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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For years people within and outside the profession of psychology have asserted that counseling is and must be a value free process. Some (e.g. Beutler, 1981) have suggested that counseling is not a value free process and others have asserted that counselors have an obligation to self-disclose value information to their clients before the counseling process begins (APA, 1981; Hare-Mustin, Marecek, Kaplan & Liss-Levinson, 1979; Rawlings & Carter, 1977). Feminist writers have been among the most vocal in calling for counselor value self-disclosure (Gilbert, 1980; Rawlings & Carter, 1977). Within the last decade, a number of studies have explored the nature of client reactions to counselor self-disclosure of feminist or Christian values.

Studies of pretherapy self-disclosure of feminist values have used two types of paradigms. One group, used written forms of implicit and explicit counselor (traditional or feminist) self-disclosure statements. These studies assessed client responses to counselors in terms of willingness to see the counselor, degree of confidence in helpfulness on a variety of problems, and the effect
of value similarity on perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Davis & Lesmeister, 1983; Lewis, Epperson & Foley, 1985; Schneider, 1985).

The other group of feminist studies used audiotape (Fygetakis, 1982) or videotape counseling stimuli (Enns & Hackett, 1990) with explicit or implicit counselor value statements. The effects were assessed in terms of willingness to see the counselor, perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness, perceived similarity to the counselor, and degree of confidence in the counselor on a variety of problems.

Some studies have examined counselor self-disclosure of Christian values. Two studies within this area explored the effect of pretherapy value self-disclosure on subjects' willingness to see a Christian counselor. Lewis and Lewis (1985) examined the effect of implicit and explicit pretherapy self-disclosure of Christian values on clients' perceptions of counselor expertness, trustworthiness, attractiveness and their willingness to see the counselor. Chock (1984) used different approaches to Christian counseling in his exploration of subjects' willingness to see a Christian counselor or a secular counselor.

Two studies did not directly examine the effects of self-disclosure of Christian values on subjects' willingness to see the counselor but are related. Pecnik & Epperson (1985) explored whether subjects' expectations of a traditional or Christian counselor would be different. Lewis & Walsh (1980) used an
implicit/explicit paradigm to explore the effect of value influence attempts within counseling on subjects' confidence in the counselor and perceptions of the counselor's expertness, trustworthiness and attractiveness.

The results of these studies were contradictory. Some reported that explicit feminist or Christian value statements had negative effects on clients' willingness to see the counselor and degree of confidence in the counselor (Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, et. al., 1983; Lewis & Lewis, 1985; Schneider, 1985). Other studies reported that value statements had a positive effect on clients' perceptions of counselor attractiveness and trustworthiness, willingness to see the counselor, and/or confidence in the ability to help (Chock, 1984; Enns & Hackett, 1990; Fygetakis, 1982).

Although the preceding studies employed a similar paradigm and some of the same dependent measures, they used different types of value statements (feminist or Christian) and methods of value self-disclosure (written or audio/video tape). Given the different results that have been reported across these studies, an exploration of the effect of these variables within one study is needed.

The current study is an exploration of the effect of pretherapy value self-disclosure. This study departs from existing research by combining variables into one study that previously have not been examined together. Specifically, two value laden approaches
to counseling (feminist and Christian) as well as a more value neutral approach to counseling (humanistic) will be examined using both written and audiotaped presentation formats. Dependent variables of interest are subjects' degree of confidence in the counselor's ability to help, perceived counselor attractiveness, trustworthiness, expertness, and preference for a counselor.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

A review of the literature in the area of values in counseling, indicates that little research exists on the effect of counselor pretherapy value self-disclosure on clients' responses to counselors. This is somewhat surprising given calls for counselor value self-disclosure (APA, 1981; Hare-Mustin, et. al., 1979; Rawlings & Carter, 1977).

The existing literature on counselor pretherapy value self-disclosure is divided into three groups for this review. Studies that examine feminist value self-disclosure using written value statements are reviewed first. Second, studies that examine feminist value self-disclosure using audio or video taped stimulus are summarized. Finally, the studies that examine Christian value self-disclosure are reviewed.

**Feminist Written Value Statements**

A series of four studies have been conducted by Lewis and her colleagues (Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Davis & Lesmeister, 1983; Lewis, Epperson & Folley, 1989) and Schneider (1985) exploring the effects of feminist pretherapy value self-disclosure
on a variety of dependent measures. Each of these studies employs a similar paradigm involving the presentation of value information using an implicit or explicit written statement and measuring subjects' attitudes toward women or feminism as well as dependent measures assessing subjects' confidence in or willingness to see the counselors.

In the first of these studies, Lewis, Davis and Lesmeister (1983) explored the effect of three types of pretherapy value information on female subjects' confidence in therapists' helpfulness, willingness to see the therapist, and judgments of subject-therapist value similarity. The written pretherapy value statements differed in amount of information provided and the value orientation of the therapist. In the traditional condition, subjects received a copy of a standard telephone book advertisement for a licensed psychologist in private practice. In the feminist label condition, the subjects received the same telephone advertisement with the addition of the word, feminist counselor. In the last condition, explicit feminist, a listing of feminist values taken from the summary of feminist values written by Rawlings and Carter (1977) was attached to the advertisement.

The experimental manipulation involved the presentation of one of the three forms of pretherapy information to a group of subjects. Subjects first responded to two items included to assess the success of the experimental manipulation. Then each
subject completed an instrument that measured her degree of confidence in the therapist's helpfulness on 18 personal problems, her general willingness to see the therapist, and similarity to the therapist on a variety of values. Subjects' degree of feminist orientation was measured using a shortened version of the Attitudes Towards Women Scale (AWS) and only profeminist subjects were included in the analysis. This resulted in the use of thirty six undergraduate women as subjects in the study.

Reported results indicated that subjects accurately assessed the experimental manipulation. Significant univariate effects for counselor were obtained on 6 of 18 presenting concerns. On four of these (anxiety, conflicts with parents, insomnia, and marriage difficulties) the traditional and feminist label counselor received similar mean confidence scores and both were higher than mean confidence scores for the explicit feminist counselor. For the remaining two items (career choice and difficulty making friends) the explicit feminist and feminist label counselors received higher mean confidence scores than the traditional counselor. Overall, subjects had the most confidence in the feminist label counselor's ability to help; subjects were least willing to see the counselor in the explicit feminist condition; and, subjects saw themselves as more similar to the feminist label therapist.

The authors concluded that amount of pretherapy information affected subjects' perceptions of similarity to therapist values, degree of confidence in the therapist's ability to help, and general
willingness to see the counselor. Further, the authors suggested that explicit presentation of feminist counselor values may violate a counselor neutrality assumption held by clients. Therefore despite clients' high scores on a measure of attitudes about women, they were not willing to see the explicit feminist counselor. The authors suggest, however that the AWS may not measure the more radical feminist values listed in the Rawlings and Carter description but rather a more general nonsexist attitude toward women.

Schneider (1985) replicated and expanded the Lewis, Davis and Lesmeister (1983) study. He included an explicit traditional condition to control for length of information. He also included both male (N = 52) and female (N = 52) subjects and used subjects' score on the Attitudes Towards Women Scale (AWS) and Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Help Scale (ATSPH) as covariates in the analysis of the dependent measures.

A similar paradigm was utilized including four experimental conditions: traditional, explicit traditional, feminist, and explicit feminist. The dependent measures for this study were the Counselor Rating Form - Short (CRF-S), a measure of the subjects' confidence in the therapist on 20 specific personal problems, and single item measures of the likelihood of recommending a friend and the general degree of helpfulness of the described therapist.

Schneider's results indicated that women viewed the feminist therapist as less trustworthy. Subjects' perceptions of counselor
expertness and attractiveness were not affected by gender, length, or value position. Only 3 of the 20 problems showed differences across therapists. Subjects, both male and female, reported the greatest amount of confidence in the explicit feminist counselor for career concerns and the least confidence in the explicit feminist for parental and marital concerns. Lastly, subjects indicated less general optimism about benefiting from the explicit feminist counselor.

Schneider suggested that his results confirmed results from the early study. Specifically, though subjects indicated a greater willingness to see an explicit feminist counselor for career concerns, they indicated less confidence in an explicit feminist counselor's ability to help on a variety of other concerns and less general optimism in the explicit feminist counselor's ability to help. He again suggested that detailed self-disclosure of feminist values may decrease client's willingness to see the counselor.

In still another study, Epperson and Lewis (1987) used the same paradigm but attempted to correct some earlier methodological flaws by making three modifications. First, they developed narrative descriptions of the traditional and feminist counselors instead of the listing of values that had been used in the preceding two studies and validated the feminist narrative using 23 raters who were familiar with feminist therapy. Second, they sought to make the traditional and feminist narrative more similar in form though substantially different in content. Third,
they used the Attitudes Toward Feminism Scale (ATFS) which is suggested to be a more accurate measure of attitudes about feminism than the Attitudes Towards Women Scale.

Again, the experimental design involved the presentation of one of the four counselor descriptions (traditional, feminist, explicit traditional, and explicit feminist) followed by the completion of dependent measures. Two dependent measures were used in this study. The first, an instrument labeled the Counselor Preference Questionnaire (CPQ) was similar to that used by Lewis, et. al. (1983) and measured subjects likelihood of choosing the described counselor on 12 different presenting concerns. The second, an instrument labeled the Impressions of Counselor Questionnaire (ICQ) and was designed to assess subjects' attention to the experimental manipulation. This instrument contained 16 items. Four of the items were similar to those used in previous research assessing subjects willingness to refer a friend, subject-counselor value similarity, and the likelihood of the counselor trying to influence the subject's thoughts, values or beliefs. Two items assessed attention to the experimental manipulations. The remaining 10 items were taken from the feminist and traditional descriptions. These items were included because they increased the information available in two ways. First, they allowed for an assessment of subjects' attention to the narrative descriptions of the counselors. Secondly, they provided
information concerning the assumptions about a counselor made by subjects who received an announcement with only a label.

A total of 365 men and women undergraduate students completed the questionnaires. However, only 232 subjects (128 women and 103 men) were included in the analysis. These subjects were selected on the basis of their scores on the ATFS. Subjects scoring in the lower third on the ATFS were labeled non-feminist and subjects scoring in the upper third were labeled feminist. Subjects in the middle third (N = 133) were not included. Analyses were conducted separately for men and women and the results were presented in two parts.

