiness ratings. The female counselor acting within her sex role, i.e., being supportive, was rated as most expert, followed by the male counselor acting out of his sex role, i.e., being supportive. The male counselor acting within his sex role, i.e., being confrontive, and the female counselor acting out of her sex role, i.e., being confrontive, were both rated as less expert than the other two counselors.
Mean Trustworthiness Scores for Male and Female Counselors as a Function of In and Out of Role Behavior

(Supportive behavior is in role for female counselor and out of role for male counselor; confrontive behavior is out of role for female counselor and in role for male counselor)
Figure 3

Mean Expertness Scores for Male and Female Counselors

as a Function of In and Out of Role Behavior

(Supportive behavior is in role for female counselor and out of role for male counselor; confrontive behavior is out of role for female counselor and in role for male counselor)
The previously described patterns of interaction of counselor sex and counselor role may be alternately interpreted as a main effect for counselor behavior. In each case, results indicated that supportive counselor behavior was judged to be more expert, attractive, and trustworthy than confrontive counselor behavior.

The interaction of subject sex and counselor sex for ratings of attractiveness was found to approach significance \( p = .06 \) and is diagrammed in Figure 4. The figure indicates that female subjects rated the attractiveness of male and female counselors similarly, and these ratings were comparable to those of male subjects who rated the female counselor. The male counselor, however, was rated as less attractive by male subjects. Post hoc comparisons of these means by Dunnett's test (Myers, 1972) indicated that the attractiveness score for the male counselor as rated by male subjects was significantly lower than that of the female counselor as rated by male subjects \( (d=3.13, p < .05) \), the female counselor as rated by female subjects \( (d=3.19, p < .05) \), and the male counselor as rated by female subjects \( (d=3.00, p < .05) \). The latter three means did not differ significantly from one another.

In further analyses, the relationships of subjects' feminist orientation scores to the extent to which they described counselors as expert, attractive, and trustworthy were examined using Pearson product-moment correlations. These correlation coefficients, calculated separately for each experimental group, are presented in Table 7.

Two clusters of statistically significant correlations were identified by the analyses described above. The central correlation of the first of these clusters indicated a significantly positive relationship
Mean Attractiveness Scores for Male and Female Counselors
Rated by Male and Female Subjects
between degree of subject feminist orientation and ratings of counselor expertness when the subject was a female rating a confrontive male counselor \((r = .47, p < .01)\). More feminist women tended to rate the confrontive male counselor as more expert than did less feminist women who rated the same counselor. Other correlations in this cluster were supportive of this central finding. These additional correlations indicated a significantly positive relationship between subject feminist orientation and ratings of counselor expertness when the counselor was male \((r = .20, p < .05)\), when a female subject rated a male counselor \((r = .34, p < .01)\), and when the counselor being rated was a confrontive male \((r = .28, p < .05)\).

The central correlation of the second cluster indicated a significantly positive relationship between degree of subject feminist orientation and ratings of counselor trustworthiness when the counselor was a confrontive female \((r = .34, p < .01)\). More feminist subjects tended to rate the confrontive female counselor as more trustworthy than did less feminist subjects. This finding was supported by other significantly positive correlations in the cluster. These additional correlations were indicative of a positive relationship between subject feminist orientation and ratings of counselor trustworthiness when the counselor was female \((r = .27, p < .01)\), when the subject was female \((r = .23, p < .05)\), when the counselor behaved out of sex role \((r = .27, p < .01)\), and when female subjects rated an out of sex role counselor \((r = .23, p < .05)\). Correlational findings in this second cluster, then, suggested that more feminist female subjects rated the confrontive female counselor as more trustworthy than did less feminist female subjects rating the same counselor.
Table 7
Correlation Coefficients for Subject Feminism and CRF Scores
as a Function of Counselor Sex, Subject Sex, and Counselor Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Expert r</th>
<th>Attractive r</th>
<th>Trustworthy r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.20\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Subject</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Subject</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.34\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.47\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Subject</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Subject</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Subject</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Subject</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7-Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Expert r</th>
<th>Attractive r</th>
<th>Trustworthy r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor In Role</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.28a</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Out of Role</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.19a</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.27b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Counselor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Counselor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.34b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Means, medians and ranges for male and female subjects' scores on the SRIS are included in Appendix F.

\(^{a} p < .05\)

\(^{b} p < .01\)
The present investigation was intended to explore subjects' ratings of male and female counselors' expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness as a function of the extent of correspondence of counselor behavior to his/her stereotypic sex role. A further objective was to investigate the relationship of subjects' feminist orientation to the above ratings of counselors by subjects, and to note any differences in subjects' ratings of the expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness of the "masculine" and "feminine" counselor roles.

Results of the analyses indicated no differences in ratings of counselors as a function of their in or out of sex role behavior, but did indicate differential ratings of the supportive and confrontive counselor roles. For attractiveness and trustworthiness ratings, and to a lesser extent for expertness ratings, supportive male and female counselors were rated more highly than were confrontive male and female counselors.

