**This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received**

69-4980

**SPRAFKIN, Robert Peter, 1940-
COMMUNICATOR EXPERTNESS AND CHANGES IN
WORD MEANINGS IN PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT.**

**The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1968
Psychology, clinical**

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

COMMUNICATOR EXPERTNESS AND CHANGES IN WORD
MEANINGS IN PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Robert Peter Sprafkin, A.B., M.A.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
1968

Approved by

Adviser
Department of Psychology

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deep appreciation to my adviser, Professor Harold B. Pepinsky, for the encouragement and intellectual stimulation he has provided. He has created an atmosphere in which one is free to explore, speculate, probe, and question.

I also wish to thank Professor Samuel H. Osipow and Professor Thomas M. Ostrom, who read the original research proposal and contributed many helpful suggestions.

I am especially grateful to Mr. Charles Gelso and Mr. James Jolliff, my able confederates, who gave generously of their time and talent. I am also indebted to Mr. Michael Donovan for his considerable help with statistical procedures. Special thanks are due to my wife, Barbara, for her reassurance and patience.

This research was partially supported by Grant GN542 from the National Science Foundation.

VITA

December 18, 1940 Born: New York, New York

1962 A.B. (Philosophy), Dartmouth College,
Hanover, New Hampshire

1963 Employment Interviewer, New York
State Employment Service, New York,
New York

1964 M.A., Teachers College, Columbia
University, New York, New York

1964 Counseling Intern, New York
State Division of Vocational
Rehabilitation, New York, New York

1965 Professional Diploma (Rehabilitation
Counseling), Teachers College,
Columbia University, New York,
New York

1965-1966 Psychology Intern, Ohio State
Rehabilitation Center, University
Hospital, Columbus, Ohio

1966 Psychology Trainee, U.S. Veterans
Administration Hospital,
Chillicothe, Ohio

1966-1967 Teaching Assistant, Department
of Psychology, The Ohio State
University, Columbus, Ohio

1967-1968 Teaching Associate, Department
of Psychology, The Ohio State
University, Columbus, Ohio

Fields of Study

Major Field: Counseling Psychology

Professors Harold B. Pepinsky, Frank M. Fletcher,
Samuel H. Osipow, Francis P. Robinson, Lyle D. Schmidt,
Maude A. Stewart, and W. Bruce Walsh

Minor Field: Clinical Psychology

Professors Edwin N. Barker, James G. Kelly, Donald L.
Mosher, Saul M. Siegel, and Thomas T. Weaver, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
TABLES	vii
 CHAPTER	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Word Meanings and Psychological	
Treatment	1
Communicator Expertness	9
Cognitive Balance	11
Confidence	16
General Propositions	17
II. METHOD	20
Subjects	20
Experimental Setting	20
Selection and Training of	
Counselor-Confederates	20
Procedure	21
Debriefing	24
Independent Variables	25
- Counselor expertness	25
Advocated change	26
Dependent Variables	28
Changes in word meanings	28
Changes in ratings of confidence	29
Design	29
Experimental Conditions	29
Hypotheses	30
Analysis of Data	31

	Page
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	33
Procedural Checks	33
Test of Hypotheses	51
Changes in ratings of synonyms initially judged as most appropriate definitions	51
Changes in ratings of synonyms initially judged as least appropriate definitions	52
Changes in ratings of confidence in one's ability to use terms appropriately	53
Discussion	54
IV. SUMMARY	64
APPENDIXES	
A. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS	67
B. COUNSELOR AND EXPERIMENTER SCRIPTS	94
C. TABLES	102
REFERENCES	117

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Ss Eliminated from the Final Sample	34
2. Analysis of Variance of the Procedural Check on Expertness	35
3. Comparison between Means on the Procedural Check on Expertness	35
4. Analysis of Variance of the Procedural Check on Liking	36
5. Comparison between Means on the Procedural Check on Liking	36
6. Comparisons between Means on the Counselor-Expertness Interaction (AC)	37
7. Analysis of Variance of the Procedural Check on the Ss' Willingness to See the Counselor Again	38
8. Comparison between Means on the Procedural Check on the Ss' Willingness to See the Counselor Again	38
9. Comparisons between Means on the Counselor-Expertness Interaction (AC)	39
10. Analysis of Variance of the First Procedural Check on Communication Effectiveness	40
11. Comparison between Means on the First Procedural Check on Communication Effectiveness	41
12. Comparisons between Means on the Counselor-Expertness Interaction (AC)	41

Table	Page
13. Analysis of Variance of the Second Procedural Check on Communication Effectiveness	42
14. Comparison between Means on the Second Procedural Check on Communication Effectiveness	43
15. Intercorrelations among the First Five Procedural Check Items	44
16. Analysis of Variance of the Procedural Check on the Ss' Perceptions of the Counselor's Definitions	45
17. Comparison between Means on the Procedural Check on the S's Perceptions of the Counselor's Definitions	45
18. Analysis of Variance of the Procedural Check on Common Relevance	47
19. Comparison between Means on the Procedural Check on Common Relevance	47
20. Analysis of Variance of the Undefined Terms Initially Judged as Least Appropriate Definitions	49
21. Comparison between Means on the Counselor Variable (A)	49
22. Analysis of Variance of Ratings of Synonyms Initially Judged as Most Appropriate Definitions	51
23. Analysis of Variance of Ratings of Synonyms Initially Judged as Least Appropriate Definitions	52
24. Comparison between Means on the Advocated Change Variable (B)	53
25. Analysis of Variance of Confidence Ratings	54

Table	Page
26. Raw Scores: Changes in Ratings of Synonyms Initially Judged as Most Appropriate Definitions	103
27. Raw Scores: Changes in Ratings of Synonyms Initially Judged as Least Appropriate Definitions	106
28. Raw Scores: Changes in Ratings of Confidence in One's Ability to Use Terms Appropriately	109
29. Raw Scores: Procedural Check Items	112
30. Means and Standard Deviations for Procedural Check Items	115
31. Differences between Means for Synonyms Rated Highest and Lowest by Pretest Group	116

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

The counseling or psychotherapeutic relationship has been viewed in recent years as a kind of social influence process in which the behavior of the counselor or therapist may effect a change in the behavior of the client or patient (cf. Frank, 1959). Much of the research in this area has dealt with the communication between the participants of the therapeutic interaction (cf. Lennard & Bernstein, 1960). The present investigation was designed to test predictions about social influence and communication within a psychological treatment situation. The aspect of social influence under consideration is the effect of different levels of communicator expertness upon the acceptance of his communication. The specific type of communication to be examined involves the meanings and changes of meanings of certain words used in the verbal interaction.

Word Meanings and Psychological Treatment

Psychological treatment may be defined as any situation in which one or more persons (A) attempt to modify the beliefs or behavior of one or more other persons (B) so as to make B more productive in A's view (cf. Pepinsky, 1966). Counseling and psychotherapy may be considered as specific examples of psychological treatment.

Research on social influence and communication in psychological treatment situations has centered on, e.g., the therapist's "moral values (Rosenthal, 1955)," his theoretical orientation (Heine, 1953), and the topics chosen for discussion (Patton, 1966). However, little attention has been paid to the participants' language usage; specifically, the meanings that the counselor or therapist and his client assign to the words they use in the therapeutic exchange. Word meaning may be thought of as suggested by Carroll (1967): "A 'meaning' of a word is, therefore a societally-standardized concept, and when we say that a word stands for or names a concept it is understood that we are speaking of concepts that are shared among the members of a speech community (p. 574)."

Some of the research on language usage in counseling and psychotherapy has suggested that the therapist and client become more alike in their language patterns, both in terms of structure and content, as therapy progresses (Lennard et al., 1960). There is also evidence that connotative meanings change over the course of counseling or therapy. Endler (1961), using Osgood's semantic differential, found that clients' connotations of self-reference changed during the course of therapy. McGreevy and Daane (1967) also used semantic differential scales, administered after each interview in a counseling series, and found the meanings of some concepts to change for both counselor and client; such change was more likely to occur early in the counseling sequence.

Landfield and Nawas (1964) used a modified form of Kelly's Role Construct Reportory Test, and found a shift in clients' self-description, toward "ideal self" descriptions supplied by their therapists.

While research into this aspect of communication has been limited, its importance and relevance has nonetheless warranted considerable attention. Such personality theorists as Sullivan (1947), Dollard and Miller (1950), and Rogers (1954) discuss language use and misuse both in terms of etiological factors in psychological "dis-ease" and in relation to psychological treatment. These theorists agree that the person with a psychological problem is limited in his intrapersonal and/or interpersonal communication ability, and that a purpose (perhaps a primary one) of psychological treatment is to help the client remedy his communication deficit. The counselor or therapist may help his client to avail himself of a more adequate language system (in the counselor's or therapist's view), by means of which the client may talk about his experiences. This is similar to what Levy (1963) refers to as psychological interpretation: "...psychological interpretation of content consists of a redefining or restructuring of the situation through the presentation of an alternate description of some behavioral datum.... More specifically, interpretation occurs whenever a new or different frame of reference, or language is brought to bear upon some problem or event (p. 5)."

In offering a more adequate language system with which both he and the client can talk about experiences, the counselor or therapist does not necessarily present his client with a new vocabulary. Rather

the task performed by a counselor or therapist is to provide his client with a more adequate language system (in the counselor's or therapist's view), and this entails providing a particular set of meanings to words which may already be part of the client's vocabulary. This consensus of meaning is a basic qualification for what Johnson (1946) describes as scientific language:

It is not enough that they (statements) refer to something for the listener. What is required is that they refer to approximately the same thing for both the speaker and the listener. In speaking meaningfully one does not just communicate; one communicates something to someone. And the something communicated is not the words that are used, but whatever those words represent. The degree to which communication occurs depends precisely upon the degree to which the words represent the same thing for the listener that they do for the speaker and the degree to which they do is an index of the clarity of the language employed--the clarity that is such a basic feature of scientific language (pp. 50-51).

Although they do not address themselves specifically to the question of changes in the meanings of words in counseling or psychotherapy, Pepinsky and Karst's (1964) discussion of "convergence" seems particularly appropriate. These authors define convergence as a shift in belief on the part of a previously uninstructed person (the client) toward that of an instructed person (the counselor or therapist). What makes this discussion relevant is the suggested roles that social influence and expectancies play in facilitating the convergence of the client's belief system (meaning system in the present context) toward that of the counselor or therapist.

Writers and theorists in many areas, not necessarily within psychology, have been interested in the meanings and changes of meanings of words, which may in turn have relevance for psychological treatment

considerations. Contributions have been made in anthropology, linguistics, literary criticism, philosophy, and speech pathology--areas in which language meaning plays a vital part. Although diverse disciplines have addressed themselves to the investigation of language meaning, several basic issues emerge from their separate pursuits. These include the acquisition of word meanings, the relationship between words and their referents, the relationship between language and experience, and the definitions of meaning, to name a few. These areas will be touched upon briefly below.

In the acquisition of word meanings there seems to be consensus among investigators that meanings of words are acquired through the influence of the contexts (verbal and nonverbal) in which they occur, and through explicit reference to particular meanings (cf. Hayakawa, 1964; Creelman, 1966; Carroll, 1967). From a developmental point of view, Werner and Kaplan (1950) summarize as follows:

The child acquires the meaning of words principally in two ways. One is by explicit reference either verbal or objective; he learns to understand verbal symbols through the adult's direct naming of objects or through verbal definition. The second way is through implicit or contextual references; the meaning of a word is grasped in the course of conversation, i.e., it is inferred from the cues of the verbal context (p. 3).

It is important to note that both of these methods presuppose that the meanings thus acquired may hold only within the social group (e.g., socio-economic class, family, occupation, region, etc.) within which they were acquired. Sapir (1967) makes the observation that size of group affects the communication of meaning. "Generally speaking, the smaller the circle and the more complex the understanding already

arrived at within it, the more economical can the act of communication afford to become (p. 77)." This condition may have bearing upon the acquisition and communication within the counseling or therapy dyad, particularly when psychotherapy is viewed as involving considerable "socialization (Lennard et al., 1960)," or "indoctrination (Frank, 1961)" of the client. It is interesting that discussions of "socialization" include the learning of appropriate "roles" within the particular social context (cf. Secord & Backman, 1964). Viewing the therapy situation as a particular kind of social context, Lennard et al. (1960) state: "In order for a therapeutic system to begin to function, it is first necessary for the patient to be inducted into the patient 'role,' that is, to acquire the set of role expectations which are reciprocal to those of the therapist (p. 24-25)." And, in relating this to language usage, Brown (1965) states: "It is as if every linguistic community, parents at home or nationals of another country or teachers of a science, adopts the same policy toward neophytes: 'Let us begin by defining our terms' (p. 330)."

A primary consideration in discussing the meanings of words and the acquisition of these meanings is the relationship between words and their referents. The basic assumption is that words are not identical with things (objects, events, experiences, etc.) they refer to, but become a way of talking about referents. As such, they are necessarily incomplete, involving not only facts about the object or experience but also evaluations of the communicator. Consequently the concept of objective fact must be modified to take into account the evaluation or

classification process, since it is those involved in the communicative act who determine the nature of the particular relationship between words and referents. There exists no necessary connection between words and referents, although individuals often seem to operate either as if there were, or as if they believed that other people drew word-referent connections similar to their own. At some level, then, agreement between words and referents has been reached, or has been assumed in terms of "an assumed normative order (Garfinkel, 1963, p. 195)." It is within this assumed normative order that a categorization or classification process takes place: "To categorize is to render discriminably different things equivalent, to group the objects and events and people around us into classes, and to respond to them in terms of their class membership, rather than their uniqueness (Bruner, Goodnow, & Austin, 1956, p. 1)." The counselor or therapist is presumed to furnish many of the categories that give both normative order and content to the counseling or therapy situation.

As was mentioned, words may represent various referents--objects, events, experiences, etc. In counseling or psychotherapy the communication between the counselor or therapist and his client often involves discussions of experiences, rather than descriptions of objects, etc. As various personality theorists have suggested, particular difficulties may arise in talking about experiences, since, as Rapoport (1950) states: "Experience cannot be transmitted as experience; it must first be translated into something else. It is that something else which is transmitted (p. 42)." Difficulties may arise in this "translation" in

that the client may not have a suitable label for the experiences, or client and therapist may define the meanings of the labels in different ways. In both cases communication, either intrapersonal or interpersonal, is not likely to be successful. The problem of defining the meanings of words used then becomes apparent.

Revised use of a word or label, which refers to or describes an experience, is likely to be more "efficient:" that is, a description that formerly has taken many words to convey its meaning, now may be communicated with a single term. It has become highly "codable (Brown, 1965)" within the "linguistic community" of counseling or therapy. Brown also notes that the "codability" of a word varies directly with the frequency of its use within a linguistic community.