First, the results indicated that explicit pretherapy information enabled subjects to form a more complete picture of the feminist counselor. In other words, subjects in the nonexplicit conditions rated their counselors significantly different on the ICQ than subjects in the explicit conditions. Second, for female subjects on 8 of 12 presenting concerns, counselor orientation by explicitness of information univariate interaction effects occurred. The described traditional counselor was preferred for presenting concerns dealing with drug or alcohol abuse and depression with the other three counselors being relatively equally preferred. The described feminist was least preferred with all others being equally preferred for conflicts with parents, marital or relationship concerns, anxiety, academic issues, homosexuality, and unwanted pregnancy. For male subjects only three univariate
interaction effects were found (depression, conflict with parents, marital or relationship). The results were the same as for female subjects. Subjects' feminist orientation did not affect scores on the CPQ.

The authors concluded that in the feminist condition, explicit value information decreased subjects' willingness to see the counselor. Given that explicitness of information did not affect subjects' willingness to see the counselor in the traditional conditions, the authors again suggest that the mere presentation of controversial values may violate assumptions about how a counselor should be.

In the last study using this paradigm, Lewis, Epperson and Foley (1989) used a design identical to the Epperson and Lewis (1987) study only with non-university subjects who were women from a University Psychiatric Hospital and Outpatient clinic. The design involved four experimental conditions created by two counselor value orientations crossed with explicit or implicit value statements. The Impressions of Counselor Items questionnaire and the Counselor Preference Items questionnaire were identical to those used in the Epperson and Lewis (1987) study. In addition, the ATFS was used to measure subjects' feminist orientation and a median split determined feminist and non-feminist groups. One hundred and seventy two women who sought treatment at the hospital clinic participated in this study.
Reported results again indicated that explicitness of information allowed subjects to more accurately identify the core values of the counselor's value orientation especially for the feminist counselors. Contrary to previous studies, an explicitness of value information by counselor orientation interaction effect was not found. However a significant main effect for counselor orientation was obtained on 6 of 12 presenting concerns (anxiety, drug/alcohol, depression, eating disorder, conflicts with parents, and marital or relationship problems) with the traditional counselors being preferred to the feminist counselors. Despite the lack of significance for the interaction effect, the authors examined the mean preference scores for explicitness of information by counselor orientation and suggested a general lack of preference for the explicit feminist therapist. The authors suggested that given the similarity of these results with earlier studies, existing research on pretherapy value self-disclosure done with college age students using an analog design may be generalizable to a client population.

Taken together, these studies do not show support for explicit self-disclosure of feminist values. Subjects reported the most confidence in the explicit feminist counselor for career concerns (Lewis, Davis & Lesmeister, 1983; Schneider, 1985). However, subjects were least willing to see the feminist counselor from whom they received explicit value information on many other concerns and had the least overall confidence or optimism in the
explicit feminist counselor (Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Davis & Lemeister, 1983; Lewis, Epperson & Foley, 1989; Schneider, 1985).

**Feminist Audio/Videotape Studies**

The second group of studies involved the use of audiotaped or videotaped counseling interactions as stimuli for the presentation of feminist and traditional values (Enns & Hackett, 1990; Fygetakis, 1982). These studies differ from the earlier studies in the mode of information delivery.

Fygetakis (1982), using an analogue design with audiotapes, explored the effect of counselor gender and approach to counseling on clients' expectations of helpfulness and willingness to see the counselor. Four experimental conditions were presented. The conditions were created by crossing gender with either a traditional or feminist approach to counseling. In the traditional conditions the counselor shared general information about himself or herself that was consistent with sex role stereotyped activities followed by an explanation of eclectic counseling. In the feminist conditions, the counselor shared information that was consistent with egalitarian, nonsex-role stereotyped behavior and information about feminist counseling.

One hundred and twenty undergraduate women filled out the CRF, the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) and an instrument assessing willingness to see the counselor on nine specific problems. For the analyses, these nine problems were grouped into
obviously women related problems, subtly women related problems and non-women related problems. Fygetakis reported that both male and female feminist counselors were perceived to be significantly more attractive and trustworthy than the traditional counselors. They were perceived to possess significantly greater ability to help with both obviously related women's problems and non-women related problems. Finally, subjects demonstrated significantly greater willingness to be counseled by the feminist than the traditional counselors.

In a recent study, Enns and Hackett (1990) hypothesized that the differences in the results from the study conducted by Fygetakis (1982) and the series of studies conducted by Lewis and colleagues (Epperson & Lewis, 1985; Lewis, Davis & Lesmeister, 1983; Lewis, Epperson & Foley, 1989) and Schneider (1985) might be connected to the sources used to define feminist counseling. Consequently, they used two forms of feminist counseling and a nonsexist humanistic counselor in their study.

Videotaped counseling vignettes were created to explore feminist and nonfeminist client reactions to three counselors who differed on value orientation and explicitness of the value self-disclosure. The videotapes presented either a liberal feminist, radical feminist or nonsexist-humanistic counselor. The radical feminist therapist was modelled after the feminist therapist described by Rawlings and Carter (1977) and used by Epperson and Lewis (1987). The liberal feminist therapist was based on
Rawlings and Carter’s (1977) guidelines for nonsexist therapy. A general humanistic approach was used for their nonsexist counselor.

Three 10 minute videotapes were created. Each videotape depicted one of the three counseling approaches using a simulated counselor client interaction. Three additional videotapes were created identical to the three just described with the inclusion of a two-minute leader that explicitly stated the counselor's value orientation. The scripts and videotapes underwent a series of manipulation checks by expert and naive raters to ensure that differences between the tapes did not exist except for the experimental manipulation.

One hundred and fifty undergraduate women subjects completed six questionnaires. The first two questionnaires were used as manipulation checks and assessed the subject's similarity to the counselor. The remaining four questionnaires assessed subjects' degree of feminism, perceptions of attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertness (CRF-S), willingness to see the counselor (CPQ), and perceptions of the counselor. For the purpose of data analysis, the authors conducted a factor analysis of CPQ items. The results of their factor analysis yielded three factors: personal-interpersonal, career, and sexual assault/harassment.

Both the liberal and radical feminist therapist were perceived as more expert and trustworthy than the nonsexist humanistic therapist. All subjects were more willing to see the feminist
counselors for career and sexual-assault/harassment concerns. Feminist subjects were more willing than nonfeminist subjects to seek counseling for personal-interpersonal and sexual assault-harrassment concerns. Lastly, the liberal and radical feminist counselors were viewed as significantly more helpful than the nonsexist humanistic counselor.

These two studies lend support to feminist approaches to counseling. In one study, feminist counselors were viewed as more attractive and trustworthy (Fygetakis, 1982) than the traditional counselor. In the other study, radical and liberal feminist counselors were viewed as more expert and trustworthy than the nonsexist humanistic counselor. Likewise, subjects were more willing to see the feminist counselor for obviously women related problems and non-women related problems (Fygetakis, 1982) and career and sexual assault/harassment concerns (Enns & Hackett, 1990).

Enns and Hackett (1990) reported surprise over the failure to obtain differences, as hypothesized, between the radical and liberal feminist counselors. Based on their results, they suggest that differences in mode of delivery might account for conflicting results between the four studies conducted using written stimulus materials (Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Davis & Lesmeister, 1983; Lewis, Epperson, & Foley, 1989; Schneider, 1985) and the two studies using audio or written materials (Enns & Hackett, 1990; Fygetakis, 1982).
Christian Value Statements

The third area of research that was reviewed for the current study concerned the use of Christian value statements in counseling. Four articles were identified within this area (Chock, 1984; Lewis & Lewis, 1980; Lewis & Walsh, 1985; Pecnik & Epperson, 1985). Two studies (Chock, 1984; Lewis & Walsh, 1985) explored the effect of a counselor's Christian value orientation on a variety of dependent measures and are reviewed first. The remaining two studies (Lewis & Lewis, 1980; Pecnick & Epperson, 1985) did not directly involve pre-therapy self-disclosure of a Christian counseling orientation. They used pre-therapy value self-disclosure and asked similar questions to the current study and therefore have been included.

Lewis and Lewis (1985) explored the effect of pretherapy value information, in-session counselor influence attempts, and counselor-client value similarity on subjects' ability to identify a counselor's value position, ability to recognize presence and direction of counselor influence, perceptions of the counselor, willingness to see the counselor, and tendency to be persuaded by the counselor's influence. Three independent variables were utilized: influence or no influence, presence or absence of counselor value statement, and client's attitude for or against premarital sex. Two audiotapes were used in this study, again with a female counselor and client. In the influence audiotape, the counselor attempted to dissuade the client from engaging in
premarital sex four different times during the interaction. In the no influence audiotape, neutral, reflective statements were used in place of the influence attempts.

Before hearing the audiotapes, the subjects received one of two kinds of background information regarding the counselor in the tape. In the minimal information condition, subjects received information about the counselor's experience, work history and reputation. In the value information condition, the subjects received this information plus a paragraph that described the counselor as a Christian who holds a set of beliefs based on the Bible and its moral code. An explicit statement against premarital sex was not presented. Crossing the two levels of both variables resulted in four experimental conditions. Clients' attitudes for or against premarital sex were assessed using a single question.

Ninety-six women subjects completed the CRF and a variation of the Counselor Response Questionnaire used in the Lewis and Walsh (1980) study. Here the CRQ was a 20 item instrument with 8 scored items assessing therapists position on premarital sex, ability to recognize counselor's influence attempts, willingness to see the counselor, and value similarity to the counselor.

Reported results indicated that subjects in the minimal information condition were more willing to see the counselor for a personal problem. Subjects who received pretherapy information, (those in the value information condition) were found to have somewhat negative perceptions of the counselor. Those in the
explicit value information condition also were more able to correctly identify a counselor's values. Similarity between counselor and client values failed to significantly affect the dependent variables. Subjects attributed a value of "against premarital sex" to the counselor in the value information condition even though no explicit statement was made.

In the other study directly addressing the question of Christian values in counseling, Chock (1984) used two different approaches to Christian counseling (nouthetic and integrative) in his study comparing Christian counseling with secular counseling. Nouthetic Christian counseling separates Christianity and psychology relying on Christianity and the bible for direction in counseling. Integrative Christian counseling synthesizes Christianity and psychology drawing from each for guidance in the counseling process. Chock created three videotapes from scripts that described the particular approach to counseling. The scripts were created to control for length, types of issues explained, and overall tone. The three counseling approaches were presented in random order to a total of 48 student volunteers from a small, methodist college.

The author used a background questionnaire, the Counselor Rating Form - Short (CRF-S), an Expected Counseling Outcome questionnaire, and a measure assessing subjects' willingness to return for a second interview and recommend the counselor to a friend. The Expected Counseling Outcome questionnaire was
designed to measure subjects' degree of confidence in the counselor's effectiveness on a variety of problems and was adopted from the questionnaire used by Lewis and Walsh (1980). The problems presented on this instrument could be broken into "spiritual" and "nonspiritual" groupings.