In addition, a trend for female subjects to rate counselors more highly on expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness than male subjects was also noted. This trend is of interest because of the lack of previous evidence to suggest that ratings on the CRF are affected by subject sex. It may be hypothesized that female subjects in this study were less critical or used more lenient standards/definitions than did male subjects in evaluating the expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness of the counselors.
The other significant main effect identified in this study was that of counselor sex for ratings of counselor attractiveness. It was found that the female counselor was perceived by subjects as more attractive than was the male counselor. This result, when examined in relation to female subjects' higher attractiveness ratings of counselors, suggests that a male counselor may be perceived as less attractive when the rater is male than when the rater is female. Ratings of a male counselor's attractiveness, as perceived by male subjects, may also be lower than ratings of a similarly behaving female counselor as perceived by male or female subjects. This greater attractiveness of the female counselor may in part be attributed to the stereotypic "feminine" characteristics associated with women's role in our society. The male counselor, by reason of his social role, may lack the benefit of such built-in attributions of attractiveness. Subjects' sex modified this result to the extent that female subjects' ratings of the male counselor's attractiveness were equivalent to their ratings of the female counselor's attractiveness. This suggests that only the males in this study retained and utilized such social role assumptions of differential levels of inherent male and female attractiveness.

Correlations of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness ratings of counselors with subjects' feminist orientation scores indicated that for expertness ratings, more feminist subjects (especially female subjects) tended to rate the within role male counselor as more expert than did less feminist subjects. Expertness ratings of the out of role female counselor were also positively correlated at near significant levels with subjects' feminist orientation scores. These results seem indicative of a tendency
for more feminist subjects to have perceived confrontive, i.e., masculine stereotyped, counselor behavior as more expert than did less feminist subjects. This result may have implications for understanding comfort levels and orientations of feminist and nonfeminist subjects to confrontive behavior in general and to confrontive counselor behavior in particular.

Correlations with subjects' feminist orientation scores resulted in a second set of significant results. It was found that more feminist subjects (especially female subjects) perceived out of sex role, i.e., confrontive, female counselors to be more trustworthy than did less feminist subjects. Once again, this result may be indicative of differential comfort levels and orientations of more and less feminist subjects with regard to confrontive behavior in general and to confrontive counselor behavior in particular.

The results of the present study, then, are important because they shed doubt on the hypothesis that out of sex role behavior by a counselor may result in lowered expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness ratings and, therefore, hinder counseling process and outcome. They are also important because they give significant, although limited, evidence for feminist orientation as a variable capable of affecting ratings of counselors' expertness and trustworthiness. Additional findings as to subject sex differences in counselor ratings and the perceptions of greater attractiveness and trustworthiness in the supportive role contribute new information, as well as questions, about the process and outcome of counseling.
The present study's finding that counselors' in and out of sex role behavior was not differentially evaluated by subjects is attenuated by the related finding that supportive and confrontive counselor behavior were differentially evaluated by subjects. It may be that the hypothesized counselor role effect was suppressed by the perceived advantages of supportive counselor behavior. This study's population of therapeutically naive undergraduates may have viewed the confrontive counselor's behavior as unpleasant and therefore less expert, attractive and trustworthy than that of the supportive counselor. Recognition of the therapeutic utility of confrontive counselor behavior may require a more sophisticated subject population. Ratings of supportive and confrontive counselors made by experienced therapists, supervisors or graduate students in counseling psychology might allow a better test of the influence of sex role expectations upon counselor evaluations, and also lessen the interference from unsophisticated definitions of appropriate and valid counselor behavior.

If the suggested lack of counselor role effect is in fact real, however, it may imply that male and female counselors' professional roles are somehow independent of traditional sex role definitions. It may be that by reason of the title of counselor, individuals are allowed more latitude in their professional behavior, while still retaining the positive evaluations of their clients. One implication of such a conclusion would be that counselors need not be concerned about sex role congruence in their choice of therapeutic behavior and technique. The counselor may have the freedom and flexibility in professional behavior to disregard social stereotypes in favor of choosing behavior for its
efficacy.

An alternative explanation of the above finding may be that social change has occurred to the extent that perceptions of male and female counselors are not affected by sex role stereotypes. It may be that, at least at this professional level, a male is free to be supportive and a female is free to be confrontive without fear of social reprisals. If such social change has taken place, then, it may be hypothesized that it is only a matter of time until these same changes filter down to the level of the general population.

The higher attractiveness and trustworthiness ratings for supportive counselors found in the present study seem congruent with other findings in the counseling literature. Kerr and Dell (1976) described the counselor variable of attractiveness as including concern for the client, responsivity to the client, and a flexible and feeling orientation. These qualities seem characteristic of the stereotypic feminine sex role as described by Parsons and Bales (1955), Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) and many others, and this would likely have been reflected in ratings of the attractiveness of the supportive counselors. Trustworthiness scale items of the CRF (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) emphasize characteristics such as sincerity, honesty, reliability and dependability which are also congruent with descriptions of the stereotypic feminine sex role. Sherriffs and Jarrett (1953) and Block (1973) described the feminine sex role as trustworthy and marked by a genuine concern for the welfare of others. Once again, similarities between the feminine sex role and the counselor characteristic of trustworthiness may have contributed to the higher trustworthiness ratings of the supportive counselors in the present investigation.
In light of the above reasoning, however, it is of interest to note the lack of association between the stereotypic masculine, i.e., confrontive, counselor role and ratings of expertness. This seems inconsistent with numerous associations which have been made between expertness and the masculine sex role (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953). One explanation may be that while the counselor's professional role is not necessarily assumed to include attractiveness and trustworthiness, it is assumed to include expertness because of the professional status of the counselor. Scheid (1976) found that an expert introduction for a counselor resulted in increased perceptions of the counselor's expertness regardless of the counselor's behavior. Thus, counselor behaviors in the short segments used in the present study may have added or subtracted little from the expertness inherent in subjects' perceptions of the counselor role. The additional attributes of attractiveness and trustworthiness in the supportive role, then, may have been responsible for the differences found to exist in subjects' ratings of counselors. One implication of such an explanation might be that counselors need to pay special attention to maximizing attractiveness and trustworthiness if they choose a cognitive or confrontive counseling orientation. Attention to these qualities and knowledge of the inherent expertness attributed to the counseling profession may allow counselors to ensure the presence of adequate amounts of attractiveness, expertness and trustworthiness in their behavior and thereby maximize client change.

