DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 882 TM 870 422

AUTHOR Yager, Geoffrey G.; And Others
TITLE Evaluations of Videotaped Counselors on a Variety of Counselor Assessment Scales.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Competence; *Concurrent Validity; *Construct Validity; Correlation; *Counselor Evaluation; Credibility; Higher Education; Interpersonal Attraction; Multitrait Multimethod Techniques; Multivariate Analysis; *Rating Scales; School Counselors; *Social Influences; Undergraduate Students; *Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS (Ivey and Authier); Barrett Lennard Relationship Inventory; Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale; Counselor Effectiveness Scale; Counselor Evaluation Inventory; Counselor Rating Form

ABSTRACT

Concurrent and construct validity of six instruments designed to assess counselor effectiveness was studied. Participants included 139, male and female, undergraduate general studies and education majors. Consistent with social influence theory, four videotaped counselor role conditions (non-expert, not-attractive, non-trustworthy, and not-deficient) were created. Participants were randomly assigned to view one of the four counseling roles and to rate the counselor on each of six commonly-used counselor effectiveness instruments, three drawn from social influence theory and three from other theoretical viewpoints. High concurrent validity was found for social influence instruments, however high discriminant validity coefficients between the expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness subscales indicates that these subscales may not measure distinct constructs. Also, considerable construct overlap was found between social influence and comparison instruments. Social influence instruments discriminated between the counselor role conditions as might be expected based on social influence theory. Implications for measurement of counselor effectiveness were discussed. (Author)

Evaluations of Videotaped Counselors on a Variety of Counselor Assessment Scales

Geoffrey G. Yager

F. Robert Wilson

Melanie Warnke

Paula Dupuy

University of Cincinnati

Running Head: EVALUATIONS OF VIDEOTAPED COUNSELORS

Abstract

Concurrent and construct validity of six instruments designed to assess counselor effectiveness was studied. Participants included 139, male and female, undergraduate general studies and education majors. Consistent with social influence theory, four videotaped counselor role conditions (non-expert, not-attractive, non-trustworthy, and not-deficient) were created. Participants were randomly assigned to view one of the four counseling roles and to rate the counselor on each of six commonly-used counselor effectiveness instruments, three drawn from social influence theory and three from other theoretical viewpoints. High concurrent validity was found for social influence instruments, however high discriminant validity coefficients between the expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness subscales indicates that these subscales may not measure distinctly constructs. Also, considerable construct overlap was found between social influence and comparison instruments. Social influence instruments discriminated between the counselor role conditions as might be expected based on social influence theory. Implications for measurement of counselor effectiveness were discussed.

Evaluations of Videotaped Counselors

on a Variety of Counselor Assessment Scales

There were two primary objectives of this investigation: (a) to determine the differential evaluations of observers of videotaped counselors who displayed deficits in expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness and (b) to explore the concurrent validity of six scales for measuring counselor effectiveness.

One primary focus of this study centered on the question: What is the effect of differences in counselor social influence behavior on scores yielded by instruments designed to measure counselor effectiveness? Participants viewed videotapes in which the counselor displayed deficits in one of the social influence variables (i.e., expertness, attractiveness, or trustworthiness) and rated the observed counselor on each of these variables with three different instruments created to measure the social influence process. In addition, the study explored the extent to which instruments not specifically created to measure the social influence process would be sensitive to the differences in counselor style displayed in the videotapes. Finally, because measurement characteristics of the three social influence measures have not been explored in a single subject pool, data collected in this study were used to assess the concurrent and discriminant validity of the three social influence instruments.

A recent study (Yager, Heilman, & Melchior, 1984) demonstrated, through a set of related experiments, that subjects who had never been trained as counselors were unable to discriminate between a videotaped counselor who expressed high levels of empathy from a counselor who expressed no empathy. A follow-up on this study (Beck & Yager, 1986) provided evidence that observers who had been clients themselves rated empathic communication more positively than content-only responses during the first part of a counseling interaction. If a behavior as central to counseling as the presence or absence of empathy (e.g., Anthony & Drasgow, 1978, Carkhuff, 1969a, 1969b, 1972) is not clearly identified as a dimension of differentiation between two counselors, would other aspects of counselor behavior be more likely to be perceived by an untrained observer of a counseling videotape?

One set of counselor behaviors that has been well investigated over recent years has been the social influence behaviors originally addressed by Strong (1968). Corrigan, Dell, Lewis, and Schmidt (1980) review extensive research related to the perceived reactions of observers and/or clients to counselors with differing levels of the three social influence behaviors: expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. None of the studies reviewed, however, had attempted to investigate observer reactions to differences in all three social influence behaviors within the same study and with the same illustrative client. In

fact, Beutler, Crago and Arizmendi (1986) have indicated that "deriving discriminative definitions of these concepts has been a major concern for psychotherapy researchers" (p. 279). Therefore, the present investigation was designed to include assessment of observer reactions to counselor behaviors representing each of the social influence areas.