Chock reported several results that are relevent for the current study. First, subjects' perceptions of counselor expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness did not differ among the three counseling approaches. Second, subjects preferred the Christian approaches to the secular approach for spiritual concerns and the secular approach for nonspiritual concerns. Lastly, followup analysis indicated that differences existed between the integrative and nouthetic Christian approaches. Specifically, the integrative approach was preferred over the nouthetic approach for spiritual problems and received comparable ratings as the secular approach on some nonspiritual problems.

Lewis and Walsh (1980) explored the effects of counselor in-session value statements regarding premarital sex on subjects' perceptions of and confidence in the counselor. Five audiotapes were prepared for use in the study, one control and four experimental tapes. The four experimental tapes were created by crossing an explicit or implicit value communication with a pro or con counselor position on premarital sex. The implicit value conditions consisted of the counselor making a statement near the
end of the tape intended to influence the client for or against premarital sex. The explicit conditions contained the same influence attempt and had a statement by the therapist explicitly stating her (a female counselor and client were used) values for or against premarital sex. The control tape contained neither the influence attempt nor the value statement.

One hundred and fifty undergraduate women (30 in each of 4 experimental groups and the control group) served as subjects for the study. Subjects were divided into two subgroups based on their answers to a single question assessing their view of premarital sex. Subjects completed the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) and an instrument assessing the subject's degree of confidence in the counselor's effectiveness on 15 commonly presented personal problems. The subjects also completed a 26 item questionnaire titled the Counselor Reaction Questionnaire (CRQ) used as a manipulation check. Embedded within the CRQ were seven manipulation check items. These items were used to measure the subject's awareness of the counselor's influence attempts, perceptions of value similarity with the counselor, awareness of the explicit and implicit communication, and the counselor's views on premarital sex.

Reported results indicated that style of value communication (explicit or implicit) had no effect on subjects' perceptions of the counselor on the CRF or confidence in the counselor's effectiveness across problems. Results also indicated that subjects were more
willing to see a counselor with values similar to their own. It is not clear how subjects' willingness to see the counselor was assessed. The authors interpreted these results as suggesting that explicit value statements by counselors might not have a negative affect on clients' perceptions of counselor attractiveness, trustworthiness, or expertness.

Pecnik and Epperson's (1985) study focused on subjects' expectations of a Christian versus traditional counselor. The study employed two written descriptions of counselors which differed only in that one identified the counselor as a Christian and one did not. Subjects' gender and religious orientation were used as blocking variables creating a three way factorial design. Subjects' religious orientation was measured using the Shepards Scale.

Only the results relevent for the current study are reported here. The traditional counselor was expected to be more expert and effective than the Christian counselor. The authors did not find a subject's religious orientation by counselor religious orientation interaction effect. However, they found some differences on the expectancy measure accounted for by subjects' religious orientation.

Together these studies again offer conflicting results. In two of the studies, one using written statements (Pecnik & Epperson, 1985) and one using audiotapes (Lewis & Lewis, 1985), differences between Christian and traditional counselors were found. Pecnik
& Epperson (1985) reported that subjects expected the Christian counselor to be less expert and effective than the traditional counselor. Lewis & Lewis (1985) reported that subjects who received Christian value information had somewhat negative perceptions of the counselor.

In the other two studies, one using audiotapes and one using videotapes, results indicated that explicit value statements and Christian value statements did not have an effect on relevant dependent measures. Lewis and Walsh (1980) reported that explicit in-session value statements did not affect subjects' perceptions of counselor attractiveness, expertness, trustworthiness or confidence in the counselor's effectiveness. Further, Chock (1984) reported that subjects' perceptions of counselor attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertness did not differ across two Christian approaches to counseling and a secular approach to counseling; and, subjects were more willing to see a Christian counselor for spiritual problems and equally as likely to see one of the Christian counselors for some nonspiritual problems as the traditional counselor.

Summary

The studies that have been reviewed used a similar paradigm and similar dependent measures. The design of each study involved the description to subjects of a variety of counseling approaches using either written or audio/videotaped stimuli followed by an assessment of subjects' reactions to the counseling approaches on
a number of dependent measures. The dependent measures of interest were subjects' general willingness to see the counselor; confidence in the counselor's ability to help on a variety of presenting concerns; and, perceptions of the counselor's attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness.

The studies differed in ways that limit comparability of results across the various studies. Most significantly, the studies differed on the value orientation used (feminist or Christian) and the method of communicating the counselor's value (written or audio/videotape). In reviewing the studies collectively, it seems that the conflicting results may be grouped according to differences in method of presenting the counseling approach: written or audio/videotape.

In studies that used written self-disclosure statements, explicit Feminist or Christian value information decreased subjects' willingness to see the counselor, confidence in the counselor's ability to help, general optimism about benefitting from the counselor, and expectations for expertness and effectiveness of the counselor (Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Davis & Lesmeister, 1983; Lewis, Epperson, & Foley, 1989; Pecnik & Epperson, 1985; Schneider, 1985). The authors of some of these studies suggest that the explicit presentation of values by a counselor violates a neutrality expectation that clients have and therefore has negative consequences.
In studies that used audio/videotape stimuli, the authors reported that explicit pretherapy self-disclosure did not affect or in some instances increased subjects' willingness to see the counselor for specific concerns, subjects' perceptions of expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness, or subjects' general ratings of counselors' overall ability to help (Chock, 1984; Enns & Hackett, 1990; Fygetakis, 1982; Lewis & Walsh, 1980). These authors suggest that presentation of explicit value information is not detrimental and that other factors must account for the differences in the existing research. One such factor might be method of presentation.

The current study expands on these prior studies in four ways. First, both written and audiotaped communications will be used. Second, three approaches to counseling will be examined of which two (feminist and Christian) are value laden approaches and one (humanistic) is a more value neutral approach. Third, both feminist orientation and religious orientation will be measured and used as blocking variables within the study. Last, subjects will be asked to respond to each of the three counselors on all dependent measures in a repeated measures format. This will allow for an assessment of each subject's preference for one of the three counselors on each of the presenting concerns. This will be compared to subjects' mean confidence scores on the presenting concerns. This study will use a design and dependent measures
similar to prior research to increase the comparability with those studies.

**Hypotheses**

Five hypotheses are being examined in this study:

1. Subjects in the audiotaped condition will perceive their counselors as being more attractive, expert and trustworthy than will subjects in the written condition.

2. Within the written and audiotaped conditions, subjects will perceive the counselors as being equally as attractive, expert, and trustworthy.

3. Subjects will have more confidence in humanistic counselor's ability to help than the Feminist and Christian counselors' ability to help in the written condition. In the audiotape condition subjects will have more confidence the Feminist or Christian counselors' ability to help than the humanistic counselor's ability to help.

4. Subjects will have equal levels of confidence in the Feminist counselor's ability to help and the Christian counselor's ability to help within both conditions.

5. When asked to make a forced choice between all three counselors, subjects will prefer to see the counselor who received the highest mean confidence score on each of the presenting concerns.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

The current study was a four way repeated measures study. The three crossed factors were: condition (audiotaped or written), feminist group orientation (feminist or nonfeminist), and religious group orientation (extrinsic, intrinsic, indiscriminately pro-religious, or indiscriminately anti-religious). The repeated measures factor was counseling approach (feminist, Christian or humanistic). All subjects completed a number of questionnaires to assess degree of confidence in the counselors, perceptions of the counselors, and preferences for the counselors. Data analysis used four way repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). The subjects, procedures, instruments and data analysis will be described in the following sections.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 179 undergraduate women enrolled in an introductory psychology course at a large midwestern university. The mean age for subjects was 20.1. Eighty seven percent of all subjects reported being in their first or second year of school. Subjects were primarily caucasion (83.2) or
black (6.9). The remaining 10% of subjects reported being Hispanic (1.7%), Asian American (3.5%), Native American (2.3), or no answer (2.4%). Lastly, a third of all subjects reported their religious affiliation as being Catholic (33.7%) and slightly under a third reported being Christian (28.5%). Of the remaining subjects, just over 25% reported some other religious affiliation (Jewish, 2.3%; Protestant, 15.7%; other, 10.5%); and, just about 10% reported not having a religious affiliation (agnostic, 2.3%; atheist, .6%; or none, 6.4%).

Subjects received course credit for their participation and were considered to be volunteers in that they had a variety of experiments from which to choose or could elect a non-participant alternative assignment. Subjects who decided to participate in the present study put their name on a sign-up sheet that briefly described the experiment and indicated the day, time and location of it.

**Written and Audiotape Stimuli**

The written and audio taped stimuli were developed by the experimenter using the following procedure. First, frequently cited sources on Feminist (Butler, 1985; Gilbert, 1980), Christian (Bergin, 1980; Strong, 1980), and Humanistic counseling (Meador & Rogers, 1984; Rogers, 1961) were reviewed to determine consistently agreed upon values within each of these counseling approaches. Feminist and Christian counseling approaches differ within themselves (Enns & Hackett, 1990; Chock, 1984). For the purposes of this study a liberal feminist and an integrative
Christian approach to counseling were selected. These two approaches were selected because they were regarded, by the experimenter, as a more moderate view of feminist and christian values respectively.

After reviewing the sources listed above, written statements summarizing the values of the selected approaches were prepared. The first paragraph in each of three approaches was nearly identical differing only in the value orientation that was used. Statements describing how each approach views problems, what areas of exploration are needed to gain knowledge about these problems, and something about the process of counseling made up the second paragraph in each statement. The final paragraph included one or two additional values that were uniquely important to the described approach. During preparation of these statements, psychology graduate students who self identified themselves as Feminist or Christian counselors were consulted for feedback regarding the statements. See Appendix A for a copy of the three statements.

After preparation of the statements, students in a counseling psychology training program and staff members of a university counseling center were solicited to provide feedback regarding the accuracy of the statements (N = 12). Each individual received a copy of two articles that were used as a basis for one of the statements and a copy of the corresponding statement. They were asked to rate how closely the statement represented the values discussed in the article (1 = not very representative to 5 = very
representative) and whether or not the statement incorporated core values from the approach (yes or no). For each of the three statements, all four raters believed that basic core values of the approach described were included in the script. For the Humanistic statement all four raters also believed that the statement was very representative of the approach (mean of 5). For the Christian and Feminist statement however, there was less agreement about how representative of the approach the statement was.