It has been stated there is no necessary connection between words and their referents--that words acquire their meanings according to their usage. Usage, then, serves to define the meaning of the word, either explicitly or implicitly. Rapoport (1950) mentions several ways in which words are commonly defined: by synonyms, by classification, by enumeration, by example, and by operational definition. Any or all of these ways may be used within counseling or therapy or in any other context involving communication. "A definition is used to answer the question 'What do you mean?'--a request to share experiences (Rapoport, 1950, p. 54)." It may be assumed therefore that persons seeking psychological treatment often suffer from difficulties in communication, and a major task which the counselor or therapist may perform (in verbal counseling or psychotherapy) is to help his client

acquire a more adequate language system (in the counselor's or therapist's view), through which the client can communicate better about his experiences. The client is expected to adopt meanings that his counselor or therapist attaches to certain words in the psycho-therapeutic interaction. The revised meanings, if adopted by the client, should also be regarded by him as more adequate for his purposes.

Communicator Expertness

Research evidence suggests that social influence plays an important role in bringing about attitude and behavior change. Particularly, the credibility of the communicator is seen to affect a recipient's interpretation of oral or written messages. Communicator credibility is discussed by Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (1953) in terms of expertness: "the extent to which a communicator is perceived to be a source of valid assertions (p. 21)," and trustworthiness: "the degree of confidence in the communicator's intent to communicate the assertions he considers most valid (p. 21)." Secord and Backman (1964) also discuss communicator credibility in terms of expertness and trustworthiness. These authors specify that expertness "may derive from special training or education, from experience, and from somewhat more general attributes such as age, position, or social background (p. 128)." After reviewing a number of factor-analytic studies on communicator credibility, Giffin (1967) reports credibility to be most often discussed in terms of the listener's perceptions of the communicator's expertness, reliability, intentions, activeness, personal attractiveness, and the majority opinion of the listener's associates.

Research indicates that there will be more opinion change in the direction advocated by the communicator when he is perceived as highly credible than when he is seen to have low credibility (cf. Abelson, 1959; Cohen, 1964; Goldstein, Heller, & Sechrest, 1966; Secord & Backman, 1964). For example, Kelman and Hovland (1953) had groups of high school students listen to tape recordings of three different speakers advocating the same policy of extreme leniency in the treatment of juvenile delinquents. The speakers were identified as a judge in the juvenile court ("high credibility"), a member of the studio audience ("neutral credibility"), and a former delinquent still involved in doubtful practices ("negative credibility"). The first speaker was believed to be most trustworthy and was more effective in changing opinions than was the second, and the second was more trusted and effective in changing opinions than the third. Hovland and Weiss (1951) obtained similar results with written materials attributed to sources of high and low credibility. Their subjects read identical written communications, but with authorship attributed to sources judged as either highly trustworthy or untrustworthy (e.g., J. Robert Oppenheimer versus Pravda). Change in attitudes in the direction advocated by the communication was greater when the communication was believed to have originated from a highly credible source than when it originated from a source of low credibility. In an experimental situation made to resemble that of psychotherapy Bergin (1962) found subjects to exhibit greater changes on a self-rating scale of masculinity-femininity when such change was advocated by a highly credible communicator (a psychologist) than when confronted by a communicator of low

credibility (a high school student). Cohen (1964) summarizes several such studies dealing with the credibility of the communicator in effecting changes in attitudes or opinions: "The data from these different experiments show with reasonably good agreement that variations in the credibility of the communicator do indeed determine variations in attitude change: the greater the trustworthiness or expertness, the greater the change toward the position advocated by the communicator (p. 29)."

The effect of the communicator's credibility on the recipient's interpretation of the meanings of messages is dealt with in a study by Asch (1952). Asch presented two groups of subjects with a written statement by Thomas Jefferson advocating rebellion. One group was told that Jefferson was the author; the other group was informed that Lenin had written it. As expected, the subjects responded with more favorable evaluations when the statement was attributed to Jefferson. The subjects were then asked to write statements as to what the quoted passage meant, and it was found that the change in authorship seemed to change the meaning of the words used in the statement. In discussing these results, Asch makes the point that change in authorship served to change the meaning of the statement rather than merely influencing opinions about the statement. The meaning of any utterance depends upon its context, and the source of the utterance is revealed to be highly relevant context.

Cognitive Balance

The foregoing discussion implies that persons tend toward consistency in responding to situation, which response Secord and

Backman (1964) note as "...one of the prevailing characteristics of human thought and behavior... (p. 109)." Several cognitive consistency theories have been formulated in recent years. As McGuire (1966) states: "These were proposed under various names (balance, congruity, symmetry, dissonance, etc.) but had in common the notion that the person tends to behave in ways that minimize internal inconsistency among his interpersonal relations, among his intrapersonal cognitions, or among his beliefs, feelings, and actions (p. 1)."

Current consistency theories were strongly influenced by Heider's (1946) article on attitudes and cognitive organization. In that paper Heider first presented his p (person), o (other person), x (object) triad, in which relationships between p, o, and x could be characterized as balanced or imbalanced, according to the signs or links between the individual elements. In this framework triads are considered balanced if all signs are positive (e.g., if p likes o, o likes x, and p likes x), or if two signs are negative and one is positive (e.g., if p dislikes o, o likes x, and p dislikes x). All other conditions would be considered as imbalanced for the actor. Heider (1958) distinguishes affective liking and disliking ("L" or "DL") from unit relations--ownership, similarity, proximity, etc. ("U" or "not U"). Heider's balance formulations have been applied primarily to situations involving interpersonal relations. Newcomb, whose work will be discussed in greater detail below, has applied balance principles first proposed by Heider to situations involving active communication between persons (cf. Newcomb, 1953).

Abelson and Rosenberg (1958) have also presented a balance theory, but one which applies primarily to intrapersonal cognitive systems. These authors posit four relations among cognitive elements (positive, negative, null, and ambivalent), and specify structural matrices upon which the relations among an individual's cognitive elements may be symbolized (Insko, 1967). Within their system, it is then possible to classify these matrices as balanced or imbalanced. The authors suggest ways in which imbalance may be resolved: by changing one or more of the relations, by redefining or differentiating among the elements, or by ceasing to think about the inconsistency (Insko, 1967). However, they do not specify which method or methods of resolution will be used in any particular situation.

Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955), on the other hand, predict specific outcomes of disequilibrium or incongruity. Their congruity model deals with pairs of objects or attitudes, which are represented on a seven point scale ranging from +3 to -3. If two attitudes differing in evaluation are linked by an assertion, pressure toward congruity is calculated according to the relative positions of the two attitudes on the scale.

The brief descriptions of the cognitive consistency theories cited above are presented to underline some of the similarities and differences among current theoretical formulations. In the present investigation particular attention is paid to Newcomb's (1953, 1956, 1959, 1961, 1968) formulations, because he has been most concerned with the applicability of his theory to situations involving

interpersonal communication. Newcomb discusses "orientation" both toward co-communicators, called attractions, and toward objects of communication, called attitudes. He deals with "systems" or orientations, consisting of A (the communicator), B (the co-communicator), and X (the object of communication).¹

While Heider is primarily concerned with the signs in determining balance or imbalance, Newcomb also considers intensities as well as signs of the orientations as determinants of balance. Recently (1968) he has reclassified the possible statuses within the communication system, labeling them as positively balanced, positively imbalanced, and nonbalanced. These designations are dependent upon the positions of the signs within the triad. A system may be said to be positively balanced for A (communicator) if (1) A is positively "attracted" (attraction is not assumed to be synonymous with "liking") to B (co-communicator) and perceives that they hold similar positive attitudes toward X (object of communication), and if (2) A is positively attracted to B and perceives that they hold similar negative attitudes toward X. Positively imbalanced systems would include those in which A is positively attracted to B and A and B differ in their perceived attitudes toward X. Situations in which A is negatively attracted to B are considered nonbalanced. Positively imbalanced sets of cognitive elements are characterized by strain in the system. In order to restore positive balance, A is motivated to

¹In his most recent discussion of interpersonal balance, Newcomb (1968) reverts to Heider's p, o, x designation.

change his attitude toward X, or to re-interpret his perception of B's attitude toward X. In a nonbalanced situation, however, such strain toward restoring balance cannot necessarily be said to exist, since A may be relatively indifferent to the situation (Newcomb, 1968).

The relationships between communicator expertness and changes of word meanings in psychological treatment situations seems readily understandable in terms of Newcomb's balance formulations. Although he does not directly discuss response to a communicator's expertness, Newcomb (1958) does discuss respect, which is defined in terms of A's perceptions of B's knowledgeability, skill, and expertness in regard to the object of communication. Respect is always considered as a positive aspect of attraction. Thus, any communication system involving degrees of A's respect for B must be classified as either positively balanced or positively imbalanced.

In a communication system consisting of two co-communicators and an object of communication, the object of communication, according to Newcomb (1961, 1968), must be assumed by A to be of common relevance to A and B. That is, in order for A, B, and X (the object) to constitute a system, the nature of X has to be such that A perceives its effects for both A and B. Newcomb (1961, 1968) gives the example of two men adrift on a life raft in mid-ocean. In this instance, it is assumed that each man regards the raft as essential to their joint survival. The raft is thus regarded by each as high in common relevance. In the present investigation the meanings of certain words used in the verbal interaction between the two communicators are regarded

as objects of common relevance, important to A in terms of ease of communication in future contacts between A and B. Newcomb has not dealt with the meanings of words as objects of communication. In the present instance they are considered as aspects of the two communicators' orientations, although many investigators would prefer to label such orientations as beliefs, rather than attitudes (cf. Fishbein, 1963). With these deviations from the conditions stipulated by Newcomb, it still seems that his balance theory may be drawn upon as a source of predictions about relationships between communicator expertness and the meanings of words used in psychological treatment.

Confidence

Confidence has been discussed by Newcomb (1953) in relation to the orientations of the two communicators toward objects of mutual interest: "...the more similar A's and B's orientations, either cognitive or cathectic (particularly in many areas where validation is heavily dependent upon 'social reality'), the more confident each of them can be of his own cognitive and evaluative orientations (p. 395)." Similarly, Festinger, in his theory of social comparison processes (1954), suggests that subjective feelings of correctness of one's own opinions are derived from comparison with those of other persons. Using confidence as a dependent variable, Festinger et al. (1952) found that conformers in a group reported greater confidence in their own opinions than did deviates in the group in a situation where perceptions of conformity or deviance were experimentally manipulated. "Conformity" as used by Festinger et al. (1952) is taken to be

generally equivalent to Newcomb's (1953) "similarity of orientations" between two communicators.

General Propositions

The previous sections state that counseling or psychotherapy provide for social influence by the counselor or therapist to effect change in the behavior of the client. Persons seeking psychological treatment often suffer from difficulties in intrapersonal and/or interpersonal communication. Treating a presumed communication deficit in his client, the counselor or therapist may act to help the client to acquire a more adequate language system (in the counselor's or therapist's view), which the client may then employ to communicate about his experiences. This new language system provides new or different meanings (that is, word-referent relationships) for words already in the client's vocabulary. The client should tend to adopt these new meanings, since they should appear more adequate to that situation than meanings formerly assumed by the client.

Research evidence has been presented which suggests that the more credible the communicator, the more likely the recipient will be to interpret messages in the manner advocated by the communicator. Viewed in light of changes of the meanings of words used in counseling or therapy, and in terms of expertness as a more specifiable dimension of credibility, it should follow that a client will be more likely to adopt word-referent relationships advocated by a highly expert counselor-communicator, and be less likely to adopt such relationships when advocated by a less expert counselor.

It has been assumed that the more similar two communicators are in their perceived orientations toward an object of mutual interest, the more confident will each be of his own orientations. Applied to the present concern with word meanings in psychological treatment, it is assumed that the more similar the client perceives his word meanings are to the meanings used by the counselor, the more confident will the client be of his own ability to use particular words appropriately.

Several predictions can be made based on Newcomb's (1953, 1956, 1959, 1961, 1968) balance formulations. A situation in which a subject encounters a communicator who is seen to be relatively expert and who advocates definitions for certain words that are different from the subject's own definitions would be classified as positively imbalanced. Since strain toward balance, according to Newcomb (1961), is dependent upon both the signs and intensities of the relationships among the elements of the communication system, a subject confronted with a highly imbalanced situation should be strongly motivated to modify his orientations in order to restore the equilibrium. It is predicted therefore that (1) a subject confronted with a communicator who advocates word definitions that differ from those initially chosen by the subject as most appropriate, will be more likely to adopt the word-referent relationships advocated by a more highly than a less highly expert communicator. Definitions formerly held by the subject to be most appropriate will appear less appropriate after the subject has been exposed to the more highly expert communicator's definitions.

A situation in which a highly expert communicator advocates the same definitions as those initially selected by the subject as most appropriate should be considered positively balanced, so that little or no strain is assumed to exist in this system. Any changes in orientations on the subject's part should occur in the direction of even greater balance. In such formally balanced situations it is predicted that (2) a subject who encounters a communicator who advocates word definitions that are the same as the subject's definitions will subsequently consider these definitions as even more appropriate when the communicator is seen to be more rather than less expert. Definitions which were initially judged as least appropriate by the subject will appear to be even less appropriate after he has been exposed to the definitions advocated by a more rather than less expert communicator.

The subject's confidence in his ability to use particular words appropriately should be directly related to the similarity which the subject perceives between his definitions and those of the communicator. The communicator's expertness also should influence the subject's confidence in his use of the words. The prediction is made that (3) a subject exposed to a relatively expert communicator who advocates definitions for certain words that are the same as the subject's initial definitions will be more confident of his own ability to use these words appropriately than will subjects in the other conditions described above.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Sixty-four male Ss participated in the experiment. All were undergraduates at the Ohio State University, and all were enrolled in an introductory psychology course during the 1968 Winter quarter. These students participated in the experiment as partial fulfillment of an introductory psychology course requirement. They ranged in age from 18 through 26, with a mean age of 19. To control for possible effects of sex only male Ss and confederates were used.

Experimental Setting

The study was conducted in the Ohio State University's Behavioral Sciences Laboratory. All interviews were held in rooms equipped with two-way reversible mirrors and sound monitoring equipment. The experimenter observed all 64 interviews through the two-way mirror from an adjoining observation room.

Selection and Training of Counselor-Confederates

Two male graduate students in Counseling Psychology at the Ohio State University were selected to serve as counselor-confederates in the experiment. Each confederate had completed his Master's degree and was working toward his Ph.D. Each had had considerable counseling

experience, working in various professional settings with a broad range of clientele. Persons selected were screened in interviews by the E to determine their interest and availability for participation in the research, as well as their ability and willingness to play the roles of counselors of higher and lower expertness.

The confederates were given specific instructions on how to behave and what to say during the interviews (Appendix B-1). To provide experience in the higher and lower expertness roles training and practice sessions were held with the two confederates. They also gained experience with actual Ss during pilot research.

Procedure

Each S had been led to expect that he would participate in research on "communication in counseling." He was met in the lobby of the Laboratory by the E and taken to an interviewing room. In a standard script for all interviews which E followed (Appendix B-2), S was told that the present research was part of a much larger research project whose purpose was to develop teaching methods for training counselors in effective communication. It has been found that observed counseling sessions had proved to be the most effective teaching technique. While it was not difficult to find actual counselors to participate in the sessions to be observed, it was more difficult to find suitable "clients." Therefore, the E was looking for persons to play the roles of clients. The E stated that amateurs, particularly students, were found to be preferable to professional actors, since the former seemed to have greater "insight" into the kinds of problems

most often encountered by college counselors. The present research was thus a kind of "tryout," and that Ss able to communicate effectively with the counselor would likely be given another opportunity to meet with the same counselor in the near future, for which the S would receive additional credit. These sessions were to be observed by counselors-in-training. This possibility of future meetings with the counselor was intended to suggest to the S that the content of the interview would be of common relevance in terms of subsequent contacts (cf. Newcomb, 1961, 1968).