Findings of higher ratings by more feminist female subjects of the expertness of the confrontive female counselor may also be compared with
existing research literature. Feminists are often characterized as possessing more self-confidence, assertiveness, and a more active orientation to life than nonfeminists (Joesting, 1971; Stoloff, 1973; Wiegers & Frieze, 1977). These characteristics are not traditional components of the feminine sex role and it may be hypothesized that many traditional women are uncomfortable with them in themselves or others. Such uncomfortableness may have contributed to the lower expertness and trustworthiness ratings by less feminist subjects of confrontive counselors. More feminist subjects may have been able to accept the confrontive counselors as expert and trustworthy with less difficulty than less feminist subjects.

If true, the above rationale for the present findings may be extended to suggest differences in how more and less feminist subjects react to not only confrontive counselor behavior, but also confrontive behavior in general. The implication for the practice of counseling of such a finding may be that counselors should be aware of possible differences in reactions of more and less feminist clients to confrontive counselor behavior.

Limitations of the present study are primarily methodological and are of consequence for application of the present findings to counseling practice. One limitation is the use of college student subjects and taped counseling interviews rather than actual client perceptions of their counselor's behavior. The students used were drawn from a population representative of typical university counseling center clients, but it would seem useful to extend the results of the present study to a naturalistic setting for further validation of them.
A second limitation of the present study is that few counselors would fit into the exclusively supportive or confrontive roles used in this design. It would seem more realistic for a counselor to vary his/her counseling style. The results and recommendations of the present study need to be considered in light of the fact that most counselors are likely to strike a balance between supportive and confrontive behaviors. The specific behaviors investigated in this study, then, must be considered only partial contributors to overall evaluations of counselor behavior.

A related limitation concerns the degree of effectiveness of the in and out of sex role manipulation of counselor behavior in the present study. Subjects' perceptions of in and out of role counselor behavior may not have been uniform and consistent with assumptions made in the research design. It would be of value for future researchers to include manipulation checks of subjects' perceptions of in and out of role behaviors.

Finally, a fourth limitation of this study is that client sex was held constant across all conditions. Evaluations of a counselor's reactions to a male client may differ from evaluations of identical counselor reactions to a female client. The results of the present study, then, are limited to counselors working with female clients.

A number of future research directions are suggested by the limitations of this study. It would be useful to examine the generalizability of these results by replicating the study in a counseling center or mental health facility setting. Although experimental controls would be difficult to accomplish in such settings, it might be possible to use the ratings of clients or independent judges to determine to what extent a
counselor had behaved in a sex role stereotypic manner during a counseling session. Clients could then be asked to complete the CRF after the counseling session in order to evaluate their counselor's levels of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Examination of such client feedback as to whether a counselor's behavior was in or out of his/her stereotypic sex role may be an important consideration in future research and may account for the lack of effect of counselor role in the present study. It may be that one individual's definition of in/out of sex role behavior can differ from that of another, and yet both individuals may react similarly to their experience of in and out of sex role behavior.

Other important areas to consider in future research include repetition of the present design with a male client to ascertain if differences in evaluations of counselors' expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness result, and also repetition of the design with a therapeutically sophisticated subject population to lessen the effects of naive raters' unsophisticated definitions of appropriate counselor behavior. A final area for future research consideration may be an investigation into possible sex differences in responses of male and female subjects to the CRF. Past research has given no evidence of such response differences and it seems important to identify whether they have in fact existed or are merely an artifact of the present study.

In summary, then, the present study was designed to examine the effect of in and out of sex role behavior of male and female counselors on evaluations of their expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness by male and female subjects. It further aimed to explore what effect, if any, subject feminist orientation had upon these evaluations. Finally,
the supportive and confrontive counselor roles used in this study were
examined for differences in their perceived expertness, attractiveness
and trustworthiness. These purposes were investigated through the use
of audiotaped segments of counseling sessions in which a female or male
counselor acted in or out of her/his stereotypic sex role. Subjects
listened to and then rated a counselor on his/her expertness, attractiveness
and trustworthiness, and also filled out a measure of personal
feminist orientation.

Results of the present study indicated no evidence for the occurrence of negative evaluations of counselors' expertness, attractiveness
or trustworthiness by subjects when the counselors behaved out of their
stereotypic sex roles. The present results do suggest, however, that a
supportive, i.e., feminine, counseling orientation may result in perceptions of male and female counselors as more attractive and trustworthy
than does a confrontive counseling orientation. Additionally, confrontive,
i.e., masculine, counselor behavior was, in certain contexts, found to be
better accepted in counselors of both sexes by more feminist subjects
than by less feminist subjects. These results are limited, however, by
the population, setting, and definitions of appropriate sex role behavior
utilized in this study and require further extension and replication in
order to be applied with confidence to the practice of counseling.