Although the major counselor effectiveness rating scales have been evaluated individually by a variety of investigators, concurrent studies of scale performance have been very rare (Ponterotto & Furlong, 1985). Since documenting the effectiveness of the counseling process is crucial to counseling and counseling training, Ponterotto and Furlong (1985) recommended a continued effort be directed toward exploring the validity of the most commonly used effectiveness rating scales. Thus, one of the purposes of the present study was to address this question: To what extent do the six most commonly used counselor rating scales tend to assess the same counselor attributes?

Methods

Participants

Participants in this study were undergraduate students in their early twenties (M = 21.82, SD = 5.98) recruited from the two-year University College program and the four-year teacher education program in the College of Education, University of Cincinnati. The sample consisted of 102 women and 37 men, of

which 115 were White, 22 were Black, and 2 were Oriental. All of the University College students and about two-thirds of the College of Education students were in their first two years of college.

Since the study focused on rating counselor effectiveness, each participant was asked to indicate prior experience with educational-vocational or personal-social counseling. Nearly all the participants had participated in educational-vocational counseling during high school (94%) and half had obtained educational-vocational counseling subsequent to high school (50%). A minority of the students had discussed personal-social concerns with a high school counselor (40%) and fewer still had received personal-social counseling in any other context (30%).

A tally of the number of persons participating in each of the treatment conditions revealed a slight imbalance. In an attempt to increase the sensitivity of the statistical analyses and to minimize distortions (Pedhazur, 1982), three persons were randomly selected for exclusion from the over-represented condition.

Instruments

The primary counselor effectiveness variables measured in this study were the three social influence variables: expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. To measure these social influence variables, three instruments which were designed within the social influence framework were employed:

the Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale (CERS, Atkinson & Carskaddon, 1975), the Counselor Rating Form (CRF, Barak & LaCrosse, 1975), and the Counselor Rating Form - Short Form (CRF-S, Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983). In addition, three other commonly-used counselor effectiveness instruments were included as comparison measures: the Barrett- Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI, Barrett-Lennard, 1962), the Counselor Evaluation Inventory (CEI, Linden, Stone, & Shertzer, 1965), and the Counselor Effectiveness Scale (CES, Ivey & Authier, 1978). An extensive review of the measurement characteristics of these scales has been reported by Ponterotto and Furlong (1985).

Stimulus Materials

A client role-play was developed to be maximally relevant to the undergraduate student participants. The client on the videotape was a freshman who had come to the university to be with a boyfriend from her home. She and her boyfriend were now growing apart, and she was feeling depressed and alone. A script for the role-playing was not prepared; the client was given a detailed description of the role-played concerns and the feelings underlying those concerns. Four unrehearsed, 7-minute counseling sessions were carried out with the same male counselor who varied his counseling responses from one videotape to another.

During one of the interviews, the non-deficient counselor condition (EAT -- i.e., expert, attractive, and trustworthy), the counselor demonstrated high levels of all three targeted social

influence variables. In each of the remaining three videotapes, one counselor characteristic was intentionally lowered through direct behavioral evidence. For the low expertness counselor role (AT~E -- attractive and trustworthy but not expert), the counselor indicated he was an intern rather than a psychologist; he did not recognize the name of a residence hall on campus; and he was confused at client's reference to the word "catharsis." For the low attractiveness role (ET~A -- expert and trustworthy but not attractive), the counselor wore blue jeans, had uncombed hair, chewed gum, blew his nose, and fidgeted uncomfortably. Finally, in the low trustworthiness role (EA~T -- expert and attractive but not trustworthy), the counselor offhandedly revealed the name of another student he had seen with similar problems; he described his schedule as so busy that the client might not be able to see him as scheduled each week; and he indicated his intention to contact the client's parents about her difficulties at school.

A group of 13 doctoral students with experience in counseling were asked to view each of the four videotapes in a random order and to rate each counselor on one item scales representing expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The EAT tape was rated highest on all three scales, and each videotape that had been intended to be deficient in one area was rated significantly lower than any of the three other videotapes

on the scale assessing that area. These data provided content validity for the four videotapes.

Although the videotapes differed on the dimension of the social influence characteristics, all other aspects of the tapes were intended to be as identical as possible. Unlike some previous studies where the counselor's role was "too exaggerated to permit generalization to counseling practice" (Corrigan, Dell, Lewis & Schmidt, 1980, p. 406), the counselor on the present videotapes continued to make empathic responses directed to the client's concerns in each of the four counselor roles.

Procedures

Recruits were given a brief description of the purposes of the study and asked to sign a subject consent form. Each participant was randomly assigned to view one of the four counselor role conditions. While watching the videotape, the participant was encouraged to "view the counselor from the perspective of the client." As soon as the viewing was complete, the observers were asked to "rate the counselor as if you were the client and wanted to talk to the counselor about something that really mattered to you." To counterbalance order effects, the six counselor effectiveness rating scales were presented to the participant in randomized order.

Results

The focus of the study was two fold. Counselor effectiveness was manipulated through the use of videotaped

counselor roles to facilitate study of the construct validity of the social influence measures. Additionally, simultaneous administration of the set of counselor effectiveness scales was employed to permit exploration of the concurrent validity of the three social influence measures (CRF, CRF—S, and CERS) and to assess their relationship to three additional counselor effectiveness instruments (BSLRI, CES, and CEI). The second of these two directions of focus will be considered first.