The S was asked to complete a Communication Effectiveness Inventory-1 (Appendix A-1), which was presented as an instrument to help assess how likely S and counselor would be to communicate effectively. To induce a belief on the S's part about the counselor-confederate's expertise, the E orally presented the counselor's credentials (Appendix B-2). Next S was given a list of Suggested Discussion Topics (Appendix A-2), derived from areas mentioned on The Mooney Problem Check Lists (Mooney & Gordon, 1950), and was told that he was free to draw upon the topics listed for subject matter in order to play the role of a client. The S was assured that the counselor would treat the interview as if it were a real counseling session, though he would know, of course, that the S was role-playing. Anything said during the interview, or during future sessions was to be kept in strict confidence.

The E left the interviewing room and went to a nearby office where the counselor-confederate was waiting. The E informed him of the

experimental condition to which the S had been randomly assigned. It was necessary to do this since the counselor-confederate's rehearsed speeches and behaviors differed for the four conditions (Appendix B-1). Then the counselor was given a sheet of paper on which were listed three psychological terms and their defining synonyms, to be introduced by him into the interview as experimental manipulations. Three undefined psychological terms were also listed on the sheet, to be used in the interview. The E accompanied the counselor to the interviewing room, and introduced him to the S.

The S and the counselor were left alone for a 15 to 20 minute interview. To add credence to the counselor's introduction of the manipulated terms, the situation was made to appear similar to a test interpretation task in which the counselor compared his own responses to those of the S on the Communication Effectiveness Inventory. The counselor then discussed whatever the S wished to talk about. During the course of the interview the counselor mentioned, but did not define, the three psychological terms which were not accompanied by synonyms. These were spoken only once by the counselor during the course of the conversation, and no special attention was drawn to them. In all cases the counselor followed the format prescribed in the interview instructions (Appendix B-1).

Just prior to the close of the interview the counselor informed the S that the time was about up. He told the S that he had enjoyed talking with him, and felt that if they were to get together in the future, they would have a good chance of communicating effectively.

The counselor stated that this would be particularly true if they were aware of how each of them defined the psychological terms they would be likely to use. The counselor then repeated the same three terms and their defining synonyms which had been mentioned at the beginning of the interview. These terms were repeated to ensure that the S was aware of the counselor's stated preferences, so that if the S were to modify his original choices he would be certain of the counselor's preference.

At the close of the interview the E re-entered the interviewing room, and the counselor departed. The E immediately administered the postinterview questionnaires. The E told the S that he needed to get some further information on communication effectiveness. The S first filled out the Communication Effectiveness Inventory (2) (Appendix A-3), followed by the Interview Rating Scale booklet (Appendix A-4). This latter instrument was intended as a check on procedure. It contained rating scales concerned with the S's reactions to the counselor, the S's perceptions of the counselor's definitions of the psychological terms, and a check on his perceptions of the common relevance of the terms.

Debriefing

Following the administration of the postinterview questionnaires, each S was asked about his reactions to the experiment (Appendix B-3). The S was encouraged to voice his comments and perceptions of what was going on. Apparently, no S was able to identify correctly the experimental purpose that his work had served.

The S then was informed as to the purpose of the study, and how every instrument and manipulation had contributed to the experiment. He was encouraged to voice further reactions, comments, or questions. At the close of the debriefing session the S agreed not to mention the content of the experiment to anyone for the duration of the study. There was no indication that subsequent Ss had been previously informed about the research. Finally, the E mentioned the name and location of a counseling service available on the campus, and offered to help make an appointment for counseling if the S were interested.

Independent Variables

Counselor expertness

Expertness was selected as an explicit dimension of "communicator credibility." Since expertness is partially determined by special education and training (cf. Secord & Backman, 1964), counselor-confederates under high and low expertness conditions were given different academic and professional credentials, composed by the author. These sets of fictitious credentials contained information concerning the counselor's educational history, awards, publications, work experience and academic position (Appendix B-2). The same sets of credentials were used for both counselor-confederates, in each of the high and low expertness conditions. These sets of credentials were pretested with introductory psychology students during the pilot studies. On the basis of oral comments and reactions from the students minor revisions were made in order to make the credentials as convincing as possible.

In addition to the academic and professional credentials, certain counselor behaviors were specified as appropriate to each of the high and low expertness roles (Appendix B-1). On the basis of reactions elicited from Ss in the pilot studies a revision of specified behaviors could also be made. To standardize dress in both the high and low expertness roles, the counselors wore a suit or a sports jacket and slacks, a dress shirt, and a tie.

Advocated change

The meanings of the psychological terms which were used were defined through the use of synonyms (cf. Rapoport, 1950). Six psychological terms, each accompanied by five "possible definitions" (synonyms) to be rated as more or less appropriate, were used in determining the specific independent variable manipulations. Particularly, if the S were assigned to a "change not advocated" condition in which the counselor and the S presumably shared the same definitions for certain terms, the E selected one synonym rated highest ("most appropriate") by the S for each of three psychological terms from the Communication Effectiveness Inventory-1. If the assignment were to an "advocated change" condition in which the counselor and the S presumably differed in their definitions for certain terms, the E likewise picked three psychological terms from the Inventory. But E defined each of these terms by choosing the one synonym to which the S had given the lowest rating. The same three psychological terms were not chosen for all Ss. Instead, an attempt was made by the E to select terms with a particularly high rating for only one synonym and a

particularly low rating for only one synonym. After the assignment of psychological terms and their defining synonyms was made, the counselor was instructed to present these pairs to the S as if they were the counselor's own preferences (Appendix B-1).

Psychological terms were chosen as the words to be defined because their use would appear to students as appropriate and expected within a counseling interview. The final group of six psychological terms was selected from pilot materials administered to 100 undergraduate males enrolled in an educational skills course at the Ohio State University during the Autumn quarter, 1967. These students were presented with 22 psychological terms and the synonyms which were used to define them. The psychological terms and their synonyms were originally selected by the author from a dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms (English & English, 1958), and from a standard college-level dictionary. Each psychological term was accompanied by five synonyms, presented as "possible definitions" of the term. The students were asked to rate these synonyms (on individual 13 point scales) as more or less appropriate for defining each psychological term. The means were computed for the rating of the synonyms for each of the 22 psychological terms. It was desirable to choose a smaller number of terms for which Ss could be expected to rate one of the possible definitions as extremely appropriate (a high score), and one as extremely inappropriate (a low score). Therefore, the differences between the means of the pairs of synonyms rated highest and lowest for each of the 22 terms were computed. When these were arranged in descending order (Appendix C, Table 31), the six terms

with the highest difference scores were selected to be incorporated into the final Inventory.

Dependent Variables

The main dependent variable is the change in word definitions made by the S from his initial responses to those made after the counselor's intervention. Changes in the S's initial to final ratings of his confidence in his ability to use the psychological terms appropriately is also treated as a dependent event.

To assess changes in word definitions and in confidence ratings, inventories (Appendix A-1 & 3) were administered to the S before and after his confrontation with the counselor. The inventories contained the aforementioned six psychological terms, each with five synonyms to be rated as more or less appropriate, derived from the original sample of 22 terms (Appendix C, Table 31). The S also was required to rate (on a 13 point scale) his confidence in his ability to use each term appropriately. The confidence scales also were administered to the pretest group. Ss in the pretest group were asked to rate their familiarity with each psychological term. This rating scale was not included in the final inventories, since Ss in that group evidenced familiarity with the six terms finally selected ($M = 10.16$, on a 13 point scale).

Changes in word meanings

Prior to encountering the counselor-confederate, the S was presented with the Communication Effectiveness Inventory - 1, which included, he was told, psychological terms "commonly used" in

counseling. Each term was followed by five synonyms to be rated as more or less appropriate for defining the psychological term. During the interview the counselor defined three of the six psychological terms by the use of one synonym as the definition for each of the three terms. The same group of six psychological terms was administered to the S following his interview with the counselor (Communication Effectiveness Inventory - 2). The S's initial selections of the least and most appropriate definitions for the three terms defined by the counselor were observed. Difference between pre- and postinterview ratings of these definitions is used as a dependent measure.

Changes in ratings of confidence

For each of the six psychological terms presented to the S in the pre- and postinterview inventories a 13 point scale was included on which he was asked to rate his confidence in his ability to use the particular psychological terms appropriately. Difference between the pre- and postinterview ratings of confidence for the three terms defined by the counselor is used as a dependent measure of the S's confidence.

Design

In the experiment three main effects were tested in a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design: counselors, advocated change, and expertness.

Experimental Conditions

Predictions tested are based upon four experimental conditions:

B_1C_1 - High expertness/Advocated change

B_1C_2 - Low expertness/Advocated change

B_2C_1 - High expertness/Change not advocated

B_2C_2 - Low expertness/Change not advocated

Hypotheses

- 1.1 Under the high expertness/advocated change condition, for the three terms defined by the counselors, Ss' ratings of synonyms initially given the lowest ratings (i.e., judged least appropriate) by Ss will be changed more in the direction of higher ratings than those of Ss under the low expertness/advocated change condition.
- 1.2 Under the high expertness/advocated change condition, for the three terms defined by the counselors, Ss' ratings of synonyms initially given the highest ratings (i.e., judged most appropriate) by Ss will be changed more in the direction of lower ratings than those of Ss under the low expertness/advocated change condition.
- 2.1 Under the high expertness/change not advocated condition, for the three terms defined by the counselors, Ss' ratings of synonyms initially given the highest ratings (i.e., judged most appropriate) by Ss will be changed more in the direction of higher ratings than those of Ss under the low expertness/change not advocated condition.
- 2.2 Under the high expertness/change not advocated condition, for the three terms defined by the counselors, Ss' ratings of synonyms initially given the lowest ratings (i.e., judged least appropriate) by Ss will be changed more in the direction of lower

ratings than those of Ss under the low expertness/change not advocated condition.

3. Under the high expertness/change not advocated condition, for the three terms defined by the counselors, Ss' ratings of confidence will be changed more in the direction of higher ratings than those of Ss under the other three experimental conditions.

Analysis of Data

Data for the 64 Ss were analyzed, with eight Ss in each of the eight experimental conditions. To test predicted effects of the experimental manipulations upon dependent measure scores, an analysis of variance program for replicated and non-replicated designs, devised by Naylor and Estep (1965), was used to determine the main and interaction effects. In addition, the program was used to obtain difference tables that permitted an ordered arrangement of all means associated with each variable or combination of variables.

Analyses of the following dependent measures were made: (1) of increase or decrease in the total score for the most appropriate definitions of the three defined terms, from S's initial to final ratings; (2) of increase or decrease in total score for the least appropriate definitions of the three defined terms, from S's initial to final ratings; (3) of increase or decrease in S's rating of confidence in his ability to use the three defined terms appropriately, from initial to final ratings. Similar analyses were performed on the procedural check items. These results will be discussed in the following chapter.

The major test of each hypothesis was an F test to determine predicted main or interaction effects. When the F was significant, a comparison of all means was also required. The latter analysis was made by means of the Newman-Keuls test, which determines the significance of the difference between any two means in an order set (Winer, 1962).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Procedural Checks

Prior to analyzing the dependent measures, a procedural check was made on the Ss' reactions to the expertness manipulation. It should be recalled that the Ss completed the Interview Rating Scale (Appendix A-4) after responding to the Communication Effectiveness Inventory-2 (Appendix A-3). Both of these instruments were administered immediately after each S's encounter with the counselor-confederate. Of primary interest is the third item, which asked each S to rate the counselor's expertness on a 13 point scale ranging from "extremely inexpert" to "extremely expert." As described in the previous chapter two discrete groups, labeled "high expertness" and "low expertness" were used, with beliefs about the counselor's expertness induced through the use of credentials, and through specific counselor behaviors in the interview. Ss in the high expertness condition (C_1) who responded with ratings of seven or below on the 13 point scale were eliminated from the analysis because it could not be assumed that they perceived the counselor as highly expert. Likewise, Ss in the low expertness condition (C_2) who responded with ratings of seven or above on the scale were also eliminated since it could not be assumed that they

perceived the counselor as low in expertness. Use of the criteria for judging the effectiveness of the expertness manipulation a total of 16 Ss were eliminated, leaving a final sample of 64 Ss. The 16 Ss who were eliminated came from the experimental conditions indicated in Table 1.

TABLE 1
SUBJECTS ELIMINATED FROM THE FINAL SAMPLE

Advocated Change (B)	Expertness (C)	
	C ₁	C ₂
B ₁	0	3
B ₂	3	10

Using Fisher's exact test (Siegel, 1956) it is found that the assumption of the probability of these frequencies occurring by chance would be rejected ($p < .05$). No additional Ss were excluded from the analysis.

As mentioned, the first page of the Interview Rating Scale (Appendix A-1) consisted of five items, each on a 13 point scale, eliciting the S's reactions to the counselor. On each scale the higher ratings represented a more favorable evaluation of the counselor. Item 3, phrased "As far as you can tell, how expert is this counselor in his field?" was used as the check on the expertness induction procedure. The analysis of variance of the results of this check on procedure is presented in Table 2. These results suggest that the expertness induction was successful for the 64 Ss. The difference

TABLE 2
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PROCEDURAL
CHECK ON EXPERTNESS

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	.77	
Advocated Change (B)	1	.77	
Expertness (C)	1	546.39	236.96***
AxB	1	.77	
AxC	1	.14	
BxC	1	3.52	1.52
Error	56	2.31	

*** $p < .001$

TABLE 3
COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE
PROCEDURAL CHECK ON EXPERTNESS

High Expertness	Low Expertness	Diff.	F	p
M = 10.38	M = 4.53	5.85	236.96	.001

between means for the Ss in the two expertness conditions is significant at the .001 level. Particularly in the low expertness condition, Ss seemed less willing to respond with extremely low ratings. This is consistent with the finding that 13 of the 16 Ss eliminated from the sample were originally in the low expertness conditions, suggesting that Ss were hesitant to express negative reactions to the counselors.

Avoidance of extremely low ratings of the counselors is further reflected in the Ss' reactions to the remaining four items on the first part of the Interview Rating Scale. Item 4 asked each S how well he liked the counselor. As shown in Table 4 there is a significant main

effect on the expertness variable, indicating that the Ss like the counselors more under the high expertness condition than under the low expertness condition.