Two raters of the Christian statement felt that it was pretty representative (4 and 5 on a 5 point scale) and two rated it as less representative (3 and 2 on a 5 point scale) yielding a mean score of 3.5. The Feminist statement had a mean rating of 2.75 with none of the raters believing that the script was very representative (ratings were 2, 1, 4, 4 on a 5 point scale). Comments the raters wrote on the articles they reviewed suggested that two of the raters of the feminist statement thought feminist counseling to be more radical than as described in the articles. As mentioned previously, the more radical forms of feminist therapy were not chosen for this study.

Following the preparation of the written statements, three audiotapes were made using the statements described above as scripts. It was decided to use a didactic format on the audio tape even though previous research (Fygetakis, 198; Enns & Hackett, 1990) had used an interactive format. A didactic format would present the same words in the audio as in the written condition. The same woman acted as counselor in each of the three
audiotapes. This individual had previously received training in acting. She was chosen because of her ability to control features such as voice tone and inflection on the tape.

**Independent and Dependent Variables**

Independent variables of interest in the present study included basic demographic information, subjects' feminist orientation, and subjects' religious orientation. Dependent variables of interest included subjects' degree of confidence in a counselor's ability to help on a variety of presenting concerns, subjects' perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, and subjects' preference for counselors on a variety of presenting concerns. Additionally, a number of variables were used as manipulation check items.

**Instruments**

A total of seven instruments were used. Three of the instruments were used as independent variable measures and will be described first. One instrument was used as a manipulation check measure and will be described next. The remaining three instruments were used as dependent variable measures and will be described last.

**Independent Variable Measures**

**Demographic Questionnaire.** This instrument was designed by the experimenter and asked for demographic information including gender, ethnicity, age, year in school, previous counseling experience, and religious affiliation.
**Atitudes Toward Feminism Scale.** The Attitudes Toward Feminism Scale (ATF) is a 9-item Thurstone attitudinal scale (Fassinger, 1985). The instrument was developed to measure global affective attitudes toward feminism and the women's movement. The 9 scored items on the scale are embedded in 22 masking items yielding a 31 item instrument. Subjects respond to all items on a 5 point scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). Scale scores are obtained by summing the 9 items, four of which are reverse scored. A sample median split is used to group subjects into feminist and non-feminist groups. One of the masking items, "I consider myself a feminist and am supportive of the women's movement" is used to assign subjects who are at the median.

One researcher has used the ATF in a variety of studies and has collected validity data (Enns, 1991). In three different studies she has obtained correlations between the ATF and a subjective measure of identification with feminism. These correlations have ranged from .62 to .74 indicating the extent to which the ATF is a valid measure of women's attitudes toward feminism. Additionally, Enns and Hackett (1990) reported 2-week test-retest reliability of .81.

**Religious Orientation Scale.** The Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) was developed out of the work of Allport during the 1970's (Donahue, 1985). The ROS contains two subscales: Intrinsic and Extrinsic religiosity. The Intrinsic scale contains 9 items and the Extrinsic scale contains 11 items. Scale scores are obtained by
summing all 9 or 11 items (some items are reversed scored). All items are answered on a 5 point scale. Higher values indicate higher Intrinsic or Extrinsic religiosity.

Taken together the two subscales distinguish between four groups of people: intrinsic, extrinsic, indiscriminately pro-religious, and indiscriminately anti-religious. Median splits are used to determine these groups in the following way. Those who score high on the Intrinsic scale and low on the Extrinsic scale are labeled Intrinsic, those who live their religion. Those who score high on the Extrinsic scale and low on the Intrinsic scale are labeled Extrinsic, those who use their religion. Those who score high on both scales are labeled indiscriminately proreligious, positive about anything that has to do with religion. Those who score low on both scales are labeled indiscriminately antireligious, negative about anything that has to do with religion.

Donahue (1985) reported correlations between other measures of religiosity and the Intrinsic and Extrinsic subscales. Across six studies the Intrinsic scale correlated .39 and the Extrinsic scale .16 with other measures of religiosity. He suggests that this indicates some convergent validity for the ROS because the Extrinsic scale does not measure religiosity per se but rather identifies people who are religious for what religion can do for them. Correlations between the two subscales were reported to be -.20.

Original scoring conventions called for the use of the theoretical medians. Recently however it has been suggested that
using the sample medians might be more appropriate (Hall, 1989). Use of the sample medians in a less highly religious sample such as the one in the present study is desirable because of the increase in statistical power. Sample medians were used in the current study to distinguish between high and low scorers on the subscales.

**Manipulation Check Measure**

**Impressions of Counselor Questionnaire.** The Impressions of Counselor Questionnaire (ICQ) is a 17 item measure developed by the investigator. Subjects rated how closely each statement described the counselor they had just heard/read on a 5 point Likert scale from do not agree at all (1) to completely agree (5). The design and content of this questionnaire was modelled after the ICQ used by Epperson and Lewis (1987).

Twelve items were used to assess subjects' attention to the content of the written and audiotaped stimuli. These twelve items were drawn directly from the written value statements of the three approaches (i.e. "would want to examine the role that oppression plays in my life", "is flexible in finding ways to help me solve my problems", etc.). The following scoring procedure was used for these twelve items.

The four items taken from each of the three statements were summed. This resulted in three subscales: an f-scale, h-scale, and c-scale. Subscales measure the amount of agreement to items taken from the feminist, humanistic or Christian scripts respectively and can range from 4 to 20. Each subject views each
of the three tapes and consequently receives an f, h, and c-scale score for each time they view a tape.

Five of the 17 items on this instrument are single item measures. Three questions: "Is a feminist counselor", "Is a Christian counselor", and "Is a licensed psychologist" directly assessed subjects' attention to the stimuli. The last two questions assessed subjects' willingness to refer a friend and similarity to the counselor they had heard or read about. These two questions were dropped from the analysis in the present study because the items were omitted by many subjects or the scores were invalid.

Dependent Variable Measures

Counselor Rating Form-Short. The Counselor Rating Form-Short (CRF-S) is a shortened version of the Counselor Rating Form developed to assess perceptions of counselors along the dimensions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975). The original instrument uses 36 adjectives and their antonym pairs (i.e. alert-unalert, likeable-unlikeable, sincere-insincere, etc.) to create 7-point bipolar scales. Split-half reliabilities of .85, .87, and .91 for attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness respectively were reported (LaCrosse & Barak, 1976). An analysis of variance indicated that the CRF distinguished between counselors and within dimensions.

Corrigan and Schmidt (1983) adapted the CRF to yield the CRF-S by reducing the number of adjectives used for each dimension
and changing the format of the presentation of the adjectives. A total of 12 items (4 for each dimension) were selected for use in the shortened version based on their high loadings on the appropriate dimension in existing factor analysis of the CRF and the level of comprehension needed to understand the items. The format was changed to use only positive adjectives (i.e. likeable, expert, prepared, etc.). Confirmatory factor analysis using covariance structure analysis yielded support for a 3-factor oblique structure in the CRF-S. Though interfactor correlations were reported to be higher than in previous studies, interitem correlations were reported to be equal or lower than previous work suggesting that the CRF-S is equally as reliable as the CRF.

Adjectives are rated on a 7-point Likert scale from not very descriptive (1) to very descriptive (7). Scale scores for attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertness are obtained by adding the score from the four individual items that make up the scale. Individual item scores range from 1 to 7 and scale scores range from 4 to 28.

Client Willingness Questionnaire. The Client Willingness Questionnaire (CWQ) was designed to assess subjects' confidence in a counselor's ability to help on a variety of presenting concerns. Numerous studies have been reviewed in Chapter II that used a similar instrument to assess subject willingness to see the counselor or confidence in the counselor's ability to help on a variety of problems (Enns & Hackett, 1990; Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Fygetakis, 1982; Lewis & Walsh, 1980). Taken together, these
studies show relative convergence on the types of problems presented. A combination of these various instruments is used in the present study. Abramczyk (1981) suggests that the problems seen by a pastoral counselor are identical to those seen by other counselors. Consequently, no additions were made to account for the inclusion of a Christian counselor in the present experiment.

In CWQ, subjects were asked to respond to 19 different presenting problems. These problems represent two general areas of concern: career related concerns and personal/social concerns. Subjects' rated how confident they are in the counselor's ability to help for each problem on a 5 point scale from definitely not be able to help (1) to definitely able to help (5).

Counselor Preference Questionnaire (CPQ). This final questionnaire presents the 19 problems of the CWQ and asks the subject to select which counselor, from the three that they have heard or read about, they would most prefer to see for each of the 19 presenting concerns.

Procedures

The subjects were tested in small groups of approximately 20 people each, under similar experimental conditions. Each subject received a test packet containing the seven instruments described above. The experiment began by having the experimenter read aloud the directions for the study and ask if anybody had any questions. Following this, procedures differed based on the experimental condition.
In the written condition, subject packets contained the instruments and the three written statements describing each of the different counselors. Each subject read one of the written statements and then filled out a CRF-S, an ICQ and a CWQ. Then they read a second statement and filled out a CRF-S, an ICQ, and a CWQ. Then they read the third and final statement and once again filled out all three instruments. After completing these instruments, subjects completed the remaining four questionnaires: the CPQ, ATF, ROS and demographic questionnaire.

Subjects received packets in a random order. The presentation order of both the written statements and the three instruments that followed the written statements (CRF-S, ICQ, CWQ) was counterbalanced. In the remaining four instruments (CPQ, ATF, ROS, demographic questionnaire) the CPQ and demographic questionnaire always came first and last respectively; however, the presentation order of the ATF and ROS was counterbalanced. Subjects worked at their own pace and were free to leave after they completed their packet.

In the audio tape condition, subjects received test packets that only contained copies of the instruments. All subjects listened as one of the audiotapes containing the scripts played using a cassette recorder. After the tape was finished playing, subjects were asked to complete a CRF-S, an ICQ and, a CWQ and then wait for another tape to be played. The experimenter watched as subjects completed the questionnaires and played the next tape when all subjects had finished completing the questionnaires.
This procedure was repeated for the second tape. The final audio tape was played and subjects were instructed that they could complete the remainder of the test packet at this time.

Subjects could leave after completing all of the instruments. Again, the presentation order of the audio tapes was completely counterbalanced creating six experimental presentation orders. Within each order, the presentation order of the instruments was also counterbalanced.

As subjects completed the test packet and left, they were given a written debriefing statement. This statement explained the purpose of the experiment, thanked them for their participation, and provided counseling consumer information in case they ever sought counseling. The name and phone number of the experimenter was given in case a subject had any questions.