The previously reported results have suggested a number of implications for counselors. One implication is that the counselor role may be
one which is at present free from traditional sex role stereotypes. The
range of acceptable behavior for male and female counselors appears to be
wider than that reported for men and women in the general population.
A second implication stems from the generally more positive ratings of supportive counselor behavior by the naive subjects used in the present study. Such a result suggests that use of confrontive counseling techniques may require preparation of the naive client by the counselor if their therapeutic impact is to be constructive. A third implication has to do with the possibility that certain identifiably therapeutic characteristics, e.g., expertness and attractiveness, may be inherent in a counselor's professional or stereotypic sex role and somewhat independent of his/her behavior. Finally, the present results suggest that confrontive counselor behavior may be more acceptable to feminists than to nonfeminists.
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Appendix A

Instructions to Subjects
and Scripts

In this experiment you are being asked to listen to a short excerpt
of what a typical counseling session might be like. Please pay care­
ful attention to what you hear and pay special attention to the counselor.
After the tape is completed, you will be asked to rate the counselor on
a number of scales. Try to imagine what you would feel toward the coun­
selor if you were the client on the tape.

Any questions?

Please put on the earphones and I will start the tape.

-TAPE-

I am now going to pass out the questionnaires for you to fill out.
Please read the directions for each one and complete all of the items.
The first one is to rate the counselor that you heard on the tape.
Check both sides of all pages as some pages have printing on the front
and the back.

When you complete the first questionnaire please fill in the
personal data sheet and then the second questionnaire. For the second
questionnaire, remember to circle the mark which best describes your
attitude toward each statement. Again, please check both sides of each
page to make sure that you fill in all of the items.

When you finish the items, please check to see that you haven't
missed any and then turn in the questionnaires and I will sign your card.
Script—Very Supportive Role

Co-ANN, HOW HAVE THINGS GONE FOR YOU THIS WEEK? ANY BETTER?

Cl-Not too well. (Pause) My roommate and I have had another argument. We just can't seem to get along. I'm beginning to hate going back to my room at night. I just don't know what to do anymore.

Co-IT SOUNDS LIKE THIS LAST ARGUMENT HAS JUST GOTTEN YOU TERRIBLY UPSET. CAN YOU TELL ME MORE? MAYBE I CAN HELP.

Cl-Well, it started out to be a really small thing. I needed to do some studying and I asked her to please turn down the volume of the stereo for a while. She got really angry and started accusing me of always telling her what to do. She said it was her room, too. Then she said that she didn't know why she had to be the one to get stuck with me for a roommate. (Close to tears)

Co-THAT SOUNDS LIKE IT REALLY HURT YOU. CAN YOU TELL ME HOW YOU WERE FEELING WHEN SHE TOLD YOU THOSE TERRIBLE THINGS?

Cl-It hurt, a lot. I don't think I'm such a horrible roommate. I really try to be nice to her. But, it just seems that sometimes I have to stand up for my rights, too.

Co-YOU'RE RIGHT, AND IT SOUNDS LIKE SHE NOT ONLY HURT YOU, BUT SHE MADE YOU ANGRY, TOO.

Cl-Oh, I don't know about that. I felt really bad that she said those things and then I started doubting myself. I keep wondering if I am as selfish and inconsiderate as she says I am. I just don't know anymore. (Close to tears again)

Co-IF YOU CAN, LET'S TRY TO EXPLORE THAT FEELING A BIT, OK?

Cl-(Quietly) OK.
Co-I'd really like to understand what those feelings of self doubt are like for you. What do you feel and think at those times?

Cl-I guess I start wondering if I'm too blind to see my own faults. Maybe I am selfish. But on the other hand, I've never had this type of problem with friends at home. I'm getting really confused. I feel terrible about the situation on some days and at other times I'd just like to tell her off!!

Co-I'd feel that way, too!!! It seems like some days you're uncertain of yourself and then you feel bad, but on other days you find that you can get angry at your roommate.

Cl-Yeah—I guess I do get angry on some days. It usually doesn't last long, though. I mean—what's the use of getting angry? It doesn't change anything and sometimes it makes things worse. I do have to live with her for the rest of the year.

Co-Sounds like it's hard for you to be angry with her because you're just not that kind of person. Seems like it's also kind of scary for you to share that anger with your roommate. (Pause) What do you think of what I've just said?

Cl-Well it is really hard for me to be angry and not feel guilty about it. I mean, I always thought it was better to solve things by being calm and not getting angry. And besides that, I don't know what would happen if I really told my roommate how I feel.

Co-It would be a pretty big risk for you to share those feelings with your roommate. I can understand how it'd be scary for you to do it.

Cl-It really is—and I don't know if I could do it.

Co-Could I help you to do it?
Cl-I think so. (Pause) But, how do I tell her all this without making her hate me? It would be awful to have to live with someone who hated me.

Co-THAT WOULD BE REALLY BE HARD ON YOU. COULD YOU AND I COME UP WITH A PLAN TO DO IT WITHOUT ANTAGONIZING YOUR ROOMMATE TOO MUCH?