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PROCEDURAL
CHECK ON LIKING

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	3.52	
Advocated Change (B)	1	4.52	1.03
Expertness (C)	1	31.64	7.20**
AxB	1	1.27	
AxC	1	23.77	5.41*
BxC	1	.77	
Error	56	4.40	

** $p < .01$

* $p < .05$

TABLE 5
COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE
PROCEDURAL CHECK ON LIKING

High Expertness	Low Expertness	Diff.	F	p
M = 10.88	M = 9.47	1.41	7.20	.01

The difference between means (Table 5) is significant. In addition to the significant main effect of expertness, a significant interaction between the counselor effect (A) and the expertness effect (C) is also found ($F_{AC} = 5.41$, $p < .05$). These data are presented in Table 6. In Table 6 the difference between the mean of 8.63 (A_2C_2)

TABLE 6

COMPARISONS BETWEEN MEANS ON THE CCOUNSELOR-
EXPERTNESS INTERACTION (AC)

		$\overline{A_2C_2}$	$\overline{A_1C_2}$	$\overline{A_1C_1}$	$\overline{A_2C_1}$
Ordered Means:		8.63	10.31	10.50	11.25
Differences	$\overline{A_2C_2}$		1.68*	1.87*	2.62**
	$\overline{A_1C_2}$		.00	.19	.94
	$\overline{A_1C_1}$			.00	.75
	$\overline{A_2C_1}$				.00

** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

and 11.25 (A_2C_1) is significant. This indicates counselor no. 2 to have been successful in eliciting significantly different ratings under the two conditions of expertness. The means of 10.50 (A_1C_1) and 10.31 (A_1C_2) are both significantly different ($p < .05$) from 8.63 (A_2C_2), which indicates that ratings elicited by counselor no. 1 under both the high and low expertness conditions were significantly higher than those elicited by counselor no. 2 under the low expertness condition (A_2C_2). Since the difference between the means for A_1C_2 and A_1C_1 is not significant, it cannot be concluded that the Ss responded to counselor no. 1 with significantly higher ratings under the high expertness condition than under the low expertness condition.

On item 5, which asked each S how willing he would be to see the same counselor in the future for further counseling, similar results are obtained. Again there is a significant main effect on

the expertness variable, indicating that the Ss were more willing to see the counselors under the high expertness condition than under the low expertness condition. The analysis of variance of these results is presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PROCEDURAL CHECK ON
THE SS' WILLINGNESS TO SEE THE COUNSELOR AGAIN

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	5.64	
Advocated Change (B)	1	3.52	
Expertness (C)	1	223.77	21.30***
AxB	1	11.39	1.96
AxC	1	26.27	4.52*
BxC	1	6.89	1.19
Error	56	5.81	

*** $p < .001$

* $p < .05$

TABLE 8

COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE PROCEDURAL CHECK ON
THE SS' WILLINGNESS TO SEE THE COUNSELOR AGAIN

High Expertness	Low Expertness	Diff.	F	<u>p</u>
M = 11.09	M = 8.31	2.78	21.30	.001

The difference between means is again significant. Ss who encountered highly expert counselors reported significantly greater willingness to see these counselors for further counseling than did Ss who met with the less expert counselors. As with item 4 (liking), in addition to the significant main effect on the expertness variable, there is also a significant interaction between the counselor effect (A) and

the expertness effect (C), ($F_{AC} = 4.52, p < .05$). These data are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9
COMPARISONS BETWEEN MEANS ON THE COUNSELOR-
EXPERTNESS INTERACTION (AC)

	$\overline{A_2C_2}$	$\overline{A_1C_2}$	$\overline{A_1C_1}$	$\overline{A_2C_1}$
Ordered Means:	7.38	9.25	10.75	11.44
$\overline{A_2C_2}$		1.87*	3.37*	4.06**
$\overline{A_1C_2}$		.00	1.50	2.19*
$\overline{A_1C_1}$			.00	.69
$\overline{A_2C_1}$				.00

** $p < .01$

* $p < .05$

In Table 9 the difference between the mean of 7.38 ($\overline{A_2C_2}$) and 11.44 ($\overline{A_2C_1}$) is significant. As with the results for item 4 ("Liking," Table 6), these data reveal counselor no. 2 to have been successful in eliciting significantly different ratings under the two expertness conditions. Also similar to the results for item 4, the means for $\overline{A_1C_2}$ (9.25) and $\overline{A_1C_1}$ (10.75) are both significantly different ($p < .05$) from the mean for $\overline{A_2C_2}$ (7.38), but not significantly different from each other. These findings show ratings elicited by counselor no. 1 under both the high and low expertness conditions to be significantly higher than those elicited by counselor no. 2 under the low expertness condition. The results again indicate that the Ss did not respond to counselor no. 1 with significantly higher ratings under the

high expertness condition than under the low expertness condition. The data also reveal that the mean for A_1C_2 (9.25) is significantly different ($p < .05$) from the mean for A_2C_1 (11.44). Counselor no. 2 is seen to have elicited significantly higher ratings under the high expertness condition than counselor no. 1 under the low expertness condition.

The responses on item 1 proved to be similar to those yielded on items 4 and 5. Item 1 asked, "How effectively did the counselor communicate with you?" As with the items previously reported expertness has a significant main effect, indicating counselors under the high expertness condition to have communicated more effectively than did counselors under the low expertness condition. The analysis of variance of these results is presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE FIRST PROCEDURAL
CHECK ON COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	4.00	
Advocated Change (B)	1	3.06	
Expertness (C)	1	232.56	53.21***
AxB	1	.06	
AxC	1	33.06	7.56**
BxC	1	.00	
Error	56	4.37	

*** $p < .001$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 11
COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE FIRST PROCEDURAL
CHECK ON COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS

High Expertness	Low Expertness	Diff.	F	p
M = 10.47	M = 6.66	3.81	53.21	.001

In addition to the significant difference between means (Table 11) there is also a significant interaction between counselor (A) and expertness (C) effects. A further analysis of these data is presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12
COMPARISONS BETWEEN MEANS ON THE COUNSELOR-
EXPERTNESS INTERACTION (AC)

		$\overline{A_2 C_2}$	$\overline{A_1 C_2}$	$\overline{A_1 C_1}$	$\overline{A_2 C_1}$
Ordered Means:		5.69	7.63	10.00	10.94
	$\overline{A_2 C_2}$		1.94*	4.31**	5.25**
	$\overline{A_1 C_2}$		.00	2.37**	3.31**
Differences:	$\overline{A_1 C_1}$			.00	.94
	$\overline{A_2 C_1}$				.00

**p<.01

*p<.05

Here there are similarities to the results on items 4 and 5, the difference between the mean for $\overline{A_2 C_2}$ and $\overline{A_2 C_1}$ being significant. In contrast to the previous results, however, the means for $\overline{A_1 C_2}$ and $\overline{A_1 C_1}$ are significantly different. Counselor no. 1, it appears, was also

successful in eliciting significantly different ratings under the two conditions of expertness. The means for A_1C_2 and A_1C_1 are each significantly different from A_2C_2 , which implies that although counselor no. 1 was able to elicit significantly different ratings under the two expertness conditions, his ratings received under both of these conditions were significantly higher than those elicited by counselor no. 2 under the low expertness condition. Counselor no. 2's mean of 10.94 under the high expertness condition (A_2C_1) is also significantly different from counselor no. 1's mean of 7.63 under the low expertness condition (A_1C_2).

Item 2, also used as a procedural check on communication effectiveness, was stated more generally, "As far as you can tell, how effectively would this counselor communicate with other students?" Again expertness has a significant main effect: the Ss saw the counselors under the high expertness condition as better able to communicate effectively with other students than the counselors under the low expertness condition. The analysis of variance of these findings is presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE SECOND PROCEDURAL
CHECK ON COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	1.00	
Advocated Change (B)	1	7.56	1.74
Expertness (C)	1	225.00	57.75***
AxB	1	6.25	1.44
AxC	1	3.06	
BxC	1	1.00	
Error	56	4.35	

*** $p < .001$

TABLE 14

COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE SECOND PROCEDURAL
CHECK ON COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS

High Expertness	Low Expertness	Diff.	F	p
M = 10.53	M = 6.78	3.75	51.75	.001

The significant difference between means (Table 14) suggests counselors under the high expertness condition to have been seen by the Ss as better able to communicate effectively with other students than were the counselors under the low expertness condition. In contrast with the results for items 1, 4, and 5 no significant interactions are found for this item. Perhaps this is because item 2 was stated in more general terms. Since the item was less personally relevant to each S, he may have been less sensitized to the counselors' individual differences.

On the basis of these results it is evident that Ss' reactions to the counselors' performance were strongly influenced by the expertness manipulation. Under the high expertness condition significantly higher ratings were obtained for all of these items. Ss did respond differentially to the two counselors on the first, fourth, and fifth items, with significant interactions between expertness and counselor effects.

Either there is a strong degree of relationship among these items or there may be a response bias in the Ss' reactions to them. To check further on relationships among these items, the means for the totalled ratings for each item were intercorrelated. Particular

attention was paid to the relationship between items 3 and 4, since it was assumed at the outset that although expertness and liking were probably related aspects of the broader concept of attraction, they were not identical. These intercorrelations are presented in Table 15 below.

TABLE 15
INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE FIRST FIVE
PROCEDURAL CHECK ITEMS

Items:	1	2	3	4	5
1. (Counselor's ability to communicate effectively)	1.00	.64	.73	.58	.68
2. (Counselor's ability to communicate effectively with other students)	.64	1.00	.74	.62	.45
3. (Counselor's expertness)	.73	.74	1.00	.37	.57
4. (S's liking for the counselor)	.58	.62	.37	1.00	.49
5. (S's willingness to see the counselor for further counseling)	.68	.45	.57	.49	1.00

All intercorrelations in the above table are positive, ranging from .74 to .37. It is interesting to note that the lowest correlation (.37) is the one between the counselor's expertness (item 3) and the S's liking for the counselor (item 4). These findings give warrant for assuming that expertness and liking are related elements of attraction, as suggested by Newcomb (1959), yet the two are not identical. Hence it may be inferred that the Ss attended to somewhat different attributes, traits, or cues when they evaluated expertness than when they responded to liking.

The second part of the Interview Rating Scale booklet (Appendix A-4) had six psychological terms and their synonym rating scales. The

instructions told the Ss to rate the terms in the way that "you believe this counselor would define them." This was intended as a procedural check on the Ss' awareness of the counselors' definitions. It was assumed that no significant differences would emerge unless Ss had interpreted the ratings as a way of resolving imbalance. The analysis of variance for the summed ratings of the three terms defined by the counselors is presented below.

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE PROCEDURAL CHECK ON THE
SS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE COUNSELOR'S DEFINITIONS

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	14.06	
Advocated Change (B)	1	324.00	7.37**
Expertness (C)	1	68.06	
AxB	1	.56	
AxC	1	12.25	
BxC	1	105.06	
Error	56	43.96	

** $p < .01$

Table 16 reveals a significant main effect on the advocated change variable (B). The difference between means is shown in Table 17.

TABLE 17

COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE PROCEDURAL CHECK ON THE
SS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE COUNSELORS' DEFINITIONS

Change Not Advocated	Advocated Change	Diff.	F	p
M = 34.63	M = 30.13	4.50	7.37	.01

These results imply that Ss were more accurate in their ratings of counselors' definitions where these were the same as the Ss' (change

not advocated condition) than when the imposed definitions were different from their own (advocated change condition). However, these findings are based on the sum of three separate ratings. If the ratings are averaged, the difference between means becomes 1.50, which suggests that Ss under the two conditions of advocated change may have been more alike in the accuracy of their perceptions of counselors' definitions than is implied by the above results.

A further check was made on whether Ss used these ratings as a way of resolving imbalance. An analysis of variance was performed on scores representing the discrepancy between ratings of synonyms initially judged as least and most appropriate by Ss under the advocated change condition (B_1). It will be recalled that the synonyms initially judged as least appropriate under this condition are those which the counselors defined, as presented in Table 16 and Table 17. If Ss did interpret these ratings as a way of resolving imbalance, a significant difference would be expected between ratings of synonyms initially judged as least and most appropriate. However, no significant differences are found (analysis of variance not reported). It may be concluded, therefore, that Ss did not interpret the ratings of counselors' definitions as an opportunity to resolve imbalance.

The final item in the Interview Rating Scale booklet was intended as a check on the "common relevance" of the psychological terms used (cf. Newcomb, 1961, 1968). The item was phrased, "If you and this counselor were to get together for further counseling and/or research, how important do you think it would be for the two of you to agree on

the definitions of the psychological terms?" This was the first and only instance that importance of agreement on the definitions was mentioned in the experiment. The analysis of variance of the responses to this item is presented in Table 18.

TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE PROCEDURAL
CHECK ON COMMON RELEVANCE

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	.14	
Advocated Change (B)	1	78.77	10.85**
Expertness (C)	1	.02	
AxB	1	6.89	
AxC	1	1.89	
BxC	1	11.39	1.57
Error	56	7.26	

** $p < .01$

A significant main effect on the advocated change variable (B) is found. The difference between the means is presented in Table 19.

TABLE 19

COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE PROCEDURAL
CHECK ON COMMON RELEVANCE

Change Not Advocated	Advocated Change	Diff.	F	p
M = 10.56	M = 8.34	2.22	10.85	.01

Evidently, Ss whose counselors had similarly defined the psychological terms (change not advocated condition) judged it more important to have future agreement on definitions than Ss whose counselors had advocated dissimilar definitions (advocated change condition).

It will be recalled that prior to the interview with the counselor all Ss had completed the Communication Effectiveness Inventory-1 (Appendix A-1), which consisted of six psychological terms each with five possible definitions (synonyms), and one confidence rating scale. During the course of the interview three of these psychological terms were defined by the counselor using one synonym for each definition. The remaining three psychological terms were mentioned once each by the counselor, but not defined. Immediately following the interview the Ss completed the Communication Effectiveness Inventory-2 (Appendix A-3), which contained the same six psychological terms and their rating scales. Differences between the pre- and postinterview ratings for the three defined psychological terms were used as measures of the dependent variables. The results for the three undefined terms were also analyzed. As with analyses of the dependent measures separate analyses of variance were run for synonyms that initially received the highest ratings, for those that initially received the lowest ratings, and for confidence ratings.

No significant difference between pre- and postinterview responses is found for synonyms that had initially received the highest ratings. Nor are significant differences found between the pre- and postinterview ratings of confidence (analyses of variance for these two measures not reported). For the synonyms that initially received the lowest ratings an unexpected significant main effect did appear. This analysis of variance is presented in Table 20 below.

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE UNDEFINED TERMS INITIALLY
JUDGED AT LEAST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	110.25	4.58*
Advocated Change (B)	1	.25	
Expertness (C)	1	36.00	1.49
AxB	1	9.00	
AxC	1	49.00	2.03
BxC	1	36.00	1.49
Error	56	24.08	

* $p < .05$

As noted in this analysis the main effect on the counselor variable (A) is significant at the .05 level. The significant difference between the means on the counselor variable is shown in Table 21.

TABLE 21

COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE
COUNSELORS VARIABLE (A)

Counselor No. 2	Counselor No. 1	Diff.	F	p
M = 5.19	M = 2.56	2.63	4.58	.05

Although these psychological terms were only mentioned once each and not explicitly defined by the counselors, results suggest that something in counselor no. 2's manner of presentation influenced the Ss to respond with significantly higher ratings for the synonyms to which they had initially attributed the lowest ratings.