Before the actual data collection was begun a predata collection was conducted for both conditions (N = 16) using the procedures described above. This predata collection was conducted to work out potential problems with the procedures, especially the directions, and insure that all instruments could be completed in the allotted time. All subjects were able to complete the instruments in the allotted time; however some minor changes were made in the instructions to increase the clarity as a result of the the predata collection. These data were not used in the data analysis for the study.
Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted in three steps. First, the subjects' scores from the Attitudes Toward Feminism Scale and the Religious Orientation Scale were analyzed to determine feminist and religious groupings for each subject. Sample median splits were used in this analysis. This resulted in a 2 (condition: audio, written) X 2 (feminist group: feminist, non-feminist) X 4 (religious group: extrinsic, intrinsic, indiscriminately pro-religious, and indiscriminately anti-religious) X 3 (scripts: Feminist, Christian, and Humanistic) repeated measures design. The scripts were the repeated measure factor.

The second step in the data analysis was analysis of the Impressions of Counselor Questionnaire (ICQ). T-tests, ANOVA's and pairwise t-tests were used to analyze the data from the 15 items on this instrument that were used as manipulation check items. Questions concerning subjects' attention to the value statements made in each of the scripts were explored during this phase of the analysis.

The third and final step used four way repeated measures analysis (condition X feminist group X religious group X value orientation) to explore the hypotheses of the study.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of this study will be presented in four parts. The first part will present the data obtained from scoring the Attitudes Toward Feminism Scale (ATF) and the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS). These data were used to assign subjects to feminist and religious groups respectively, and these groups were used as blocking variables in the main data analysis. The second part of the results section presents the data from the analysis of the first 15 items on the Impressions of Counselor Questionnaire (ICQ). These data were used to determine how well subjects attended to the content of the written statements or audiotaped scripts. The third section of the results presents the data from the analysis of the Counselor Rating Form-Short (CRF-S). This section will address hypotheses regarding perceived attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness across the three counselors. Last, the data from the analysis of the Counselor Willingness Questionnaire (CWQ) and Counselor Preference Questionnaire (CPQ) are presented. This section addresses the primary hypotheses of the study, regarding subjects' degree of confidence in a counselor's ability to help on a variety of
presenting concerns and subjects' preferences for one of three types of counselors.

**Analysis of Independent Measures**

**Attitudes Toward Feminism Scale (ATF).** In the present sample, the median score on the ATF was 29 (range 14 to 44). The median ATF score, in this study was somewhat lower (3 or 4 points) than median ATF scores in earlier studies though the ranges in all studies were virtually the same (Enns, 1991). Subjects falling at the median were assigned to groups based on their answers to the question "I consider myself a feminist and am supportive of the women's movement". Those who scored a 4 or 5 (on a 5 point scale) were assigned to the feminist group and other subjects were assigned to the nonfeminist group. As a result, 53% (n = 95) of the sample was labeled feminist and 47% (n = 84) was labeled nonfeminist. All 8 subjects at the median were assigned to the feminist group. Mean ATF scores differed significantly between the groups t(175) = -17.17, p < .0001. Nonfeminist subjects had a mean ATF score of 24.7 and feminist subjects had a mean ATF score of 33.56. Mean scores for feminist and non-feminist subjects were also somewhat lower (2-4 points) in this study than in previous research (Enns, 1991). Chi-square analysis revealed no differences between the written and audio conditions on the assignment to feminist groups \( X^2 \) (1,N=179) = .78, p < .37.

**Religious Orientation Scale (ROS).** The sample median for the Intrinsic and Extrinsic scales on the ROS was 20 (range 10 - 31)
and 19 (range 5 - 39) respectively. As a result, 26% (n = 46) of the sample was assigned to the indiscriminately anti-religious group; 26% (n = 47) was assigned to the Extrinsic group; 23% (n = 42) was assigned to the Intrinsic group; and, 25% (n = 44) was assigned to the indiscriminately proreligious group. A one way ANOVA showed differences between the four religious groups on both the intrinsic and extrinsic scales in the desired directions $F(3,170) = 95.68, p < .0001$ and $F(3,168) = 81.41, p < .0001$ respectively. Chi-square analysis revealed no differences between written and audio conditions on the assignment of subjects to religious orientation groups $X^2(3, N=179) = .65, p < .88$.

**Analysis of Impressions of Counselor Questionnaire**

The analysis of the Impressions of Counselor Questionnaire (ICQ) is reported in two parts. The first part is the analysis of single item checks on subjects attention to explicit statements within the scripts (e.g. "Is a licensed psychologist", "Is a Christian counselor"). The second part is the results from the analysis of the f, h, and, c-subscals of the ICQ.

**Single item results**

**Christian Counselor.** A significant main effect for script was obtained on the statement "Is a Christian counselor" $F(2,326) = 845.00, p < .00$. Subjects agreed with the statement more strongly when they heard or read the Christian scripts ($M = 4.83$) than when they heard or read either the Feminist ($M = 1.63$) or Humanistic ($M = 1.66$) scripts.
Feminist Counselor. A significant main effect for script was obtained on the statement "Is a Feminist counselor" $F(2,326) = 553.55, p < .00$. Subjects agreed more strongly with the statement when they heard or read the Feminist script ($M = 4.75$) than when they heard or read either the Humanistic ($M = 2.09$) or Christian ($M = 1.71$) scripts. Two significant interaction effects also were found on the statement "Is a Feminist counselor".

A script by condition interaction effect was found $F(2,326) = 4.41, p < .013$. The interaction effect can be seen in the pattern of subjects' scores for this item when responding to the Christian and Humanistic scripts. In the written condition, subjects' means scores for the item "Is a feminist counselor" were lower when responding to the Christian script ($M = 1.68$) than when responding to the Humanistic script ($M = 2.32$). In the audio condition, subjects' mean scores for the item "Is a Feminist counselor" were the same for the Humanistic script ($M = 1.81$) and the Christian script ($M = 1.75$). In both conditions, subjects agreed with the statement significantly more when responding to the Feminist scripts.

A significant script by religious group interaction effect $F(6,326) = 2.78, p < .012$ also was obtained for the statement "Is a Feminist counselor". For the Humanistic and Feminist scripts, all four religious groups had similar mean agreement scores. However for the Christian scripts indiscriminately anti-religious and indiscriminately pro-religious subjects had significantly lower mean agreement scores. Again, the interaction effect does not
alter the interpretation of the significant main effect for script. The feminist script received significantly higher mean agreement scores across all four religious groups.

**Licensed Psychologist.** A significant main effect for script was obtained for the statement "Is a licensed psychologist" $F(2,326) = 8.41, p < .0003$. Subjects were less likely to agree with this statement when hearing or reading the Christian script ($M = 4.42$) than when hearing or reading either the Feminist ($M = 4.72$) or the Humanistic ($M = 4.70$) scripts. Though subjects agreed with the statement least when reading or hearing the Christian scripts, in general subjects agreed strongly with the statement. After hearing or reading the Feminist and Humanistic scripts, 92% of all subjects responded with a score of 4 or 5 (on a five point scale). For the Christian scripts, 82% of all subjects responded with a score of 4 or 5.

**ICQ Subscale Analysis**

Subscales scores for the ICQ were calculated by summing the four items that corresponded to each of three scripts, the scores could range from 4 to 20. The three subscales are the f-scale, h-scale and, c-scale. These correspond to the sum of the items taken from the Feminist, Humanistic and Christian scripts respectively. When responding to the Feminist script the f-scale is the primary scale and the h and c-scales are secondary scales. Parallel patterns hold for the remaining two scripts.

The subscales were analyzed in two ways. First, t-tests and ANOVA's were used to determine if mean subscale scores differed
between condition, feminist group, or religious group. Second, primary subscales were compared to secondary subscales within each script, using pairwise t-tests, for both conditions to determine if differences in the desired direction existed.

**Analysis of subscales by condition and group.** T-test analyses and ANOVA's revealed only a few significant differences on mean subscale scores by condition, feminist group, or religious group for the Feminist, Christian and Humanistic scripts. A t-test analysis \( t(177) = -2.21, p < .03 \) indicated that non-feminist subjects disagreed more strongly with the items on the h-scale (\( M = 11.75 \)) when responding to the feminist scripts than feminist subjects (\( M = 12.84 \)).

T-test analysis also indicated differences by condition on the f-scale \( t(177) = 2.77, p < .006 \) and h-scale \( t(177) = 2.86, p < .005 \) when responding to the Christian scripts. Specifically subjects agreed more strongly with items on the f-scale when hearing the Christian scripts (\( M = 10.26 \)) than when reading the Christian script (\( M = 9.08 \)), and subjects agreed more strongly with items on the h-scale when hearing the Christian script (\( M = 11.74 \)) than when reading the Christian script (\( M = 10.33 \)).

Lastly, an ANOVA indicated that indiscriminately anti-religious subjects agreed significantly less with items on the f-scale when hearing or reading the Christian scripts than other subjects \( F(3,178) = 3.88, p < .01 \).

**Pairwise analysis of primary and secondary subscales.** Pairwise t-tests were used to determine if subjects rated items that came
from the humanistic script (h-scale) higher than items that came from feminist scripts (f-scale) or Christian scripts (c-scale) when responding to the humanistic scripts. Parallel t-tests were used for the feminist and Christian scripts as well. Significant differences were found in all pairwise t-tests, p< .0001, for subscales within each of the three scripts for both conditions. Table 1 lists the means and standard deviations for subscale scores from each of the scripts by condition. Examination of the Table reveals that the differences are in the desired direction. Subjects rated the f-scale highest when responding to the Feminist script, the h-scale highest when responding the Humanist script and, the c-scale highest when responding to the Christian script.

Conclusions

Analysis of the single item manipulation checks suggests that subjects accurately heard the statements made in the scripts. Subjects strongly agreed with the statement "Is a licensed psychologist" for all scripts and agreed with the statements "Is a Feminist counselor" or "Is a Christian counselor" significantly more when responding to the Feminist or Christian scripts respectively.

Subjects' condition, feminist group or religious group did not affect mean subscale scores in meaningful ways except for one case. Mean agreement scores were higher in the audio condition than the written condition for both secondary subscales when responding to the Christian scripts. In other words, subjects agreed with all items on the ICQ more when hearing the Christian script than when reading the Christian script.
Table 1
Mean ICQ Subscales Scores by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Feminist</th>
<th>Humanistic</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 17.89</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 2.58</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Condition (n=79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-scale</td>
<td>M 12.65</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 3.48</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-scale</td>
<td>M 7.00</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>19.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 4.07</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Condition (n=100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-scale</td>
<td>M 18.35</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 2.21</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-scale</td>
<td>M 12.10</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 3.14</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-scale</td>
<td>M 6.21</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 2.98</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Differences between primary subscales and secondary subscales within each script for both conditions were significant with $p < .0001$.