Cl-(Pauses) I think I'd have to wait for a time that I was feeling good about myself and when she and I were on pretty good terms. Then I could ask her to sit down to have a talk about all the trouble we've been having. (Pause) Maybe I could tell her that I'd really like to be friends and work things out between us. Then maybe I could share how I feel when we have arguments, both the hurt and the anger.

Co-DO YOU THINK YOU COULD TRY TELLING HER ABOUT HOW MUCH OF A RISK IT WAS FOR YOU TO EXPRESS THOSE FEELINGS TO HER?

Cl-I could do that. She might understand how difficult all this has been for me then.

Co-WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN IF YOU SHARED THOSE FEELINGS WITH HER?

Cl-I'm still scared about how she'll respond. She might get really angry or she might understand and then we could get things straightened out between us.

Co-YOU KNOW ANN, SHARING FEELINGS IS A REALLY SCARY THING TO DO. IT'S HARD FOR ME SOMETIMES JUST LIKE IT IS FOR YOU. I'M AFRAID I'LL GET HURT EVEN MORE. I CARE ALOT ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS TO YOU AND I REALLY HOPE YOU'RE ABLE TO WORK THINGS OUT WITH YOUR ROOMMATE.

Cl-Yeah, I think it will be a matter of how much I can take. Up until recently I just tried to ignore it all, but now I'm feeling so miserable that maybe it is time to do something about it. Things can't get a lot worse than they are now. Maybe I'll try it this week.
Script—Supportive Role

Co—WELL ANN, HOW HAVE THINGS GONE THIS WEEK?
Cl—Not too well. (Pause) My roommate and I had another argument yesterday. We just can't seem to get along. I'm beginning to hate going back to my room at night. I just don't know what to do anymore.

Co—IT SOUNDS LIKE THIS LAST ARGUMENT HAS REALLY GOTTEN YOU CONFUSED AND UPSET. CAN YOU TELL ME SOME MORE ABOUT IT?

Cl—Well, it started out to be a really small thing. I needed to do some studying and I asked her to please turn down the volume of the stereo for a while. She got really angry and started accusing me of always telling her what to do. She said it was her room, too. Then she said that she didn't know why she had to be the one to get stuck with me for a roommate. (Close to tears)

Co—SOUNDS LIKE THAT'S THE PART THAT REALLY UPSET YOU. HOW WERE YOU FEELING WHEN SHE TOLD YOU THOSE THINGS?

Cl—It hurt a lot. I don't think I'm such a horrible roommate. I really try to be nice to her. But, it just seems that sometimes I have to stand up for my rights, too!!

Co—SO MAYBE YOU WEREN'T ONLY HURT, BUT ALSO ANGRY THAT SHE DOESN'T RESPECT YOUR NEEDS?

Cl—Oh, I don't know about that. I felt really bad that she said those things and then I started doubting myself. I keep wondering if I am as selfish and inconsiderate as she says I am. I just don't know anymore. (Close to tears again)

Co—LET'S EXPLORE THAT FEELING A LITTLE BIT, OK?

Cl—(Quietly) OK.
WHAT'S IT LIKE TO DOUBT YOURSELF LIKE THAT? WHAT DO YOU FEEL LIKE AND THINK ABOUT AT THOSE TIMES?

Cl-I guess I start wondering if I'm too blind to see my own faults. Maybe I am selfish. But on the other hand, I've never had this type of problem with friends at home. I'm getting really confused. I feel terrible about the situation on some days and at other times I'd just like to tell her off!!!

So on some days you feel uncertain of yourself and wonder if you really are an inconsiderate person, and on other days, maybe when you feel better about yourself, you get kind of angry about the way your roommate gives you all the blame.

Cl--I guess I do get angry on some days. It usually doesn't last long, though. I mean--what's the use of getting angry? It doesn't change anything and it makes things worse sometimes. I do have to live with her for the rest of the year.

Co--You know, I think I hear you saying two different things about anger. First I hear you saying that you think anger is bad or immature and then I hear that it's also scary to share anger with someone that you have to live with for the rest of the year. (Pause) What do you think of what I've just said?

Cl--Well it is really hard for me to be angry and not feel guilty about it. I mean, I always thought it was better to solve things by being calm and not getting angry. And besides that, I don't know what would happen if I really told my roommate how I feel.

Co--It is pretty scary to share those feelings with someone you're in close contact with.
Cl—It really is—and I don't know if I could do it.

Co—WOULD YOU LIKE TO DO IT?

Cl—I think so. (Pause) But, how do I tell her all this without making her hate me? It would be awful to have to live with someone who hated me.

Co—THAT'S A BIG RISK TO TAKE. HOW DO YOU THINK YOU COULD DO IT WITHOUT ANTAGONIZING HER TOO MUCH?

Cl—(Pauses) I think I'd have to wait for a time that I was feeling good about myself and when she and I were on pretty good terms. Then I could ask her to sit down to have a talk about all the trouble we've been having. (Pause) Maybe I could tell her that I'd really like to be friends and work things out between us. Then maybe I could share how I feel when we have arguments, both the hurt and the anger.

Co—AND MAYBE YOU COULD TELL HER WHAT A RISK YOU TOOK IN EXPRESSING THOSE FEELINGS TO HER.