In testing the hypotheses it had to be assumed that Ss under the two conditions of expertness perceived the counselors as intended by the manipulation of expertness. To check on the success of this

induction, Ss were asked to rate the counselor's expertness. This rating scale (item 3) was embedded in a larger number of procedural check items. Analyses of the results of these additional procedural checks reveal, first, that the expertness manipulation strongly influenced Ss' reactions to the various aspects of the counselors' performances, with more favorable responses elicited under the high expertness condition than under the low expertness condition for the first five procedural check items. Also, there is evidence that the counselors' individual styles influenced differential perceptions of them, since significant interactions between expertness and counselor effects were obtained on items 1, 4, and 5. In addition, Ss who encountered counselor no. 2 rather than counselor no. 1 responded to the synonyms initially rated as least appropriate for the undefined terms with postinterview ratings significantly higher than pre-interview ratings. The advocated change manipulation affected Ss' ratings of counselors' definitions and of common relevance, with significantly higher ratings for both under the change not advocated condition. In short, expertness, advocated change, and the counselors' individual styles did influence the results of the procedural check items. The manipulation of expertness, however, did produce its desired induction: Ss under the two conditions responded differently to the check on expertness (item 3). Accordingly, there is warrant for testing the hypotheses.

Test of Hypotheses

Changes in ratings of synonyms initially judged as most appropriate definitions

Hypothesis 1.2 predicts that under the high expertness/advocated change condition (B_1C_1), Ss' ratings of synonyms initially given highest ratings (i.e., judged most appropriate) by the Ss would be changed more in the direction of lower ratings than those of Ss under the low expertness/advocated change condition (B_1C_2). Hypothesis 2.1 predicts that under the high expertness/change not advocated condition (B_2C_1) initially highest ratings of synonyms would be changed more in the direction of higher ratings than those of Ss under the low expertness/change not advocated condition (B_2C_2). The analysis of variance of the synonyms initially rated highest (i.e., judged to be most appropriate definitions) is presented in Table 22.

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RATINGS OF SYNONYMS INITIALLY JUDGED AS MOST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	.56	
Advocated Change (B)	1	30.25	1.29
Expertness (C)	1	10.56	
AxB	1	33.06	1.41
AxC	1	42.25	1.80
BxC	1	14.06	
Error	56	23.43	

The table indicates neither the main nor the interaction effects are significant. Thus, there was neither a significant increase nor a decrease from pre- to postinterview ratings of these initially "most appropriate" synonyms, in either the high or low expertness condition,

regardless of whether change was advocated by the counselors.

Hypothesis 1.2 and hypothesis 2.1 are not supported by the present findings.

Changes in ratings of synonyms initially judged as least appropriate definitions

Hypothesis 1.1 predicts that under the high expertness/advocated change condition (B_1C_1), as compared with the low expertness/advocated change condition (B_1C_2), the ratings of synonyms initially rated as lowest in appropriateness by the Ss would be changed more in the direction of higher ratings. Hypothesis 2.2 predicts that under the high expertness/change not advocated condition (B_2C_1), as compared with the low expertness/change not advocated condition (B_2C_2), these initially lowest ratings by the Ss would be changed more in the direction of still lower ratings. The analysis of variance of these results is presented in Table 23.

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RATINGS OF SYNONYMS INITIALLY
JUDGED AS LEAST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	56.25	1.45
Advocated Change (B)	1	600.25	15.46***
Expertness (C)	1	81.00	2.09
AxB	1	10.56	
AxC	1	.56	
BxC	1	39.06	1.01
Error	56	38.83	

*** $p < .001$

As shown in Table 23 a significant main effect for the advocated change variable (B) is found, but the predicted interaction effects

are not significant. The significantly different means on the advocated change variable (B) are displayed in Table 24.

TABLE 24
COMPARISON BETWEEN MEANS ON THE
ADVOCATED CHANGE VARIABLE (B)

Advocated Change	Change Not Advocated	Diff.	F	p
M = 10.41	M = 4.28	6.13	15.46	.001

While hypothesis 1.1 predicts that an interaction of high expertness and advocated change would influence the Ss to change their ratings of the synonyms initially judged as least appropriate in the direction of higher ratings, these results suggest that regardless of the perceived expertness of the counselor who advocated the change, such change was accepted by the Ss. It should be recalled that change in this instance required the Ss to adopt the synonyms presented by the counselors as the more appropriate definitions. Thus, the Ss adopted the synonyms presented by the counselor as most appropriate and responded with higher ratings under both conditions of expertness.

Hypothesis 2.2 is not supported by the present results: there was no significant movement in the direction of lower ratings for the synonyms initially rated as least appropriate definitions.

Changes in ratings of confidence in one's ability to use terms appropriately

In hypothesis 3 it is predicted that under the high expertness/change not advocated condition (B_2C_1), as compared with the three other experimental conditions, ratings of confidence would become

higher. As shown in the analysis of variance presented in Table 25 neither main nor interaction effects are significant.

TABLE 25
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
CONFIDENCE RATINGS

Source	df	MS	F
Counselors (A)	1	25.00	1.72
Advocated Change (B)	1	49.00	3.37
Expertness (C)	1	1.00	
AxB	1	1.00	
AxC	1	12.25	
BxC	1	6.25	
Error	56	14.54	

Indeed, there was no significant movement in the direction of higher ratings. Ss' ratings of confidence in their ability to use the terms appropriately cannot be said to have been significantly affected by the experimental manipulations of expertness or advocated change.

Discussion

The results of this experiment suggest Ss' changes in ratings of synonyms for psychological terms to have been motivated by a desire to achieve agreement with the counselor, regardless of his expertness. In changing their ratings of synonyms in the direction advocated by the counselors, under both the high and low expertness conditions, Ss responded primarily to the advocated change manipulation, rather than to an interaction of advocated change and expertness. The Ss were thus able to restore positive balance in former positively

imbalanced situations. Interpreted in this light these findings lend support to Newcomb's (1961, 1968) balance formulations.

According to Newcomb (1959) expertness is always considered to be a positive attribute of attraction, so the relationship between the S and the counselor was always considered by the S to be positive. Newcomb (1961) considers balance to be dependent upon both the signs and the intensities of relationships among the two communicators and the object of communication. Manipulation of expertness in the present experiment was presumed to alter intensity of the relationship between the S and the counselor. This manipulation, in turn, was assumed to have an affect on the amount of strain toward restoring balance in imbalanced situations. The present results suggest, however, that the sign, more than the intensity of the relationship between the S and the counselor was potent in restoring balance in imbalanced systems. The sign of the relationship between the S and the counselor was always positive, contributing more toward a change in the S than the counselors' degree of expertness.

These findings make it desirable to examine further the differences between the high and low conditions of expertise. According to the procedural checks on the Ss' responses to expertness, two discrete groups of Ss with a significant mean difference in ratings could be identified. Yet those who assigned low ratings to their counselors may still have perceived them to be much more expert than the Ss themselves. Hence, even the relatively inexpert counselors may have been viewed as more likely to be correct in their definitions

of the psychological terms, which may have led the Ss to accept these counselors' definitions as more adequate than their own.

It should be recalled that the average age for the Ss was 19 years. The average age for the two counselors was 27.5 years. Difference in age may have contributed to perceptions of the counselors, even in the low expertness conditions, as relatively more expert, experienced, and knowledgeable than the Ss. The credentials for the less expert counselors, even in the low expertness conditions, as relatively more expert, experienced, and knowledgeable than the Ss. The credentials for the less expert counselors mentioned that they had taken an advanced psychology course. The Ss, who were all enrolled in an introductory psychology course, may have assumed the counselors to have gained relatively greater specific knowledge in this advanced course. Further, the counselors in both the high and low expertness conditions were always dressed in jackets and ties, which, particularly in the low expertness condition, may have influenced the Ss to perceive the counselors as more expert. Consequently, a number of factors may have influenced the Ss to perceive the relatively inexperienced counselors as more expert than had been intended. All of these considerations have been discussed under the broader rubric of "communicator credibility" by Secord and Backman (1964). In the present experiment even though a special effort was made to specify particular attributes that contribute to perceptions of high and low expertness, the desired induction of contrast effect between greater and lesser expertness may not have been obtained despite the significant mean difference of ratings under the two conditions.

It is necessary to reconcile the present experimental results, which imply that degree of expertness did not differentially affect the acceptance of the communicator's message, with the bulk of previous research findings, which suggest that the greater a communicator's perceived expertness or (more broadly) credibility, the greater the receiver's change toward a position advocated by the communicator (cf. Cohen, 1964). One possible explanation is that relatively little research on communicator credibility has involved dyadic interpersonal relationships as in the present investigation. In particular, little attempt has been made to specify the attributes of greater or lesser expertness. Previous studies have involved speakers (live or tape-recorded) addressing larger groups of people, or have involved written communications. Perhaps the S who encounters a communicator in a one-to-one relationship responds to different cues than those which might be salient in a less intimate encounter. Bergin (1962) did utilize dyadic relationships which resembled psychological treatment conditions. However, he used different communicators in each of the high and low credibility conditions. These communicators differed markedly in age and in dress. Also, different physical settings were used for the high and low credibility conditions. While at first glance the results of the present experiment appear to contradict previous research evidence, it is difficult to specify the particular factors in previous studies that may have influenced their results. Aronson and Golden (1962) have shown that such factors as occupation and race may be more or less relevant aspects of credibility for different Ss and may

contribute differentially to advocated change. Perhaps influences to be expected on the basis of previous research evidence were not as salient in the kind of two person situation encountered by Ss in this experiment.

It was also predicted that in a situation already formally balanced--that is, where change was not advocated--any subsequent modification in the Ss' ratings of synonyms would be in the direction of higher ratings, and that such modification would be greater under the condition of high expertness than under that of low expertness. These predictions are not supported by data. One possible explanation is that the original ratings were quite high ($M = 12.12$, on a 13 point scale), which left little room for movement in the direction of higher ratings. Also, since these ratings were quite high, and since the situations were already formally balanced, the Ss may have little or no incentive to make subsequently higher ratings.

Hypotheses 1.2 and 2.2 predict that once the Ss had responded to the counselors' choices of the most appropriate definitions, the definitions formerly chosen by the Ss as most appropriate (hypothesis 1.2) and least appropriate (hypothesis 2.2) would be changed in the direction of lower ratings. The results do not support these predictions. The assumption underlying both of these hypotheses is that the Ss' responses to the most appropriate and least appropriate definitions for the same psychological term are interrelated. In stating hypothesis 1.2 for instance, it was assumed that if the S selected a new synonym as most appropriate, the synonym formerly

selected as most appropriate should have declined in its perceived appropriateness. Or in the case of hypothesis 2.2, if the synonym initially chosen by the S as most appropriate was then designated by the counselor as the best choice, the synonym initially chosen as least appropriate should have appeared to the S to be even less appropriate. The present results suggest, however, that the Ss did not perceive this assumed relationship between most appropriate and least appropriate definitions. Rather, the logic of the situation for the Ss may have suggested more than one synonym meriting extremely high or extremely low ratings. In hypothesis 1.2, where change was advocated by the counselors, the Ss appear to have accepted the counselors' definitions without decreasing the ratings of synonyms previously chosen as most appropriate. An additional problem may have arisen in the testing of hypothesis 2.2, which predicts that ratings of synonyms which had initially received the lowest ratings would move in the direction of even lower ratings. Even if the Ss had perceived these low ratings as related to the high ratings for the same psychological term, the initial ratings were quite low ($M = 2.43$), which left very little room for movement in the direction of lower ratings.

The prediction concerning the Ss' confidence in their ability to use the psychological terms appropriately (hypothesis 3) is not supported on the present experiment. This may result because the psychological terms were mentioned prior to and following the discussion part of the interview, and presented as if they were related to a measuring instrument which was not discussed in the body of the

interview. The Ss were not given any opportunity or encouragement to use the terms in the interview. In fact, the counselors were instructed not to answer any questions about the terms during the course of the interview. Thus, the counselors' definitions of the psychological terms may have appeared to the Ss as unrelated to what they may have seen as the content of the experiment. Since the Ss did not have an opportunity to use the terms, they may have had no chance to transform isolated facts into actual behavior. Indeed, such a change in attitude may require a prior change in behavior (cf. Insko, 1967). Therefore, in this experiment the Ss' expressed confidence in their ability to use the terms appropriately should not have increased since the Ss were not given opportunity to practice their use of the words.

In addition to what has already been discussed, other factors may have contributed to results obtained in the present experiment. It seems likely that the counselors' individual styles may have influenced the Ss' responses in ways that had not been anticipated. Efforts were made to obtain equivalent performances from the two counselors through the use of standard speeches, specified behaviors, rehearsals, and constant monitoring by the E. However, as evidenced by the significant interactions between expertness and counselor effects on procedural check items 1, 4, and 5, as well as the significant main effect on the counselor variable for the synonyms judged least appropriate for the undefined terms, counselors' individual differences in performance did emerge. Indeed, it was not possible to specify and control all behavioral cues which would appear relevant for all Ss.

It also seems likely that the order of presentation of the rating scales may have affected the present results. The rating instruments were presented in the same order for all Ss. Following the interviews with the counselors the Ss were asked to complete the Communication Effectiveness Inventory-2 (Appendix A-3), intended as a measure of the dependent variables. The Ss then were given an opportunity to respond to the procedural checks on reactions to the counselors, as well as the other procedural check items. It was assumed that if the Ss were to respond in ways which would restore or increase positive balance these responses would be made on the ratings of the psychological terms, which were considered the objects of communication, and were presented first. It is possible, however, that some Ss may have interpreted the opportunity to rate the counselors or to respond to the other procedural check items as ways of reducing imbalance or increasing balance. For example, on the check on common relevance, which asked each S to rate how important it would be for him and the counselor to agree on the definitions, the means under the change not advocated condition were significantly higher than under the advocated change condition. The Ss who apparently already agreed with the counselors responded as if this agreement would be an important component of future interactions with the counselors, while the Ss who apparently did not agree with the counselors on the definitions may have attempted to resolve this conflict by minimizing its importance. These latter Ss may have been attempting to reduce imbalance by degrading the relevance of the objects of communication.

This method of strain reduction has been proposed by Newcomb (1959), but its use had not been anticipated in the present investigation.

The order of presentation of the rating scales may also have affected responses which caused Ss to be eliminated from the analysis. For instance, it will be recalled that ten of the 16 Ss eliminated were from the low expertness/change not advocated condition. These Ss were confronted with a situation which was formally balanced but with low intensity. They may have attempted to increase balance by responding with higher ratings to the check on the counselor's expertness, which was presented second, rather than to the ratings of the psychological terms which were presented first. It therefore appears likely that the order of presentation, as well as the counselors' individual styles of presentation, may have had unanticipated effects upon the results.

A major intent of the present investigation was to attempt to build an "analogical bridge" (Goldstein & Dean, 1966) between research and theory in social psychology and applications relevant to counseling or psychotherapy, "a bridge wide enough to accomodate two-way traffic (p. 370)." Several interesting findings emerge from the experiment which may indeed require two-way traffic between the two areas. For example, an attempt was made to utilize a more specifiabale dimension of the broader rubric of "communicator credibility," and to draw upon literature in that area to predict certain types of responses in a psychological treatment situation. Using "expertness" instead of "credibility," and manipulating the Ss' perceptions of counselor

expertness through the use of credentials and certain behaviors, it was predicted that the Ss would be more responsive to the counselors' influence under the high expertness condition than under the low expertness condition. The results suggest, however, that the Ss responded to counselor influence in the dyadic relationship regardless of the level of expertness of the counselor. It seems likely that either the Ss were responding to other indices of expertness than those specified in this experiment, or that many of the previous research findings regarding credibility or expertness may not have been applicable in the two person situations presented here.