Lastly, pairwise analysis of the subscales on the ICQ reveals that subjects agreed most strongly with the items on the primary subscale of interest when responding to each of the three scripts.
or written scripts. For all three scripts, mean agreement scores on the primary subscale are significantly different from mean agreement scores on the secondary subscales. Subjects accurately heard or read the explicit value statements made by each counselor.

**Counselor Rating Form Short**

Two hypotheses were tested using the Counselor Rating Form Short (CRF-S). Hypothesis 1 states that subjects in the audio condition will perceive their counselors as possessing higher levels of attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness than subjects in the written condition. Hypothesis 2 states that within presentation formats counselors will be perceived as having equal levels of attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness. Four way repeated measures ANOVA's were used to analyze the data obtained from the CRF-S.

**Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 was partially confirmed by the data. A significant main effect for condition, in the anticipated direction, was found for the attractiveness dimension $F(1,163) = 6.63, p < .01$. All subjects in the audio condition rated the scripts as more attractive ($M = 19.07$) than subjects in the written condition ($M = 17.51$).

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 was not confirmed by the data. Three way ANOVA's revealed significant script main effects and script by feminist group interaction effects on all three dimensions of the
CRF-S. Subjects' ratings of perceived attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertness differed across the three scripts presented in the study and by subjects' feminist group orientation. Table 2 shows mean scores for all three CRF dimensions by subjects' feminist group. The results of the analysis for each dimension will be presented.

Attractiveness. A significant script by feminist-group interaction effect $F(2,326) = 8.61, p = .0002$ was obtained on the

Table 2

Mean Scores for CRF Dimensions by Feminist Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRF Dimension Group</th>
<th>Humanistic</th>
<th>Feminist</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>sd</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>18.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-feminist</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-feminist</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>19.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-feminist</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>17.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

feminist group $n = 95$
non-feminist group $n = 84$
dimension of perceived attractiveness. Feminist subjects perceived the Humanistic scripts as slightly more attractive (M = 20.21) than either the Christian (M = 17.41) or Feminist (M = 18.17) scripts. However, non-feminist subjects perceived the Christian (M = 19.15) and Humanistic (M = 19.43) scripts as greatly more attractive than the Feminist scripts (M = 15.67).

**Expertness.** A significant script by feminist group interaction effect F(2,326) = 6.42, p = .0018 was obtained for the dimension of perceived expertness. Feminist subjects perceived the Humanistic scripts and Feminist scripts as equally expert (M = 20.80 and 20.33 respectively) but more expert than the Christian scripts (M = 17.34). Nonfeminist subjects however perceived all three scripts as equally expert (F = 17.75, H = 18.86, C = 17.40). A significant feminist group main effect F(1.163) = 4.44, p = .037 also was obtained on the dimension of perceived expertness. The main effect is shown by higher mean expert scores for feminist subjects (M = 19.50) than nonfeminist subjects (M = 18.16).

**Trustworthiness.** A significant script by feminist group interaction effect F(2,326) = 5.71, p = .0036 was obtained on the dimension of perceived trustworthiness. Feminist subjects perceived all three scripts as equally trustworthy (F: M = 19.99, H: M = 20.49, C: M = 20.25). Non feminist subjects however perceived the feminist script as significantly less trustworthy (M = 17.57) than either the Humanist (M = 19.74) or the Christian (M = 20.57) scripts.
Conclusions

Contrary to predicted results, presentation format significantly affected subjects' ratings on only one of three CRF dimensions. Subject's ratings of perceived attractiveness were significantly higher in the audio taped condition than the written condition.

Again, contrary to predicted results, subjects perceived the 3 counselors as having differing levels of attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness. These differences were related to the counselor and the subject's feminist orientation. Non-feminist subjects rated the feminist counselor as less attractive and trustworthy but equally as expert as the other two counselors. Feminist subjects however, rated the Christian counselor as less expert and attractive though equally as trustworthy as the other two counselors. The Humanistic counselor received generally high ratings by both feminist and non-feminist subjects on all three dimensions.

Counselor Willingness Questionnaire

Two hypotheses were tested using the Counselor Willingness Questionnaire (CWQ). Hypothesis 3 predicted a condition by counselor interaction effect will be found. It stated "subjects will express more confidence in the humanistic counselor in the written condition and the feminist or christian counselor in the audio condition". Hypothesis 4 predicted that subjects to have equal confidence in the feminist and Christian counselors' ability to help within the two conditions.
Four way repeated measures ANOVA's were used to analyze the data obtained from the CWQ. The results are presented by hypothesis. Given the large number of independent ANOVA's used during the analysis of this instrument, the significance level was set at .01.

**Hypothesis 3.**

Hypothesis 3 was not supported by the data. No significant script by condition interaction effects were found. Subjects' expression of confidence in a counselor was not affected by presentation format for any of the 19 CWQ items.

**Hypothesis 4.**

Hypothesis 4 was not supported by the data. Subjects did not have equally as much confidence in the Christian counselor as they had in the Feminist counselor. Significant script main effects and script by feminist group interaction effects indicated that subjects had significantly more confidence in the Feminist counselor's ability to help than in the Christian counselor's ability to help. The results of the analysis for hypothesis 4 are presented in Tables 3 - 6 and are discussed in the following three sections.

**Script main effects.** For 6 of the CWQ items (improving grades, anxiety, rape/sexual assault, existential, meaning of life, and sexual harassment) only significant main effects for script were obtained. Table 3 lists mean confidence scores, F, and p values for these items. Examination of the mean confidence scores indicates that all three counselors received the highest mean confidence score on two of the 6 CWQ items. For two items
(improving grades and bereavement) the mean confidence scores do not differ significantly between the highest and second highest mean confidence scores.

Table 3
Mean Confidence Scores and F values for Selected CWQ items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWQ item</th>
<th>Humanistic</th>
<th>Feminist</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improving grades</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>22.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>30.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rape/sexual assault</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>38.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning in life</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>35.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bereavement</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>8.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>105.16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .0004; ** p < .0001

Non moderated interaction effects. Seven CWQ items (deciding on a major, career selection, exploring interests, problem pregnancy, gay/lesbian/bisexual concerns, assertiveness, eating, and job interview/resume) have significant script main effects and significant script by feminist group and/or script by religious group interaction effects. One item (exploring interests) has a script main effect and feminist group by religious group interaction effect. Table 4 shows F and p values for these 8 items.

Examination of the mean confidence scores for the significant interaction effects on these 8 items indicates that the rank order of mean confidence scores does not differ between feminist group or religious group. Rather the pattern of scores is somewhat
Table 4
F and p values for Selected CWQ items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Script(^a)</th>
<th>S x (^b)</th>
<th>S x (^c)</th>
<th>S x (^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deciding on a major</td>
<td>62.58(^**)</td>
<td>5.42(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career selection</td>
<td>65.44(^**)</td>
<td>4.47(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem pregnancy</td>
<td>4.57(^*)</td>
<td>4.50(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertiveness</td>
<td>65.30(^**)</td>
<td>5.84(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating</td>
<td>37.21(^**)</td>
<td>13.80(^**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job interview/resume</td>
<td>65.76(^**)</td>
<td>6.92(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gay/lesbian/bisexual</td>
<td>65.71(^**)</td>
<td>7.36(^*)</td>
<td>2.78(^*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exploring interests</td>
<td>81.15(^**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.07(^*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\) p < .01; \(^**\) p < .0001

a: Script main effect (repeated measure)
b: Script by Feminist group interaction effect
c: Script by Religious group interaction effect
d: Feminist group by Religious group interaction effect

different among groups. Specifically, the script by feminist group interaction effect is accounted for by significantly lower mean confidence scores feminist subjects gave the Christian scripts. The script by religious group interaction effect is accounted for by significantly lower mean confidence scores for the Christian scripts among indiscriminately anti-religious subjects. Lastly, the significant feminist group by religious group interaction effect is accounted for by the high mean confidence scores non-feminist, indiscriminately pro-religious subjects gave the Christian counselors. All other subjects rated the Christian scripts on the average a 2.30 (on a 5 point scale). However the
non-feminist, indiscriminately pro-religious subjects rated the Christian scripts 3.04.

Because the interaction effects did not modify the interpretation of the script main effects (in terms of rank ordering) the mean confidence scores are collapsed across feminist group and religious group for these 8 CWQ items and presented in Table 5. Examination of Table 5 indicates that the Feminist counselor was preferred on 5 of the items (deciding on a major, career selection, gay/lesbian/bisexual concerns, assertiveness, and job interview/resume), and the Humanistic counselor was preferred on 3 CWQ items (exploring interests, problem pregnancy, and eating). The Christian counselor was not preferred on any of the items.

Table 5
Mean Confidence Scores for Selected CWQ items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWQ Item</th>
<th>Humanistic M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Feminist M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Christian M</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deciding on a major</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career selection</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exploring interests</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem pregnancy</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gay/lesbian/bisexual</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertiveness</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job or resume prep.</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moderated Interaction Effects. The remaining five CWQ items must be examined independently because one or more of the significant interaction effects complicates the interpretation of the script main effects. Significant script by feminist group interaction effects must be examined on all five items and significant script by religious group interaction effects must be examined on two items (parental/family conflict and relationships). The results of the analysis from these 5 items are presented below and summarized in Tables 6 and 7. Table 6 shows F and p values and Table 7 shows mean CWQ scores by feminist group and religious group.

Table 6

F and p values for Selected CWQ items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scripta</th>
<th>S x Fb</th>
<th>S x Rc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drugs/alcohol</td>
<td>16.12**</td>
<td>5.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depression</td>
<td>33.03**</td>
<td>6.95*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual concern</td>
<td>43.69**</td>
<td>13.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental/family conflict</td>
<td>17.10**</td>
<td>5.01*</td>
<td>2.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship (spouse/partner)</td>
<td>10.56**</td>
<td>4.15*</td>
<td>2.69*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01; ** p < .0001
a: Script main effect (repeated measure)
b: Script by Feminist group interaction effect
c: Script by Religious group interaction effect

A significant script by feminist group interaction effect F(2,326) = 5.23, p = .006 was obtained for the CWQ item, "drugs/alcohol". Feminist subjects expressed the most confidence
in the Humanistic scripts (M = 3.76) and least confidence in the Christian scripts (M = 3.01) with the Feminist scripts being in the middle (M = 3.17). However, the non-feminist subjects expressed the least confidence in the Feminist scripts (M = 2.79), the most confidence in the Humanist scripts (M = 3.45), with the Christian scripts being in the middle (M = 3.27). Table 7 shows mean CWQ scores by feminist group.