Cl—I could do that. She might understand how difficult all this has been for me then.

Co—WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN IF YOU SHARE THOSE FEELINGS WITH HER?

Cl—I'm still scared about how she'll respond. She might get really angry or she might understand and then we could get things straightened out between us.

Co—YOU KNOW ANN, SHARING FEELINGS IS A REALLY SCARY THING TO DO. IT'S HARD FOR ME SOMETIMES BECAUSE I'M AFRAID THAT I'LL GET HURT EVEN MORE. I THINK THIS MIGHT JUST COME DOWN TO HOW IMPORTANT IT IS FOR YOU TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT WHAT'S BEEN GOING ON BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR ROOMMATE.

Cl—Yeah, I think it will be a matter of how much I can take. Up until recently I just tried to ignore it all, but now I'm feeling so
miserable that maybe it is time to do something about it. Things can't get a lot worse than they are now. Maybe I'll try it this week.

Script—Very Confrontive Role

Co-HOW HAVE THINGS GONE, ANN?
Cl-Not too well. (Pause) My roommate and I had another argument yesterday. We just can't seem to get along. I'm beginning to hate going back to my room at night. I just don't know what to do anymore.
Co-TELL ME ABOUT THIS ARGUMENT. YOU SEEM TO BE MORE AGITATED THAN USUAL.
Cl-Well, it started out to be a really small thing. I needed to do some studying and I asked her to please turn down the volume on the stereo for a while. She got really angry and started accusing me of always telling her what to do. She said it was her room, too. Then she said that she didn't know why she had to be the one to get stuck with me for a roommate. (Close to tears)
Co-THAT LAST PART IS INTERESTING. I THINK YOU MAY HAVE HAD SOME FEELINGS AT THAT TIME. WHAT DO YOU THINK?
Cl-It hurt, a lot. I don't think I'm such a horrible roommate. I really try to be nice to her. But, it just seems that sometimes I have to stand up for my rights, too.
Co-SO, YOU WERE ANGRY THAT SHE DOESN'T RESPECT YOUR NEEDS.
Cl-Oh, I don't know about that. I felt really bad that she said those things and then I started doubting myself. I keep wondering if I am as selfish and inconsiderate as she says I am. I just don't know anymore. (Close to tears again)
Co-I WANT YOU TO TALK ABOUT THAT FEELING.

Cl-(Quietly) OK.

Co-YOU KNOW, I THINK YOU'RE REALLY FURIOUS AT YOUR ROOMMATE, BUT YOU'RE TOO CONSTRICTED TO LET YOURSELF GO. YOU TURN ANGER AT YOURSELF INSTEAD OF AT YOUR ROOMMATE WHERE YOU SHOULD BE DIRECTING IT.

Cl-I guess I start wondering if I'm too blind to see my own faults. Maybe I am selfish. But on the other hand, I've never had this type of problem with friends at home. I'm getting really confused. I feel terrible about the situation on some days and at other times I'd just like to tell her off!!!!

Co-SO YOU DO ADMIT TO GETTING ANGRY ON SOME DAYS. I THINK IT'S WHEN YOU FEEL GOOD ABOUT YOURSELF THAT YOU CAN DO IT. IT'S ONLY WHEN YOU DON'T BELIEVE IN YOURSELF THAT YOU FEEL SELF DOUBT.

Cl-Yeah---I guess I do get angry on some days. It usually doesn't last long, though. I mean---what's the use of getting angry? It doesn't change anything and sometimes it makes things worse. I do have to live with her for the rest of the year.

Co-ANGER ISN'T AS BAD OR IMMATURE AS YOU SEEM TO THINK IT IS, ANN. SURE IT'S SCARY TO SHOW ANGER, BUT IT WON'T DESTROY YOU. (PAUSE) DOES THIS MAKE SENSE TO YOU?

Cl-Well, it is really hard for me to be angry and not feel guilty about it. I mean, I always thought it was better to solve things by being calm and not getting angry. And besides that, I don't know what would happen if I really told my roommate how I feel.

Co-YOU'LL JUST HAVE TO TRY IT OUT AND SEE, WON'T YOU? WE ALL HAVE TO TAKE RISKS SOMETIMES IN OUR LIVES. IT'S SCARY.
Cl—It really is—and I don't know if I could do it.

Co—DO YOU WANT TO DO IT?

Cl—I think so. (Pause) But, how do I tell her all this without making her hate me? It would be awful to have to live with someone who hated me.

Co—IT'S A BIG RISK THAT ONLY YOU CAN TAKE. YOU HAVE TO TAKE CONTROL OF YOUR LIFE SOMETIME.

Cl—(Pauses) I think I'd have to wait for a time when I was feeling good about myself and when she and I were on pretty good terms. Then I could ask her to sit down to have a talk about all the trouble we've been having. (Pause) Maybe I could tell her that I'd really like to be friends and work things out between us. Then maybe I could share how I feel when we have arguments, both the hurt and the anger.

Co—YOU ALSO NEED TO TELL HER THAT THIS PROCESS WAS HARD FOR YOU TO FOLLOW THROUGH ON.

Cl—I could do that. She might understand how difficult all this has been for me then.

Co—TELL ME ABOUT YOUR FEARS AS TO WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN IF YOU HAVE THIS TALK WITH YOUR ROOMMATE.