In the present study specific predictions were based on Newcomb's (1961, 1968) balance formulations. In particular, it was assumed that both the signs and the intensities of the relationships among the two communicators and the object of communication would contribute to the strain toward balance in imbalanced situations. The findings suggest, however, that in terms of the relationship between the two communicators (the S and the counselor), the sign, rather than the intensity of the relationship is more salient in bringing about balance in imbalanced situations.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

An experiment was designed to test predictions about social influence and communication within a psychological treatment situation. The aspect of social influence under consideration was the effect of different levels of communicator expertness upon the acceptance of his message. It was assumed that the more expert the communicator was perceived to be, the more likely would the recipient be to interpret messages in the manner advocated by the communicator. In the present context this was interpreted to mean that Ss would be more likely to accept the meanings and advocated changes of meanings of certain terms when these were proposed by communicators of high expertness rather than communicators of low expertness. It was further assumed that the more similar the S's definitions were to those proposed by the high expertness communicator, the more confident would the S be of his own ability to use the terms appropriately. The specific predictions were derived from the interpersonal balance theory formulated by Newcomb (1961, 1968).

To determine the effect of different levels of communicator expertness and advocated change on changes in the meanings of words, the following predictions were tested: (1) an S will be more likely to change the definitions of particular psychological terms when

such change is advocated by a more highly than a less highly expert counselor. (2) It was further predicted that when an S encounters a more highly expert counselor than one who is less expert, who advocates definitions for certain psychological terms which are the same as the S's initial definitions, the S will subsequently rate these definitions as even more appropriate. (3) Finally, it was predicted that when an S is exposed to a more highly expert counselor who advocates definitions for certain psychological terms which are the same as the S's own, the S will be more confident of his own ability to use these terms appropriately than will the Ss in the other experimental conditions.

Sixty-four male undergraduate Ss were run individually in an interview situation made to correspond to an initial counseling session. Ss were subjected to two experimental manipulations: (1) the induction of a belief in the level of the counselor-confederate's expertness; and (2) an interview with one of two counselor-confederates who either advocated the same or different definitions for psychological terms as those initially chosen by the Ss. Sixteen Ss were run in each of four experimental conditions: (1) high expertness/ advocated change; (2) high expertness/ change not advocated; (3) low expertness/ advocated change; and (4) low expertness/ change not advocated. Differences in scores on pre- and postinterview rating scales indicating the amount and direction of changes of ratings were used as measures of the dependent variables.

Although the results did not support the predictions as stated, it was found that Ss did change their definitions of the psychological terms when such change was advocated by the counselors, regardless of their level of expertness. Those findings suggest, in terms of Newcomb's balance formulations, that signs more than the intensities of the relationships between the communicators contributed to the restoration of balance in imbalanced situations.

APPENDIX A

Communication Effectiveness Inventory - 1	1
Suggested Discussion Topics	2
Communication Effectiveness Inventory - 2	3
Interview Rating Scale	4

1

NAME _____

AGE _____

Communication Effectiveness Inventory (1)

We are interested in finding out your impressions of how some psychological terms are likely to be defined in the context of the counseling situation. At the top of each page you will be presented with a psychological term, followed by five possible definitions. Each definition has its own rating scale. Please check (✓) the rating scale for each possible definition according to how well the definition fits the term at the top of the page; that is, how appropriate or inappropriate each possible definition is for defining the term at the top of the page. On each scale #1 will refer to the least appropriate definition of the term, and #13 will refer to the most appropriate definition of the term. Also, please check the scale at the bottom of each page, which concerns your confidence in using the term correctly.

BE SURE TO NOTE THE DIRECTION OF THE RATINGS BEFORE YOU MARK THEM

An example is given on the following page.

EXAMPLE(term) DEVELOPMENT

(possible definitions)	1. <u>expansion</u>	✓ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 extremely moderately moderately extremely inappropriate inappropriate appropriate appropriate
	2. <u>growth</u>	✓ 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 extremely moderately moderately extremely appropriate appropriate inappropriate inappropriate
	3. <u>evolution</u>	✓ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 extremely moderately moderately extremely inappropriate inappropriate appropriate appropriate
	4. <u>maturation</u>	✓ 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 extremely moderately moderately extremely appropriate appropriate inappropriate inappropriate
	5. <u>increase</u>	✓ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 extremely moderately moderately extremely inappropriate inappropriate appropriate appropriate

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
 extremely low low moderate extremely high
 confidence confidence confidence confidence

WORK RAPIDLY. BE SURE TO CHECK EACH SCALE.

DEPENDENCY1. reliance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. relationship

13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. inferiority

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. exploitation

13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. surrender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
extremely low				low		moderate				extremely high			
confidence				confidence		confidence				confidence			

REINFORCEMENT1. reward

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. relief

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. response

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. strengthening

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. satisfaction

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low				low			moderate			extremely high		
confidence				confidence			confidence			confidence		

CONFLICT1. confusion

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. struggle

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. impulse

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. opposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. doubt

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low				low			moderate			extremely high		
confidence				confidence			confidence			confidence		

REACTION1. retaliation

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. opposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. resistance

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. response

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. movement

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low				low			moderate			extremely high		
confidence				confidence			confidence			confidence		

IDENTIFICATION1. naming

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. likeness

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. classification

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. sympathy

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. imitation

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	
extremely low				low		moderate				extremely high			
confidence				confidence		confidence				confidence			

COMPLEX1. system

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. trend

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. complicated

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. disposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. sentiment

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low			low				moderate			extremely high		
confidence			confidence				confidence			confidence		

Suggested Discussion Topics

There are some problem topics which students very often wish to discuss with college counselors. Some of these are listed below. You are free to draw upon these, or other problem areas, as bases for things to talk about with your counselor.

1. health and physical fitness
2. finances, living conditions, and employment
3. social and recreational activities
4. relations with friends
5. dating, sex, marriage
6. home and family
7. morals, values, interests
8. adjustment to college work
9. future plans: vocational and educational

NAME _____

Communication Effectiveness Inventory (2)

After participating in a counseling interview you probably have some impressions as to how certain psychological terms are likely to be defined within the context of the counseling situation. Please check (✓) the following definitions according to how appropriate you believe them to be for defining the psychological term presented at the top of each page. Also, please check the scale at the bottom of each page, which concerns your confidence in using the term correctly.

Be sure to note the direction of the ratings before you mark them.

CONFLICT1. confusion

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. struggle

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. impulse

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. opposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. doubt

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low			low				moderate			extremely high		
confidence			confidence				confidence			confidence		

IDENTIFICATION1. naming

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. likeness

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. classification

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. sympathy

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. imitation

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low				low			moderate			extremely high		
confidence				confidence			confidence			confidence		

DEPENDENCY1. reliance

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. relationship

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. inferiority

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. exploitation

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. surrender

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low				low			moderate			extremely high		
confidence				confidence			confidence			confidence		

REACTION1. retaliation

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. opposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. resistance

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. response

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. movement

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low			low				moderate			extremely high		
confidence			confidence				confidence			confidence		

COMPLEX1. system

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. trend

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. complicated

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. disposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. sentiment

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low			low				moderate			extremely high		
confidence			confidence				confidence			confidence		

REINFORCEMENT1. reward

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. relief

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. response

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. strengthening

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. satisfaction

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

How confident are you of your ability to use this term appropriately?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely low				low			moderate			extremely high		
confidence				confidence			confidence			confidence		

NAME _____

Interview Rating Scale

On each rating scale, please check (✓) the number which best describes your reactions to the counselor. This form will not be shown to the counselor, and will not be used to evaluate you or him in any way.

Be sure to note the direction of the ratings before you mark them.

1. How effectively did this counselor communicate with you?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
extremely			moderately			moderately			extremely			
ineffectively			ineffectively			effectively			effectively			

2. As far as you can tell, how effectively would this counselor communicate with other students?

13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
extremely			moderately			moderately			extremely			
effectively			effectively			ineffectively			ineffectively			

3. As far as you can tell, how expert is this counselor in his field?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
extremely			moderately			moderately			extremely			
inexpert			inexpert			expert			expert			

4. As far as you can tell, did you like this counselor?

13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
extremely			moderately			moderately			extremely			
like			like			dislike			dislike			

5. How willing would you be to see this counselor in the future for further counseling?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
extremely			moderately				moderatley			extremely		
unwilling			unwilling				willing			willing		

On the following pages are some psychological terms, each accompanied by five possible definitions. Please rate these terms in the way that you believe this counselor would define them.

DEPENDENCY1. reliance

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. relationship

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. inferiority

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. exploitation

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. surrender

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

CONFLICT1. confusion

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. struggle

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. impulse

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. opposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. doubt

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

REACTION1. retaliation

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. opposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. resistance

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. response

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. movement

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

REINFORCEMENT1. reward

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. relief

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. response

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. strengthening

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. satisfaction

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

COMPLEX1. system

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. trend

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. complicated

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. disposition

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. sentiment

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

IDENTIFICATION1. naming

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

2. likeness

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

3. classification

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

4. sympathy

<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
appropriate			appropriate				inappropriate			inappropriate		

5. imitation

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
inappropriate			inappropriate				appropriate			appropriate		

If you and this counselor were to get together for future counseling and/or research, how important do you think it would be for the two of you to agree on the definitions of the psychological terms?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
extremely			moderately				moderately			extremely		
unimportant			unimportant				important			important		

APPENDIX B

Confederate's Interview Instructions and Script	1
Experimenter Script	2
Debriefing Script	3

1

Confederate's Interview Instructions and Script

In this experiment you will be expected to play the role of a counseling psychologist. You will meet with Ss in counseling-like interview situations in which the Ss will play the roles of clients who seek out help with various problems, either real or fabricated. In these interview situations you will be asked to play two different roles; one of a counselor who is perceived as highly expert, and one of a counselor who is perceived as of low expertness. It is important to remember that the Ss' perceptions and preconceptions of high and low expertness are of primary importance, not necessarily those which professionals might label as "good" or "bad" counselor behavior. The Ss with whom you are to meet have probably been exposed to many persons who have used the title of "counselor," and these Ss have probably formed certain expectations as to how more or less expert counselors are likely to behave. While we cannot predict with certainty what traits or behavioral components all Ss will associate with high or low expertness, the suggestions listed below are likely to be convincing for most of the Ss encountered:

(a) High Expertness: try to believe and act as if you have a great deal of experience in counseling with college students. You may be asked to answer specific questions about procedures or curriculum or to explain your opinion on various campus topics. Try to answer these if you can, in as direct factual manner as possible. In terms of behavior, you should engage in some or all of the following: (1) nod head in agreement and reassurance, (2) smile, (3) sit upright, but not rigidly, (4) maintain a moderate degree of eye contact, but not so much as to make the S self-conscious, (5) verbalize agreement and understanding, when appropriate, (6) compliment S, when appropriate, (7) be prepared to carry the bulk of the conversation.

(b) Low Expertness: try to believe and act as if you have had little or no experience in counseling with college students. If asked to answer specific questions about procedures or curriculum, or to express your opinion on various topics, admit you lack of experience, and invite the S to discuss another topic with which you might be more helpful. Your behavior should include: (1) admissions of lack of experience and/or understanding, (2) apologies for not being better able to help the S, (3) glancing at watch or clock, (4) frequent silences, (5) very little eye contact with S, (6) be relatively inactive, both physically and verbally, (7) depend upon the S to carry the bulk of the conversation.

It is important to be consistent throughout the interview. Although each performance will be monitored by the E, you should be constantly monitoring your own behaviors in order to maintain the proper role.

Prior to each interview you will be given a sheet of paper which will list the specific terms to be used for the S you will see. At the top of the page either the words "No change" or "Change" will be written. Beneath this word three pairs of terms will be listed. The former pairs of terms are those which you will include in the introductory and concluding speeches listed below. The three remaining terms are to be mentioned only once each during the course of the body of the interview. Try to introduce each of these terms as naturally as possible, and be sure not to draw any special attention to them. The sheet of paper with the abovementioned information will be placed in a manila folder which will contain various other papers. You will carry this folder with you into the interview. You may refer to the sheet during the course of the interview, but do it as unobtrusively as possible.

The sequence of the interview will be as follows:

1. Introduction: Structure the introductory part of the interview as if it were a brief test interpretation task. Your intent is to communicate to the S either that you presumably share the same definitions for certain psychological terms ("no change"), or that you differ on your definitions for certain psychological terms ("change"). Specifically, say to the S:

"Before we begin discussing whatever is on your mind, I wanted you to know that I've had an opportunity to look over your 'Communication Effectiveness Inventory' and find that we generally share the same definitions for most of the terms listed."

Then state either:

(a) no change: "In particular, you seem to agree with me that _____ is best defined as _____; _____ as _____."

(b) change: "However, we do differ on a few words. I feel that _____ is best defined as _____; _____ as _____; and _____ as _____."

"Why don't we go on to the problems that you would like to talk about?"

2. Main body of interview: Invite the S to discuss such topics as his impressions of O.S.U., his coursework, his social life, etc. In responding to these areas, be sure to be consistent with either your high or low expertness behaviors, as described above. In the course of the interview, mention, as unobtrusively as possible, each of the three terms listed on the paper provided prior to the interview. If at anytime during the interview the S wishes to discuss the terms that were introduced, do not respond to this request, but change the topic or otherwise re-direct the conversation. The body of the interview should run approximately 15-20 minutes.

3. Transition and conclusion: After the interview has run approximately 15 minutes, say to the S:

"Well, _____, I see that our time is about up. I've enjoyed talking with you, and if we do get together for counseling in the future, I think we would have a good chance of communicating effectively. This would be particularly true if we are aware of how each of us defines the psychological terms that we would be likely to use. As I mentioned in the beginning, I feel that _____ is best defined as _____; _____ as _____; _____ as _____. Well, I promised Mr. Sprafkin that I wouldn't take too much time. Nice meeting you, and I hope that we do have an opportunity to get together again."

To end the interview you may merely stand, and the E will promptly enter the interviewing room.

EXPERIMENTER SCRIPT

(in Reception Area)

"HELLO _____. I'M GLAD YOU WERE ABLE TO MAKE IT DOWN HERE TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH. MY NAME IS MR. SPRAFKIN. WHY DON'T WE WALK DOWN TO THE INTERVIEWING ROOM, AND I'LL BE ABLE TO FILL YOU IN ON WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO."

(in Interviewing Room)

"WE ARE DOING SOME RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN COUNSELING. THAT IS, WE ARE TRYING TO INVESTIGATE THE WAYS IN WHICH COUNSELORS AND CLIENTS (STUDENTS) COMMUNICATE WITH ONE ANOTHER IN COUNSELING, AND TO IMPROVE UPON THESE WAYS, IF POSSIBLE. THIS PRESENT RESEARCH IN WHICH YOU WILL BE PARTICIPATING IS PART OF A MUCH LARGER RESEARCH PROJECT WHOSE PURPOSE IS TO TRY TO DISCOVER WAYS TO TEACH COUNSELORS TO COMMUNICATE MORE EFFECTIVELY WITH CLIENTS---WAYS TO IMPROVE THE UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COUNSELOR AND THE STUDENT."