A significant script by feminist group interaction effect F(2,326) = 6.95, p < .001 was obtained for the CWQ item "depression". Feminist subjects expressed the most confidence in the Humanistic scripts (M = 4.10) and the least confidence in the Christian scripts (M = 3.08). Non-feminist subjects however expressed the least confidence in the Feminist scripts (M = 2.96) though they expressed the most confidence in the Humanistic scripts (M = 3.94) like the feminist subjects. Table 7 shows mean CWQ scores by feminist group.

A significant script by feminist group interaction effect F(2,326) = 13.36, p = .001 was obtained on the CWQ item "sexual concerns". Feminist subjects expressed the most confidence in the Feminist scripts (M = 3.85) than either the Humanist (M = 3.78) or Christian (M = 2.42) scripts. Non-feminist subjects however, expressed more confidence in the Humanistic scripts (M = 3.50) than either the Feminist (M = 3.30) or Christian (M = 2.95) scripts. Table 7 shows mean CWQ scores by feminist group.

Significant script by feminist group F(2,326) = 5.01, p = .007 and script by religious group F(6,326) = 2.68, p < .015 interaction
### Table 7
Mean Confidence Scores by Feminist Group and Religious Group for Selected CWQ items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWQ item</th>
<th>Counseling Approach</th>
<th>Humanistic</th>
<th>Feminist</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>sd</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugs/alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-feminist</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-feminist</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-feminist</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental/family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-feminist</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extrinsic</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrinsic</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-religious</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-feminist</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extrinsic</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrinsic</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-religious</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effects were obtained for the CWQ item "parental/family conflict". Feminist subjects expressed more confidence in the Humanistic scripts (M = 3.90) than either the Feminist (M = 3.48) or the Christian (M = 3.64) scripts. Non-feminist subjects however, expressed more confidence in the Christian scripts (M = 3.84) than either the Humanistic (M = 3.73) or Feminist (M = 3.05) scripts. Indiscrimately pro-religious subjects expressed the most confidence in the Christian scripts where all other subjects expressed the most confidence in the Humanistic scripts. Table 7 shows mean CWQ scores by feminist group and religious group.

Significant script by feminist group $F(2,326) = 4.15, p < .016$ and script by religious group $F(6,326) = 2.69, p < .014$ interaction effects were obtained for the CWQ item "relationship (spouse/partner)". The feminist subjects expressed the most confidence in the Humanistic scripts ($M = 4.10$), and the least confidence in the Christian scripts ($M = 3.35$), with the Feminist scripts being in between ($M = 3.94$). Non-feminist subjects however, expressed the least confidence in the feminist scripts ($M = 3.51$), the most confidence in the Humanistic scripts ($M = 3.92$), with the Christian scripts in the middle ($M = 3.63$). The script by religious group interaction effect is accounted for by significantly higher mean confidence scores for the Christian scripts by the indiscriminately pro-religious subjects. All other subjects expressed the most confidence in the Humanistic scripts; however, the indiscriminately pro-religious subjects expressed the most
confidence in the Christian scripts. Table 7 shows mean CWQ scores by feminist group and religious group.

Conclusions

Contrary to predicted results, the presentation condition did not affect subjects preferences for counselors and subjects' preferences differed for the Feminist and Christian counselor. Specifically, the Christian counselor was most preferred on 2 CWQ items (meaning of life and bereavement). In contrast, the Feminist counselor was preferred on 7 items (rape/sexual assault, sexual harassment, deciding on a major, career selection, gay/lesbian/bisexual, assertiveness, and job/resume preparation). Lastly, the Humanistic counselor was most preferred on 5 CWQ items (improving grades, anxiety, exploring interests, problem pregnancy, and eating). On these 14 CWQ items subjects indicated a clear preference for one of the scripts regardless of condition, feminist group or religious group. The remaining 5 CWQ items are less clear. The script by feminist group interaction effects will be summarized first and then the script by religious group interaction effects.

For 3 items (drugs/alcohol, depression, and relationships) both feminist and non-feminist subjects preferred the Humanistic counselor most. However, non-feminist subjects preferred the Christian counselor second while feminist subjects preferred the Feminist counselor second. On the remaining two items, subjects' feminist group was related to preference for a counselor. Feminist subjects were most willing to see the feminist counselor
for sexual concerns while the non-feminist subjects were most willing to see the Humanistic counselor. For parental/family concerns, feminist subjects were most willing to see the Humanistic counselor while non-feminist subjects were most willing to see the Christian counselor. Again, across most groups on these 5 items, the Humanistic counselor received high mean confidence scores.

On both CWQ items with significant script by religious group interaction effects (parental/family concerns and relationships) indiscriminately pro-religious subjects expressed the most confidence in the Christian counselor while all other groups expressed the most confidence in the Humanistic counselor.

In general, for all but a few groups of subjects, on these 5 CWQ items, the Humanistic counselor received the highest mean confidence scores.

**Counselor Preference Questionnaire**

**Hypothesis 5**

One hypothesis was tested using the Counselor Preference Questionnaire (CPQ). Hypothesis 5 predicts that the counselor who received the highest mean willingness score on a given CWQ item will also be the most preferred counselor among the three counselor choices. Cross tabulations indicating the number of subjects who preferred each of the three counselors was used to test the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 5 was supported by the data. On 17 of 19 CWQ items the counselor who received the highest mean confidence
score was also the counselor who was most preferred by the greatest number of subjects. For two CWQ items (deciding on a major and career selection) subjects expressed the greatest confidence in the Feminist counselor’s ability to help but more subjects preferred to see the Humanistic counselor.

Conclusions

Confirming predicted results, most subjects preferred to see the counselor that received the highest mean confidence scores.
The current study examined the effect of pretherapy value self-disclosure on female subjects' perceptions of a counselor. Specifically, the study presented three different approaches to counseling using either an audiotape or written format. Subjects responded to each counselor on a measure of counselor attractiveness, trustworthiness, expertness, and a measure of the subject’s confidence in counselors’ ability to help on a variety of presenting concerns. A manipulation check instrument was used and subjects were assessed for degree of feminist orientation and religious orientation.

Five hypotheses were tested in this study. These hypotheses involved the effect of presentation format and counselor value orientation on several dependent measures. Specifically, as related to presentation format it was predicted that subjects in the audiotaped condition would perceive their counselors as possessing higher levels of attractiveness, expertness and trustworthiness. Additionally, it was predicted that in the audiotaped condition subjects would have greater confidence in the
Feminist and Christian counselors' ability to help than in the Humanistic counselor's ability to help. It was predicted that this would be reversed in the written condition. Relative to counselor value orientation, it was predicted that within presentation formats, subjects' perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness would not differ. Additionally, it was predicted that participants would rate the Feminist and Christian counselor similarly on CWQ items within presentation formats. The data in this study do not lend support to these hypotheses.

Presentation format had an effect on only one of the CRF dimensions and none of the CWQ items. Subjects perceived the counselors in the audiotaped condition as having higher levels of attractiveness. However no differences were found between the two presentation formats on subjects' perceptions of trustworthiness or expertness. Additionally, subjects did not have higher degrees of confidence in the Feminist and Christian counselors' ability to help in the audiotaped condition. Nor did subjects have higher degrees of confidence in the Humanistic counselor's ability to help in the written condition.

Counselor value orientation however had a significant effect on subjects' degree of confidence in the counselor's ability to help on a number of possible presenting concerns and these differences held across both conditions. An unexpected finding of the study was the strong effect for subjects' feminist orientation on
perceptions of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness as well as several possible presenting concerns.

The results of this study will be discussed here. Possible explanations for the results, in light of this study and other existing research will be explored. Limitations of this study and directions for future research also will be presented. The results will be discussed in terms of presentation format, counselor value orientation and feminist group effects.

Presentation Format

It was predicted that differing modes of presenting pretherapy value information might account for some of the conflicting results within existing research. Previous research has used either a written presentation format (Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Davis & Lesmeister, 1983; Lewis, Epperson & Foley, 1989; Pecnik & Epperson, 1985; Schneider, 1985) or an audio/videotaped (Chock, 1984; Enns & Hackett, 1990; Fygetakis, 1982; Lewis & Walsh, 1980) presentation format. The results of the two groups of studies differed. The present study employed both a written and audiotaped presentation format. However, differences accounted for by presentation format were found on only one dependent measure: perceived attractiveness. Participants in the audiotaped condition perceived the counselors as more attractive than counselors in the written condition. No differences due to presentation format were found for any of the presenting concerns.
The failure to find differences due to presentation format in the present study might be due to the similarity between the two stimuli. Previous studies that utilized an audio or video recorded stimulus had used an interactive format between a counselor and client (Chock, 1984; Fygetakis, 1982; Enns & Hackett, 1990). Additionally, the videotapes were described as being either 10 or 12 minutes in length (Chock, 1984; Enns & Hackett, 1990). It can be inferred that the audiotapes in the Fygetakis (1982) study were also somewhat longer.

For the purposes of the present study, a one page script was developed to describe each counselor. This script was then read, without client responses, to create the audiotapes. Each audiotape was about two minutes in length. This procedure was used to enhance the comparability between the two conditions within the study. However, creating such closely matched stimuli might have eliminated any possible differences attributable to presentation format.

In a study that recently has been conducted by Hackett, Enns and Zetzer (1991) similar results to those reported here have been found. These authors used the three videotapes created for the Enns and Hackett (1990) study however they also added a written copy of the dialogue from the script and an extended written description. They did not find difference on dependent measures for mode of presentation delivery. The current study and the one conducted by Hackett, et. al. (1991) suggests that conflicting
results in previous research might not be attributable to differences in mode of information delivery.

**Counselor Value Orientation**

Previous research has suggested that feminist values are controversial and that the explicit presentation of these values might violate a neutrality assumption held by clients and therefore create negative perceptions of the counselor. In the present study, however, it was hypothesized that negative perceptions of counselors who made explicit value statements were due to the value the presentation format rather than value orientation as discussed in the preceding section. Consequently, a secondary hypothesis of this study was that two approaches to counseling, each with different value orientation would receive similar ratings, within presentation formats, on dependent measures of interest. In other words, it was predicted that within presentation formats, participants would express equal confidence in the Feminist and Christian counselors' ability to help on a variety of possible presenting concerns. It was also predicted that participants perceptions of the three counselors on CRF dimensions would not differ within presentation formats. These hypotheses were not support by the data.