Cl—I'm still scared about how she'll respond. She might get really angry or she might understand and then we could get things straightened out between us.

Co—ANN, YOU CAN'T KEEP RUNNING AWAY FROM RISKS FOREVER. YOU NEED TO START FACING UP TO THEM. YOU HAVE TO BE THE ONE TO DECIDE WHETHER THIS IS IMPORTANT ENOUGH FOR YOU TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT.
Cl—Yeah, I think it will be a matter of how much I can take. Up until recently I just tried to ignore it all, but now I'm feeling so miserable that maybe it is time to do something about it. Things can't get a lot worse than they are now. Maybe I'll try it this week.

Script—Confrontive Role

Co—HOW HAVE THINGS GONE THIS WEEK, ANN?

Cl—Not too well. (Pause) my roommate and I had another argument yesterday. We just can't seem to get along. I'm beginning to hate going back to my room at night. I just don't know what to do anymore.

Co—THIS LAST ARGUMENT HAS GOTTEN YOU MORE UPSET AND CONFUSED THAN USUAL. TELL ME MORE ABOUT IT.

Cl—Well, it started out to be a really small thing. I needed to do some studying and I asked her to please turn down the volume of the stereo for a while. She got really angry and started accusing me of always telling her what to do. She said it was her room, too. Then she said she didn't know why she had to be the one to get stuck with me for a roommate. (Close to tears)

Co—I THINK THAT LAST PART WAS WHAT REALLY HURT. AND THERE WERE PROBABLY SOME OTHER FEELINGS GOING ON WITH YOU, TOO. WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU WERE FEELING?

Cl—It hurt, a lot. I don't think I'm such a horrible roommate. I really try to be nice to her. But, it just seems that sometimes I have to stand up for my rights, too.

Co—SO, YOU WERE ANGRY THAT SHE DOESN'T RESPECT YOUR NEEDS.

Cl—Oh, I don't know about that. I felt really bad that she said those
things and then I started doubting myself. I keep wondering if I am as selfish and inconsiderate as she says I am. I just don't know anymore. (Close to tears again)

Co-I WANT YOU TO TALK ABOUT THAT FEELING, OK?

Cl-(Quietly) OK.

Co-ANN, I THINK THAT THERE WAS SOME ANGER GOING ON WITHIN YOU, BUT THAT YOU JUST DON'T ALLOW YOURSELF TO RECOGNIZE IT. I THINK MAYBE YOU TURN IT INWARD AND THEN START DOUBTING YOURSELF, INSTEAD OF DIRECTING THE ANGER AT HER.

Cl-I guess I start wondering if I'm too blind to see my own faults. Maybe I am selfish. But on the other hand, I've never had this type of problem with friends at home. I'm getting really confused. I feel terrible about the situation on some days and at other times I'd just like to tell her off!!!!

Co-SO YOU'RE TELLING ME NOW THAT IT'S ONLY ON SOME DAYS THAT YOU FEEL UNCERTAIN AND WONDER ABOUT YOURSELF. THE OTHER DAYS WHEN YOU'RE FEELING GOOD ABOUT YOURSELF, YOU DO GET ANGRY WITH YOUR ROOMMATE FOR THE WAY SHE GIVES YOU ALL THE BLAME.

Cl-Yeah---I guess I do get angry on some days. It usually doesn't last long, though. I mean---what's the use of getting angry? It doesn't change anything and it makes things worse sometimes. I do have to live with her for the rest of the year.

Co-ANN, YOU'RE LABELING ANGER AS BAD AND IMMATURE AND AT THE SAME TIME YOU'RE REALLY FRIGHTENED OF IT. AFTER ALL, IT IS SCARY TO SHARE ANGER WITH SOMEONE YOU HAVE TO LIVE WITH FOR THE REST OF THE YEAR. (PAUSE) WHAT DO YOU THINK OF WHAT I'VE SAID?
Cl—Well, it is really hard for me to be angry and not feel guilty about it. I mean, I always thought it was better to solve things by being calm and not getting angry. And besides that, I don't know what would happen if I really told my roommate how I feel.

Co—EVERYONE HAS TO TAKE THOSE KINDS OF RISKS. IT’S SCARY, ISN'T IT?

Cl—It really is—and I don't know if I could do it.

Co—DO YOU WANT TO DO IT?

Cl—I think so. (Pause) But, how do I tell her all this without making her hate me? It would be awful to have to live with someone who hated me.

Co—THAT IS A BIG RISK, BUT YOU HAVE TO DECIDE WHAT TO DO. I CAN'T TELL YOU HOW TO DO IT.

Cl—(Pauses) I think I'd have to wait for a time when I was feeling good about myself and when she and I were on pretty good terms. Then I could ask her to sit down to have a talk about all the trouble we've been having. (Pause) Maybe I could tell her that I'd really like to be friends and work things out between us. Then maybe I could share how I feel when we have arguments, both the hurt and the anger.

Co—I THINK IT'D ALSO BE A GOOD IDEA TO SHARE THE DIFFICULTY YOU'VE HAD TRYING TO TELL HER THOSE FEELINGS.

Cl—I could do that. She might understand how difficult all this has been for me then.

Co—TELL ME WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN IF YOU SHARE THESE THINGS WITH YOUR ROOMMATE.