"THROUGH THIS RESEARCH WE HAVE LEARNED SOME THINGS SO FAR. ONE OF THE MAIN THINGS WE'VE LEARNED IS THAT COUNSELORS CAN BE TAUGHT TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY IF THEY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE OTHER COUNSELORS AT WORK, IN OBSERVATION ROOMS SUCH AS THIS. WHILE IT IS NOT TOO DIFFICULT TO GET ACTUAL COUNSELORS TO PARTICIPATE, IT IS MORE DIFFICULT TO FIND SUITABLE 'CLIENTS,' MAINLY FOR ETHICAL REASONS. THEREFORE, WE ARE LOOKING FOR PEOPLE TO PLAY THE ROLES OF CLIENTS. WE HAVE, IN THE PAST, TRIED TO USE PROFESSIONAL ACTORS, BUT THEY HAVE NOT BEEN AS EFFECTIVE AS AMATEURS, BECAUSE AMATEURS, PARTICULARLY STUDENTS SUCH AS YOURSELF, SEEM TO HAVE A BETTER INSIGHT INTO THE KINDS OF PROBLEMS STUDENTS MOST OFTEN BRING TO COLLEGE COUNSELORS. THIS RESEARCH, THEN, IS A KIND OF A TRYOUT--LOOKING FOR PEOPLE TO PLAY THE ROLES OF CLIENTS. THOSE STUDENTS WHO ARE ABLE TO DO A CONVINCING JOB OF COMMUNICATING WITH THE COUNSELOR, ARE LIKELY, IN THE NEAR FUTURE, TO BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO MEET WITH THE SAME COUNSELOR AGAIN AND TO BE GIVEN ADDITIONAL CREDIT. THOSE SESSIONS WOULD BE OBSERVED BY COUNSELORS IN TRAINING, FOR TRAINING PURPOSES."

"BEFORE WE GET INTO THE ACTUAL INTERVIEW, I'D LIKE YOU TO FILL OUT THIS 'COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS INVENTORY' WHICH MAY HELP TO EVALUATE HOW LIKELY YOU AND YOUR COUNSELOR WILL BE TO UNDERSTAND ONE ANOTHER."

(S reads instructions. E answers any questions about Inventory and/or example. S completes Inventory.)

"FINISHED? FINE."

"NOW, LET ME TELL YOU A LITTLE ABOUT THE COUNSELOR YOU ARE GOING TO SEE:"

High Expertness

"DR. _____ GRADUATED WITH HONORS IN PSYCHOLOGY, AND HAS A MASTERS DEGREE AND DOCTORATE IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY. THROUGHOUT HIS GRADUATE TRAINING HE WAS EMPLOYED AS A COUNSELOR WITH THE COUNSELING SERVICE, AND DURING HIS FINAL TWO YEARS IN GRADUATE SCHOOL HE ALSO SUPERVISED OTHER COUNSELORS, AS WELL AS SERVING AS A COUNSELOR HIMSELF. HIS DOCTORAL DISSERTATION WAS AWARDED AN OUTSTANDING RESEARCH AWARD OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH. HE HAS FIVE PROFESSIONAL JOURNAL ARTICLES TO HIS CREDIT, AND IS A MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, AND THE COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY HONORARY SOCIETY. IN THE ONE YEAR SINCE RECEIVING HIS DOCTORATE HE HAS BEEN AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY, DOING RESEARCH AND COUNSELING AT THE HARVARD COUNSELING SERVICE, WHILE SUPPORTED BY A GENERAL MOTORS FELLOWSHIP. HE IS PRESENTLY A VISITING PROFESSOR IN THE AREA OF COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY."

Low Expertness

"_____ IS PRESENTLY A FOURTH QUARTER JUNIOR IN EDUCATION. HE HAS RECENTLY EXPRESSED AN INTEREST IN COUNSELING, AND IS PRESENTLY ENROLLED IN HIS FIRST COURSE IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY. IN CONNECTION WITH THIS COURSE HE HAS PARTICIPATED IN TWO OR THREE PRACTICE COUNSELING SESSIONS, WITH MIXED RESULTS. HE WOULD LIKE TO CHANGE HIS MAJOR TO PSYCHOLOGY. _____'S ACADEMIC CAREER WAS INTERRUPTED AT THE END OF HIS SOPHOMORE YEAR BECAUSE OF SOME ACADEMIC DIFFICULTY, AND BETWEEN HIS SOPHOMORE AND JUNIOR YEARS AT THE UNIVERSITY HE SERVED IN THE NAVY FOR FOUR YEARS, AND WORKED FOR ALMOST TWO YEARS, MOSTLY IN RETAIL SALES. SEVERAL YEARS AGO HE SPENT A SUMMER AS A COUNSELOR AT A BOYS' SUMMER CAMP."

"IN ORDER TO MAKE YOUR TASK A LITTLE EASIER, WE'VE PREPARED THIS LIST OF 'SUGGESTED DISCUSSION TOPICS' WHICH STUDENTS MOST OFTEN BRING TO COLLEGE COUNSELORS. YOU ARE FREE TO USE AS FEW OR AS MANY OF THESE AS YOU WISH IN ORDER TO PLAY THE ROLE OF A CLIENT. THE BASIC TASK IS TO PRESENT A PROBLEM OR PROBLEMS AS THOUGH THEY WERE YOUR OWN. WHY DON'T YOU TAKE A MINUTE AND LOOK THEM OVER. FINISHED? GOOD."

"I'LL GO AND SEE IF DR./MR. _____ IS READY TO SEE YOU. I'LL BRING HIM RIGHT IN AND I'LL BE WATCHING FROM THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS TWO WAY MIRROR. I'LL BE IN TO TALK TO YOU AGAIN AFTER THE INTERVIEW. REMEMBER, DR./MR. _____ WILL TREAT THIS AS HE WOULD A REAL COUNSELING INTERVIEW, ALTHOUGH HE KNOWS, OF COURSE, THAT YOU ARE TAKING THE PART OF A CLIENT. AND, ANYTHING YOU SAY DURING THIS, AND ANY FUTURE INTERVIEWS, WILL BE KEPT IN THE STRICTEST CONFIDENCE."

DEBRIEFING SCRIPT

(E enters interviewing room after counselor's departure)

"THANK YOU _____. THAT WAS A GOOD JOB.

"WE'D LIKE TO GET SOME FURTHER INFORMATION ON COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS. SO, IF YOU WOULD FILL OUT THIS INVENTORY

(S fills out Communication Effectiveness Inventory - 2)

"WE ALSO NEED TO GET YOUR PERSONAL REACTIONS TO THE INTERVIEW. IF YOU WOULD COMPLETE THESE RATINGS, IT WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL."

(S completes Interview Rating Scale)

"WELL, I'VE ASKED YOU TO DO QUITE A FEW THINGS. I THINK IT ONLY FAIR THAT YOU GET A CHANCE TO TALK. I'D BE INTERESTED IN YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE RESEARCH INTERVIEW. WHY DON'T YOU BEGIN BY TELLING ME WHAT YOU THOUGHT WAS GOING ON. ...THE COUNSELOR.....THE INVENTORIES.... ETC.

"BECAUSE YOU'VE BEEN SO COOPERATIVE, I WANT TO FILL YOU IN AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE AS TO WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO GET AT IN THIS RESEARCH. AS I MENTIONED IN THE BEGINNING, WE ARE INTERESTED IN STUDYING THE WAYS PEOPLE COMMUNICATE IN A COUNSELING SITUATION. IN COUNSELING, AS IN OTHER SITUATIONS WHERE PEOPLE USE WORDS TO COMMUNICATE, IT'S POSSIBLE THAT THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE COMMUNICATION MAY, INITIALLY AT LEAST, ATTRIBUTE DIFFERENT MEANINGS TO THE WORDS THEY USE. IT ALSO SEEMS THAT OVER THE COURSE OF THEIR CONTACT THEY MAY REACH AN AGREEMENT AS TO HOW PARTICULAR WORDS ARE DEFINED. WE ARE INTERESTED IN STUDYING THE FACTORS THAT MAY INFLUENCE A PERSON TO ADOPT PARTICULAR MEANINGS FOR THE WORDS USED. WE SUSPECT THAT ONE FACTOR WHICH MAY INFLUENCE THE ADOPTION OF PARTICULAR WORD MEANINGS IS THE EXPERTNESS OF THE PERSON WHO USES THE WORD. THAT IS, IF AN EXPERT IN A FIELD DEFINES A WORD IN A CERTAIN WAY, PEOPLE MAY BE MORE INCLINED TO ACCEPT HIS DEFINITION, THAN IF THE WORD IS USED AND DEFINED BY SOMEONE WHO IS LESS EXPERT.

"IN ORDER TO STUDY THIS IN THE CONTEXT OF COUNSELING WE HAVE PRESENTED COUNSELORS WHO ARE INTENDED TO APPEAR TO BE MORE OR LESS EXPERT, AND HAVE HAD THEM EITHER ADVOCATE THE SAME OR DIFFERENT DEFINITIONS AS THOSE INITIALLY CHOSEN BY THE STUDENTS. WE ARE THEN IN A POSITION TO OBSERVE WHETHER OR NOT THE STUDENTS (SUCH AS YOURSELF) WOULD CHANGE THEIR DEFINITIONS TO THOSE PROPOSED BY THE MORE OR LESS EXPERT-APPEARING COUNSELOR.

"IN ORDER TO MAKE THIS RESEARCH MEANINGFUL, IT WAS NECESSARY TO OBTAIN A MEASURE OF YOUR DEFINITIONS OF CERTAIN TERMS, AND THEN TO TELL THE COUNSELOR WHETHER OR NOT TO USE THOSE SAME DEFINITIONS. IT WAS ALSO NECESSARY TO MAKE THE COUNSELORS APPEAR MORE OR LESS EXPERT THAN THEY REALLY ARE. MR. _____ IS IN FACT, AN ADVANCED GRADUATE STUDENT IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY. AT PRESENT, WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO SCHEDULE FUTURE CONTACTS WITH THE COUNSELOR IN CONNECTION WITH THIS RESEARCH.

"DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

"THERE IS ONE MORE, VERY IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION. IN ORDER FOR THIS RESEARCH TO WORK, AND TO GET AT THE FACTORS WHICH WE ARE TRYING TO STUDY, IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN STRICTEST SECURITY ON WHAT HAS GONE ON, AT LEAST UNTIL THE PROJECT IS FINISHED. THIS MEANS YOU MUST NOT TALK TO ANYONE ABOUT THIS UNTIL AT LEAST THE END OF WINTER QUARTER. WILL YOU DO THAT FOR ME? THIS MIGHT BE DIFFICULT AT TIMES. BUT IF A CLASSMATE ASKS ABOUT WHAT YOU DID, YOU COULD MERELY SAY 'I TALKED WITH A COUNSELOR' -- 'VERY INTERESTING,' ETC. THE LESS SAID THE BETTER. IN ANY EVENT, IT'S BEST THAT YOU DON'T BRING IT UP -- O.K.?

"IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN REAL COUNSELING, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT YOU MAKE AN APPOINTMENT WITH THE STUDENT CONSULTATION SERVICE, LOCATED IN ROOM 333 ARPS HALL. THIS SERVICE OPERATES THROUGHOUT THE SCHOOL YEAR, AND THE COUNSELORS THERE ARE QUITE HELPFUL IN DEALING WITH STUDENTS' PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS. IF I CAN BE OF ASSISTANCE IN HELPING YOU GET AN APPOINTMENT WITH A COUNSELOR, I'D BE HAPPY TO DO SO. MY OFFICE IS 346 ARPS. ALSO, IF YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY, FEEL FREE TO CONTACT ME.

"AGAIN, THANKS FOR COMING DOWN HERE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCH, AND REMEMBER NOT TO MENTION IT TO ANYONE, EVEN THOSE WHO HAVE ALREADY PARTICIPATED."

APPENDIX C

Tables

TABLE 26

RAW SCORES^a

CHANGES^b IN RATINGS OF SYNONYMS INITIALLY
JUDGED AS MOST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
A ₁ B ₁ C ₁	1	6	7
	2	8	5
	3	0	-3
	4	0	1
	5	-3	6
	6	2	2
	7	0	-1
	8	5	9
A ₂ B ₁ C ₁	9	-2	0
	10	0	-1
	11	10	1
	12	0	2
	13	23	2
	14	5	0
	15	7	-1
	16	4	0

a. Scores represent summed difference between the S's preinterview and postinterview ratings for the three terms.

b. Minus signs indicate postinterview ratings greater than pre-interview ratings (i.e., change in the direction of higher ratings).

A₁ = Counselor no. 1

A₂ = Counselor no. 2

B₁ = Advocated change

B₂ = Change not advocated

C₁ = High expertness

C₂ = Low expertness

TABLE 26 (Continued)

RAW SCORES
CHANGES IN RATINGS OF SYNONYMS INITIALLY
JUDGED AS MOST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
$A_1 B_2 C_1$	17	2	7
	18	7	2
	19	0	0
	20	-2	-1
	21	15	0
	22	-1	0
	23	-4	6
	24	0	-4
$A_2 B_2 C_1$	25	1	2
	26	3	7
	27	2	4
	28	-2	3
	29	11	9
	30	-2	0
	31	1	0
	32	-3	0
$A_1 B_1 C_2$	33	4	4
	34	3	2
	35	0	6
	36	1	0
	37	2	-1
	38	2	-1
	39	12	3
	40	-1	10
$A_2 B_1 C_2$	41	0	0
	42	1	4
	43	1	-2
	44	-2	0
	45	1	3
	46	4	0
	47	9	7
	48	0	0

TABLE 26 (Continued)

RAW SCORES
CHANGES IN RATINGS OF SYNONYMS INITIALLY
JUDGED AS MOST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
$A_1 B_2 C_2$	49	1	0
	50	6	3
	51	5	4
	52	0	1
	53	0	4
	54	12	8
	55	0	-1
	56	1	5
$A_2 B_2 C_2$	57	1	0
	58	-3	1
	59	5	1
	60	0	7
	61	0	1
	62	3	0
	63	-2	-1
	64	1	5

TABLE 27

RAW SCORES^a

CHANGES^b IN RATINGS OF SYNONYMS INITIALLY
JUDGED AS LEAST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
A ₁ B ₁ C ₁	1	-10	-1
	2	-11	-2
	3	-24	-1
	4	-7	-6
	5	-3	-4
	6	-14	-4
	7	-11	-4
	8	-15	2
A ₂ B ₁ C ₁	9	-11	-6
	10	-15	-1
	11	-1	1
	12	-4	2
	13	-35	-16
	14	-20	-6
	15	-11	-10
	16	-5	-5

a Scores represent summed difference between the S's preinterview and postinterview ratings for the three terms.

b Minus signs indicate postinterview ratings greater than pre-interview ratings (i.e., change in the direction of higher ratings).