Participants expressed the most confidence in the Feminist counselor's ability to help on 7 possible presenting concerns and the most confidence in the Christian counselor's ability to help on only 2 presenting concerns. Additionally on none of the presenting
concerns did the Feminist and Christian counselors receive equal scores for ability to help. These differences held across both the written and audiotaped presentation formats.

Differences due to counselor orientation also were found on the CRF dimensions of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. The humanistic counselor received the best overall scores on all three dimensions. These scores however, were modified by a strong subject feminist orientation by counselor value orientation interaction effect and will be discussed in the next section. Differences due to counselor value orientation on the presenting concerns will be discussed here.

The Christian counselor received the highest mean confidence scores on the two items: meaning of life and bereavement. The Feminist counselor received the highest mean confidence scores on 7 items: rape/sexual assault, sexual harassment, deciding on a major, career selection, gay/lesbian/bisexual concerns, assertiveness, and job or resume preparation. Lastly, the Humanistic counselor was preferred on 5 items: improving grades, anxiety, exploring interests, problem pregnancy, and eating. The remaining 5 presenting concerns are discussed in the following section because of the presence of differences attributable to subject feminist or religious orientation.

The results of the present study do not support the hypothesis that pretherapy self-disclosure of values decreases subjects’ willingness to see a counselor, as has been suggested elsewhere
(Epperson & Lewis, 1987; Lewis, Davis & Lesmeister, 1983; Schneider, 1985). Rather the present study suggests that clients might believe that counselors with certain value orientations would be more or less helpful for certain presenting concerns.

These results are most consistent with the existing research that used only a videotaped or audiotaped presentation format (Fygetakis, 1982; Enns & Hackett, 1990). Feminist counselors seem to be preferred for career and sexual assault/harrassment concerns. Humanistic counselors are preferred for general anxiety and self-exploration concerns. Lastly, Christian counselors are preferred for more existential type concerns. The Christian counselors might be preferred for a broader range of problems if some more clearly spiritual problems had been included as done elsewhere (Chock, 1984).

Subjects' Feminist Orientation

An expected finding within the present study was the strong subject feminist orientation by counselor value orientation interaction effect that was found for all three CRF dimensions and 12 possible presenting concerns. An added unexpected part of this finding is the marked lack of findings for subjects' religious orientation. Closer examination of these findings reveals some interesting patterns that warrent comment. The results for subjects' feminist group orientation will be discussed first and the results for subjects' religious orientation discussed second.
Subjects' feminist orientation affected their mean confidence scores on twelve possible presenting concerns. On only one of these items (sexual concerns) did subjects' feminist orientation affect their mean confidence scores for the Feminist counselor. Feminist subjects had the most confidence in the Feminist counselor's ability to help and nonfeminist subjects had the most confidence in the Humanistic counselor's ability to help for the present concern of sexual concerns. For parental or family concerns, feminist subjects had the most confidence in the Humanistic counselor and nonfeminist subjects had the most confidence in the Christian counselor. Feminist subjects preferred the Feminist counselor second for three other concerns (drugs/alcohol, depression, and relationships) while nonfeminist subjects preferred the Christian counselor second. For the remaining seven presenting concerns (deciding on a major, career selection, problem pregnancy, assertiveness, eating, job interview or resume preparation, and gay/lesbian/bisexual concerns) subjects' feminist orientation significantly affected the degree to which they felt the Christian counselor would be helpful. Feminist subjects expressed significantly less confidence in the Christian counselor's ability to help on these presenting concerns than did nonfeminist subjects.

Subjects' feminist orientation did not affect their rating of the Feminist counselor but rather affected their ratings of the Christian counselor. Previous research has not included two
different value approaches to counseling and therefore has not had the opportunity to discover this effect. The current study is consistent with previous research in that a subject feminist orientation by counselor feminist orientation interaction effect has not been found.

Subjects' religious orientation, however, affected their rating of the Christian counselor on three presenting concerns (relationships, parental/family concerns, and gay/lesbian/bisexual concerns). Specifically, indiscriminately anti-religious subjects had the least confidence in the Christian counselor for gay/lesbian/bisexual concerns and indiscriminately pro-religious subjects had the most confidence in the Christian counselor for relationship and parental/family concerns.

**Limitations**

Several limitations of the present study should be considered when interpreting the results. First, the analog nature of the present study and the use of college student subjects limits the generalizability. On the other hand, Lewis, Epperson and Foley (1989) conducted a study using women who appeared for therapy at a university psychiatric center and found similar results to earlier studies using college age subjects. They suggested that the similarity between the results of the study using clients from a psychiatric center and college age subjects may indicate an ability to generalize results from analog studies done with college students onto a client population.
Second, sample median splits were used to determine feminist and religious groups in the present study. Statistical analysis revealed that the two feminist groups differed on mean ATF scores and the four religious groups differed on the extrinsic, intrinsic subscales of the ROS. However, the actual scores achieved in the present study might not be meaningful because the range of the ATF and ROS scores in the present study does not represent the range of possible scores especially on the ROS. Specifically, if theoretical medians had been used in the present study, as suggested elsewhere (Donahue, 1985), the group of intrinsic and indiscriminately pro-religious individuals would be extremely small. Consequently, replicating the present study with a more religious group of subjects would be important. In contrast though mean ATF scores for both feminist and nonfeminist subjects in the present study, were lower than mean ATF scores in previous research (Enns, personal communication), differences were found for feminist group orientation. These differences may be attributable to sampling error.

Third, the scripts that were used in the present study were brief. Additionally, validation of the scripts yielded some disagreement about both the Feminist and Christian scripts. Again, this could be related to definitional issues. As stated previously in Chapter 3, there are different forms of both Feminist and Christian counseling. Therefore raters may have rated the scripts used in the present study against their own version of the
Feminist or Christian counseling rather than the published ones they were given.

Lastly, most existing research used both implicit and explicit pretherapy value self-disclosures. Authors of existing research have used differences in subjects' responses to implicit and explicit self-disclosures as a foundation for some of their conclusions about subjects' responses to explicit pretherapy value self-disclosures. The current study however, used only explicit pretherapy value self-disclosures. Therefore comparisons about differences between implicit (label only) and explicit statement of values can not be commented on. Additionally, the results of the present study are not entirely comparable to earlier studies.

Directions for Future Research

Several directions for future research are indicated given the results of the present study and those of previous research. First, definitional issues continue to be a question that plague this area of research. Using a more liberal definition of feminist counseling within the present study yielded positive results in response to the feminist counselor. This was not however true for the Christian counselor. Additional studies using the format that Chock (1984) and Enns & Hackett (1990) used with two different approaches to Christian and Feminist counseling within one study are needed.

The present study did not address questions about subjects' value assumptions based on implicit or explicit counselor value
information that have been addressed in previous research. It might be helpful to explore how modes of information delivery might affect the value assumptions that participants might make. In other words, a study that has several modes of information delivery as well as the implicit and explicit independent variable is needed.

Most of the research that has been conducted exploring feminist approaches to counseling has used primarily female subjects as well as female counselors. One study (Fygetakis, 1982) used male and female counselors however few others have. Further research is needed that includes male subjects as well as male feminist counselors.

Lastly, research that explores existing results with a nonstudent population is needed. The one study that examines the questions explored in the area of research with a nonstudent population found similar results (Lewis, Epperson & Foley, 1989). These results however need to be replicated. Studies that include several value approaches to counseling and different modes of information delivery also need to be conducted with nonstudent subjects.
APPENDIX A

STATEMENTS
Feminist Statement

Before we meet, I would like you to have some information about me as a professional. I am a licensed psychologist and I use an approach to counseling called feminist therapy. My beliefs affect how I approach counseling and what I believe is important to focus on. Therefore, I think it is important that you know something about how I work as a therapist so that you can decide whether or not you think that I would be able to help you.

First, I believe that people's problems are most often caused by external forces in the world. As a result, counseling would likely involve exploration of your concerns to determine which forces are external and which are internal. One of the external forces I find important is oppression. Specifically, I believe that our society limits the options available to most minority groups especially women, and this often makes us angry. During therapy, I would want to focus on exploring the role that oppression has played in your life and allowing you a place to express your anger.

Additionally, I believe that all relationships should be based on equality between the people involved. Even the counseling relationship is one of equality. As a result, I believe that my role is not one of the expert but rather one of helping you discover your own personal goals. This might be difficult because often our goals are influenced by societal expectations. Therefore, exploration of non-traditional roles in careers, relationships, and lifestyles is often important.
Christian Statement

Before we meet, I would like you to have some information about me as a professional. I am a licensed psychologist and I use an approach to counseling called Christian counseling. My beliefs affect how I view counseling and what I believe is important to focus on. Therefore, I think it is important that you know something about how I work as a therapist so that you can decide whether or not you think that I would be able to help you.

First, I believe that people's problems are most often caused by not adhering to the Word of God as described in the Bible. As a result, counseling would likely involve exploration of your concerns to determine what direction the Bible might have to offer. One direction that the bible has to offer is the importance of forgiveness. Specifically, it is important to move beyond anger, bitterness, or insecurity about ourselves to forgiveness. During therapy I would want to focus on prayer and development of self control to promote forgiveness and healing.

Additionally, I believe that a personal relationship with God is a critical avenue in therapy. I believe in using my relationship with God in my work as a therapist. As a result, my role is to turn to God's Word for guidance to facilitate your healing. Sometimes personal healing is difficult because society teaches us non-Biblical goals and values. A part of healing, as I see it, is a recommitment to family, marriage and fidelity.
Humanistic Statement

Before we meet, I would like you to have some information about me as a professional. I am a licensed psychologist and I use an approach to counseling called humanistic counseling. My beliefs affect how I approach counseling and what I believe is important to focus on. Therefore, I think it is important that you know something about how I work as a therapist so that you can decide whether or not you think that I would be able to help you.

First, I believe that people's problems are most often caused by a denial of our personal experiences. As a result, counseling would likely involve an exploration of your inner world to better understand your feelings and experiences. Specifically, I believe that people deny true feelings and desires in order to receive conditional love and acceptance. The denial of our feelings often leaves us feeling distant from ourselves and others. During therapy, I would want to focus on helping you to experience your true inner feelings and begin to make choices congruent with these feelings.

Additionally, I believe that all growth comes within the context of relationships. As a result, I believe that my role is to develop a warm and empathic relationship with you to facilitate your growth. This may be difficult because we are taught to look to others for approval. However, I believe that we must follow our own paths to self fulfillment. These paths and the solutions that we discover can be very flexible.
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