Cl—I'm still scared about how she'll respond. She might get really angry or she might understand and then we could get things straightened
out between us.

Co-THAT'S A RISK YOU'VE GOT TO BEGIN TAKING IF YOU WANT TO BE HONEST IN YOUR RELATIONSHIPS. YOU HAVE TO DECIDE HOW IMPORTANT ALL THIS IS FOR YOU AND WHETHER YOU WANT TO ACT.

Cl-Yeah, I think it will just be a matter of how much I can take. Up until recently I just tried to ignore it all, but now I'm feeling so miserable that maybe it is time to do something about it. Things can't get a lot worse than they are now. Maybe I'll try it this week.
Appendix B

Judges' Rating Form and Instructions

Dear Rater,

This packet contains eight rating forms for you to fill out, one for each taped segment you will listen to. There are four roles on each side of the accompanying cassette, with a period of blank space between each of the roles. In each of the roles please listen for the content and tone of the counselor and rate him or her on the ten items of the scale. The set of roles on each side are the same except for the sex of the counselor. If you note any great discrepancies between the two counselors, please feel free to comment on the back of this sheet, it will be appreciated!!!

If you have any questions my home phone number is 291-2704 and a message can be left for me at 422-0494.

Thank you very much,
In this questionnaire you will be shown a number of personality characteristics. I would like you to use these characteristics to describe the counselor you just heard on the tape. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 7, how well each of these characteristics describes the counselor.

For each characteristic:

Circle 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF THE COUNSELOR

Circle 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE OF THE COUNSELOR

Circle 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE OF THE COUNSELOR

Circle 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE OF THE COUNSELOR

Circle 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE OF THE COUNSELOR

Circle 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE OF THE COUNSELOR

Circle 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF THE COUNSELOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Never or Almost Never True</th>
<th>Usually Not True</th>
<th>Sometimes but Infrequently True</th>
<th>Occasionally True</th>
<th>Often True</th>
<th>Usually True</th>
<th>Always or Almost Always True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

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, please place a check mark as follows:


OR


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


OR


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


OR


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:


Your first impression is the best answer.

PLEASE NOTE: PLACE CHECK MARKS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SPACES.
<p>| agreeable | disagreeable |
| unalert | alert |
| analytic | diffuse |
| unappreciative | appreciative |
| attractive | unattractive |
| casual | formal |
| cheerful | depressed |
| vague | clear |
| distant | close |
| compatible | incompatible |
| unsure | confident |
| suspicious | believable |
| undependable | dependable |
| indifferent | enthusiastic |
| inexperienced | experienced |
| inexpert | expert |
| unfriendly | friendly |
| honest | dishonest |
| informed | ignorant |
| insightful | insightless |
| stupid | intelligent |
| unlikeable | likeable |
| logical | illogical |
| open | closed |
| prepared | unprepared |
| unreliable | reliable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>opposite adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
Appendix D

SELF DESCRIPTION FORM

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the correct mark on the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The husband should be regarded as the legal representative of the family group in all matters of law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A wife's activities in the community should complement her husband's position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A woman should have exactly the same freedom of action as a man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The best thing a mother can teach her daughter is what it means to be a girl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A married woman should feel free to have men as friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Woman's work and man's work should not be fundamentally different in nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Swearing by a woman is no more objectionable than swearing by a man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A woman is not truly fulfilled until she has been a mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When a man and a woman live together, she should do the housework and he should do the heavier chores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A normal man should be wary of a woman who takes the initiative in courtship even though he may be very attracted to her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. It is an outdated custom for a woman to take her husband's name when she marries.  
12. Women should be paid a salary by the state for the work they perform as mothers and homemakers.  
13. Women should be much less concerned about makeup, clothing and body care.  
14. Every child should be taught from an early age to feel a special honor and respect for Motherhood.  
15. A woman should be appreciative of the glances and looks she receives as she walks down the street.  
16. It should be perfectly alright for a mature woman to get involved with a young man.  
17. Marriage should not interfere with a woman's career any more than it does with a man's.  
18. A man's main responsibility to his children is to provide them with the necessities of life and discipline.  
19. A woman should be careful how she looks, for it influences what people think of her husband.  
20. A woman who dislikes her children is abnormal.  
21. Homosexual relationships should be socially accepted as heterosexual relationships are.  
22. More day care centers should be available to free mothers from constantly caring for their children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Women should be allowed the same sexual freedom as men.</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. A man's job is too important for him to get bogged down with household chores.</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. A woman should be no more concerned about her physical appearance on the job than a man.</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Abortion should be permitted at the woman's request.</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The first duty of a woman with young children is to home and family.</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. For the good of the family, a wife should have sexual relations with her husband whether she wants to or not.</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. A woman should be more concerned with helping her husband's career than having a career herself.</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Women should not expect men to offer them seats on buses.</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Circle the correct information for each of these questions:

Sex: M F

My experience in counseling has been:

none 1-3 sessions 4-7 sessions more than 7

If you have seen a counselor before, please indicate where your experience took place:

high school OSU private counselor hospital

other __________________

never saw a counselor
Appendix F

Table 8

Means, Medians and Ranges for Subjects' SRIS Feminism Scores as a Function of Subject Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Feminism Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Range=74 to 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean=121.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median=122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Range=81 to 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean=132.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median=131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Feminism scores may range from 30 to 210 on the SRIS.