A₁ = Counselor no. 1

A₂ = Counselor no. 2

B₁ = Advocated change

B₂ = Change not advocated

C₁ = High expertness

C₂ = Low expertness

TABLE 27 (Continued)

RAW SCORES
CHANGES IN RATINGS OF SYNONYMS INITIALLY
JUDGED AS LEAST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
$A_1 B_2 C_1$	17	2	-5
	18	-3	0
	19	3	-5
	20	-6	-7
	21	-11	-3
	22	-6	-1
	23	-4	1
	24	-2	1
$A_2 B_2 C_1$	25	-1	-3
	26	-1	-14
	27	-2	-18
	28	-11	0
	29	-3	-18
	30	-7	-6
	31	-13	-2
	32	-9	-7
$A_1 B_1 C_2$	33	-12	-4
	34	0	2
	35	4	-3
	36	-5	1
	37	-7	3
	38	-12	-5
	39	-20	-7
	40	-11	-13
$A_2 B_1 C_2$	41	-14	-6
	42	-15	-8
	43	-5	-8
	44	-9	3
	45	-11	-9
	46	-12	-3
	47	-3	0
	48	-4	-4

TABLE 27 (Continued)

RAW SCORES
CHANGES IN RATINGS OF SYNONYMS INITIALLY
JUDGED AS LEAST APPROPRIATE DEFINITIONS

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
A ₁ B ₂ C ₂	49	-3	-3
	50	0	0
	51	2	1
	52	1	0
	53	-5	2
	54	-5	-15
	55	-4	-5
	56	-6	3
A ₂ B ₂ C ₂	57	-1	-7
	58	-6	1
	59	-5	1
	60	-3	-6
	61	-5	-3
	62	-2	-2
	63	-16	-1
	64	-5	-5

TABLE 28
 RAW SCORES^a
 CHANGES^b IN RATINGS OF CONFIDENCE IN ONE'S
 ABILITY TO USE TERMS APPROPRIATELY

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
A ₁ B ₁ C ₁	1	-5	-4
	2	-2	-1
	3	1	-4
	4	1	-6
	5	0	3
	6	0	-2
	7	0	0
	8	1	3
A ₂ B ₁ C ₁	9	-2	3
	10	2	-4
	11	-6	-1
	12	0	1
	13	14	-5
	14	1	-4
	15	6	-5
	16	2	1

a Scores represent summed difference between the S's preinterview and postinterview ratings for the three terms.

b Minus signs indicate postinterview ratings greater than pre-interview ratings (i.e., changes in the direction of higher ratings).

A₁ = Counselor no. 1

A₂ = Counselor no. 2

B₁ = Advocated change

B₂ = Change not advocated

C₁ = High expertness

C₂ = Low expertness

TABLE 28 (Continued)

RAW SCORES
CHANGES IN RATINGS OF CONFIDENCE IN ONE'S
ABILITY TO USE TERMS APPROPRIATELY

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
A B C 1 2 1	17	-5	1
	18	0	-3
	19	-6	6
	20	-4	-4
	21	-1	-4
	22	-2	-3
	23	0	1
	24	-1	0
A B C 2 2 1	25	0	0
	26	1	-4
	27	-3	-5
	28	-2	-3
	29	0	-8
	30	-1	-4
	31	-1	-1
	32	0	-1
A B C 1 1 2	33	11	-9
	34	-2	-2
	35	0	0
	36	2	-2
	37	-1	4
	38	-12	-7
	39	3	-2
	40	1	-1
A B C 2 1 2	41	0	-5
	42	-1	-3
	43	0	4
	44	0	-2
	45	-2	-3
	46	3	-1
	47	4	0
	48	-7	-2

TABLE 28 (Continued)

RAW SCORES
CHANGES IN RATINGS OF CONFIDENCE IN ONE'S
ABILITY TO USE TERMS APPROPRIATELY

Condition	Subjects	Terms Defined by Counselors	Terms Not Defined by Counselors
$A_1 B_2 C_2$	49	0	-1
	50	0	-2
	51	-1	-4
	52	-1	0
	53	-3	1
	54	3	1
	55	-10	-4
	56	-3	-1
$A_2 B_2 C_2$	57	1	0
	58	0	0
	59	-1	-5
	60	-5	1
	61	0	-1
	62	-1	-1
	63	1	-2
	64	1	1

TABLE 29
RAW SCORES

PROCEDURAL CHECK ITEMS

Condition	Subjects	I ^a	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII ^b
A ₁ B ₁ C ₁	1	12	3	13	1	13	10	27
	2	9	10	11	10	10	6	16
	3	12	13	11	13	10	11	39
	4	11	10	11	11	11	9	30
	5	8	10	8	10	8	4	20
	6	2	7	8	7	11	2	25
	7	11	11	11	13	13	9	36
	8	12	13	13	13	12	13	28
A ₂ B ₁ C ₁	9	10	8	8	10	13	7	30
	10	12	12	11	12	12	13	37
	11	11	12	11	11	11	9	15
	12	12	12	12	13	11	1	16
	13	12	11	10	11	10	10	39
	14	12	13	11	12	13	9	38
	15	8	11	10	11	11	5	20
	16	10	9	9	10	10	9	29

a Higher scores represent more favorable evaluation (range = 1 to 13 for items I-VI).

b Higher scores represent more appropriate definitions (range = 3 to 39 for item VII).

I = S's rating of counselor's ability to communicate effectively

II = S's rating of counselor's ability to communicate effectively with other students

III = S's rating of counselor's expertness

IV = S's rating of his liking for the counselor

V = S's rating of his willingness to see the counselor for future counseling

VI = S's rating of importance of agreement on definitions ("common relevance")

VII = S's ratings of counselor's definitions of terms (sum of three terms)

A₁ = Counselor no. 1

C₁ = High expertness

A₂ = Counselor no. 2

C₂ = Low expertness

B₁ = Advocated change

B₂ = Change not advocated

TABLE 29 (Continued)

 RAW SCORES
 PROCEDURAL CHECK ITEMS

Condition	Subjects	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
$A_1B_2C_1$	17	11	12	10	12	11	11	38
	18	11	11	9	10	10	8	35
	19	12	12	10	13	13	11	37
	20	8	11	8	9	10	9	36
	21	11	12	13	13	9	13	23
	22	11	11	9	13	12	11	35
	23	9	11	11	10	10	9	36
	24	10	10	11	10	9	12	26
$A_2B_2C_1$	25	10	11	11	11	11	11	36
	26	13	13	13	13	13	13	37
	27	11	8	10	13	13	13	38
	28	11	10	13	10	13	11	36
	29	12	11	10	13	10	12	39
	30	10	10	9	10	10	10	39
	31	12	10	9	10	11	11	28
	32	9	9	8	10	11	11	39
$A_1B_1C_2$	33	8	6	6	11	11	8	20
	34	9	11	5	8	8	3	29
	35	8	5	3	11	11	11	39
	36	3	3	3	8	1	13	35
	37	6	6	4	9	9	12	39
	38	10	9	5	10	10	10	39
	39	8	6	5	13	13	13	15
	40	9	7	4	12	12	4	39
$A_2B_1C_2$	41	6	7	6	7	7	4	39
	42	3	5	3	6	1	6	38
	43	4	8	6	9	7	9	27
	44	4	9	6	10	9	11	29
	45	3	4	2	7	4	13	39
	46	7	8	6	10	9	9	32
	47	4	4	1	8	2	7	27
	48	11	3	2	10	10	7	33

TABLE 29 (Continued)

RAW SCORES
PROCEDURAL CHECK ITEMS

Condition	Subjects	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
$A_1 B_2 C_2$	49	7	7	5	10	11	10	29
	50	8	9	5	11	9	10	31
	51	7	7	6	8	5	10	38
	52	5	6	4	9	6	9	36
	53	8	10	4	10	10	11	35
	54	10	4	4	11	10	10	36
	55	7	9	6	12	11	9	37
	56	9	9	6	12	11	10	37
$A_2 B_2 C_2$	57	6	7	5	9	7	9	35
	58	9	8	5	12	12	8	38
	59	7	10	5	10	10	12	32
	60	8	6	6	10	8	9	36
	61	5	6	5	9	6	13	37
	62	4	4	4	7	13	9	26
	63	4	6	4	5	7	12	28
	64	6	8	4	9	6	11	39

TABLE 30
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR PROCEDURAL CHECK ITEMS

Item	M	S.D.
I. S's rating of counselor's ability to communicate effectively	8.56	2.87
II. S's rating of counselor ability to communicate effectively with other students	8.66	2.80
III. S's rating of counselor's expertness	7.45	3.29
IV. S's rating of his liking for the counselor	10.17	2.24
V. S's rating of his willingness to see counselor for further counseling	9.70	2.84
VI. S's rating of importance of agreement of definitions ("common relevance")	9.45	2.83
VII. S's rating of counselor's definitions of terms (sum of three terms)	32.38	6.91

TABLE 31

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS FOR SYNONYMS RATED
HIGHEST AND LOWEST BY PRETEST GROUP

<u>Term</u>	<u>Difference between highest and lowest means</u>
Complex*	6.78
Dependency*	6.61
Identification*	6.51
Conflict*	6.15
Reinforcement*	5.73
Reaction*	5.53
Emotion	5.53
Rationalization	4.95
Character	4.94
Fear	4.70
Fantasy	4.69
Depression	4.68
Egocentric	4.62
Neurotic	4.62
Impulse	4.20
Anxiety	4.12
Defensive	4.11
Personality	3.91
Condition	3.61
Sensitivity	3.29
Detachment	3.24
Regression	3.10

*Terms used in final inventories

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abelson, H. I. Persuasion. New York: Springer, 1959.
- Abelson, R. P., & Rosenberg, M. J. Symbolic psycho-logic: A model of attitudinal cognition. Behavioral Science, 1958, 3, 1-13.
- Aronson, E., & Golden, B. W. The effect of relevant and irrelevant aspects of communicator credibility on opinion change. Journal of Personality, 1962, 30, 135-146.
- Asch, S. E. Social psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.
- Bergin, A. E. The effect of dissonant persuasive communications upon changes in self-referring attitude. Journal of Personality, 1962, 30, 423-438.
- Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- Bruner, J. S., Goodnow, J. J., & Austin, G. A. A study of thinking. New York: Wiley, 1956.
- Carroll, J. B. Words, meanings and concepts. In L. A. Jakobovits & M. S. Miron (Eds.), Readings in the psychology of language. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967. Pp. 567-586.
- Cohen, A. R. Attitude change and social influence. New York: Basic Books, 1964.
- Creelman, M. B. The experimental investigation of meaning. New York: Springer, 1966.
- Dollard, J., & Miller, N. E. Personality and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- Endler, N. S. Changes in meaning during psychotherapy as measured by the semantic differential. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 105-111.
- English, H. B., & English, A. C. A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms. New York: McKay, 1958.
- Festinger, L., Gerard, H. B., Hymovitch, B., Kelley, H. H., & Raven, B. The influence process in the presence of extreme deviates. Human Relations, 1952, 5, 327-346.

- Festinger, L. A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 117-140.
- Fishbein, M. An investigation of the relationships between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward that object. Human Relations, 1963, 16, 233-239.
- Frank, J. D. The dynamics of the psychotherapeutic relationship. Psychiatry, 1959, 22, 17-40.
- Frank, J. D. Persuasion and healing. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961.
- Garfinkel, H. A conception of, and experiments with, "trust" as a condition of stable concerted actions. In O. J. Harvey (Ed.), Motivation and social interaction. New York: Ronald Press, 1963. Pp. 187-238.
- Giffin, K. The contribution of studies of source credibility to a theory of interpersonal trust in the communication process. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 68, 104-120.
- Goldstein, A. P., & Dean, S. J. Analogue research. In A. P. Goldstein & S. J. Dean (Eds.), The investigation of psychotherapy: Commentaries and readings. New York: Wiley, 1966. Pp. 369-373.
- Goldstein, A. P., Heller, K., & Sechrest, L. B. Psychotherapy and the psychology of behavior change. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Hayakawa, S. I. Language in thought and action. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.
- Heider, F. Attitudes and cognitive organization. Journal of Psychology, 1946, 21, 107-112.
- Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Heine, R. W. A comparison of patients' reports on psychotherapeutic experience with psychoanalytic, nondirective and Adlerian therapists. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1953, 7, 16-23.
- Hovland, C. E., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. Communication and persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1951, 15, 635-650.

- Insko, C. A. Theories of attitude change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Johnson, W. People in quandries. New York: Harper & Row, 1946.
- Kelman, H. C., & Hovland, C. I. "Reinstatement" of the communicator in delayed measurement of opinion change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 327-335.
- Landfield, A. W., & Nawas, M. M. Psychotherapeutic involvement as a function of communication and adoption of therapists' values. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 336-341.
- Lennard, H. L., & Bernstein, A. The anatomy of psychotherapy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- Levy, L. Psychological interpretation. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.
- McGreevy, C. P., & Daane, C. J. Changes in semantic differential meaning that accompany counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 526-534.
- McGuire, W. J. The current status of cognitive consistency theories. In S. Feldman (Ed.), Cognitive consistency. New York: Academic Press, 1966. Pp. 1-46.
- Mooney, R. L., & Gordon, L. V. The Mooney Problem Check Lists. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1950.
- Naylor, J. C., & Estep, C. An analysis of variance program for replicated or non-replicated designs; 5 factor. Unpublished manuscript, Laboratory of Aviation Psychology, The Ohio State University, 1965.
- Newcomb, T. M. An approach to the study of communicative acts. Psychological Review, 1953, 60, 393-404.
- Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.
- Newcomb, T. M. Individual systems of orientation. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 3. Foundations of the person and the social context. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959. Pp. 384-422.
- Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

- Newcomb, T. M. Interpersonal balance. In R. P. Abelson, E. Aronson, W. J. McGuire, T. M. Newcomb, M. J. Rosenberg, & P. Tannenbaum (Eds.), Cognitive consistency: A sourcebook. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968, in press.
- Osgood, C. E., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The principle of congruity in the prediction of attitude change. Psychological Review, 1955, 62, 42-55.
- Patton, M. J. Attraction, discrepancy, and responses to psychological treatment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1966.
- Pepinsky, H. B. Help-giving in search of a criterion. In E. Landy & A. M. Kroll (Eds.), Guidance in American education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1966. Pp. 197-223.
- Pepinsky, H. B., & Karst, T. O. Convergence: A phenomenon in counseling and psychotherapy. American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 333-338.
- Rapoport, A. Science and the goals of man. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Rogers, C. R. Communication: Its blocking and its facilitation. In S. I. Hayakawa (Ed.), Language, meaning and maturity. New York: Harper, 1954. Pp. 53-60.
- Rosenthal, D. Changes in some moral values following psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1955, 19, 431-436.
- Sapir, E. Communication. In J. P. DeCecco (Ed.), The psychology of language, thought, and instruction. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967. Pp. 75-78.
- Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. Social psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Sullivan, H. S. Conceptions of modern psychiatry. Washington, D. C.: William A. White Psychiatric Foundation, 1947.
- Werner, H., & Kaplan, E. The acquisition of word meanings: A developmental study. Society for Research in Child Development Monographs, 1950, XV, No. 1.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.