Concurrent Validity of Social Influence Measures

To investigate the concurrent and discriminant validity of the three social influence instruments, a multitrait-multimethod matrix (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) was constructed. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed and arranged to display the correlations among pairs of instruments for each of the three social influence variables. Table 1 contains these correlation coefficients and normative data for each social influence scale.

The concurrent validity coefficients, coefficients computed by pairing different measures of the same construct, were generally high (range: .82 to .89; median: .85). Between instrument correlation ranges for each of the variables were: expertness, .82 to .85; attractiveness, .83 to .89; and trustworthiness, .83 to .86. All were significant at $p < .001$.

Under social influence theory, the three social influence variables are expected to be independent measures of counselor

effectiveness. Accordingly, they should yield low discriminant validity coefficients. In the present study, however, discriminant validities were also relatively high. When the measures of expertness were correlated with the measures of attractiveness, the correlations ranged from .57 to .70 (median: .66). The expertness/trustworthiness combination yielded discriminant validity coefficients ranging from .53 to .73 (median: .65). Finally, the attractiveness/trustworthiness pairing yielded discriminant coefficients of .66 to .76 (median: .71).

Insert Table 1 about here

Because of the high concurrent validity among instruments for each of the three social influence scales, the scale metric was equated by converting all 9 social influence scales to *z*-scores. A composite score for each social influence variable (i.e., expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness) was computed by averaging *z*-scores across the three social influence instruments (i.e., CRF, CRF-S, and CERS).

Examination of the between scale correlations among the other instruments revealed that the two Ivey and Authier (1978) scales (CES-1 and CES-2) were also very highly correlated, r = .94, and, therefore, these two scales were also equated for metric and averaged to produce a composite score.

Test of Differences between Populations

Before exploring hypotheses concerning the effects of the counselor role conditions on measures of counselor effectiveness, a multivariate analysis was conducted to determine whether the two populations sampled for this study (i.e., the University College and the College of Education) differed across the full set of dependent variables. The multivariate analysis of variance revealed there was no significant difference between the two populations sampled [$T^2 = 0.19$, $F(13, 122) = 1.79$, $p > .05$]. The populations were combined in all subsequent analyses.

Effect of Counseling Role Stimuli

To test the effect of the four counselor roles on participant ratings of counselor social influence, a multivariate analysis of variance was completed. This analysis featured one between-subjects factor, counselor role, with four levels. Three levels involved a form of counselor deficiency, not-expert (AT~E), not-trustworthy (EA~T), and not-attractive (ET~A), while the fourth level portrayed a counselor with no specific deficiency (EAT). Thirteen dependent variables were employed, including the three standardized and averaged social influence variables, five BLRI scales, the average of the two standardized CES scales, three CEI scales and the CERS-Utility scale. Means and standard deviations for all scales and counselor role conditions are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

A significant multivariate difference was found for the comparison of the four videotapes [T^2 = 1.30, $F(39,356)$ = 3.97, p < .001]. To explore the specific ways in which the variables discriminated between the counselor stimuli, univariate analyses of variance with Tukey post hoc contrasts were conducted. In addition to pair-wise comparisons of counselor roles, a planned contrast between the non-deficient counselor role (EAT) and the average of the deficient counselor roles (EA~T, ET~A, and AT~E) was computed. The results of the univariate analyses of variance and planned contrasts between the non-deficient counselor and the pooled deficient counselors are presented in Table 3, and the results of the Tukey pair-wise comparisons are presented in Table 4.

Insert Table 3 and 4 about here

Social Influence Variables. Each of the three social influence variables proved useful in discriminating between the counselor role conditions. For the standardized composite expertness variable, the non-deficient (EAT) counseling role was rated at nearly .5 sd above the mean, the non-trustworthy (EA~T) and the non-expert (AT~E) roles scored at or slightly below the

mean (.0 sd and -.1 sd, respectively), and the non-attractive (ET˜A) role scored more than -.4 sd below the mean. Both the omnibus test [$F(3,132) = 6.45$, $p < .05$] and the planned contrast between the non-deficient and deficient counselor roles [$t(132) = 3.68$, $p < .05$] yielded significance. Tukey pair-wise comparisons revealed that although the non-deficient counselor was perceived to be more expert than both the non-expert and the non-attractive counselor ($p < .05$) none of the other pair-wise comparisons achieved significance.

Ratings on the attractiveness variable suggested that the non-expert (AT˜E) and non-deficient (EAT) counselor roles were viewed somewhat positively (.3 sd and .2 sd, respectively) while the non-trustworthy (EA˜T) and non-attractive (ET˜A) roles were viewed more negatively (-.2 sd and -.4 sd). Attractiveness discriminated between the counselor roles for the omnibus test [$F(3,132) = 4.65$, $p < .004$], but the test between non-deficient and pooled deficient counselor roles was not significant, $t(132) = 1.71$, $p > .05$. Both the non-expert and the non-deficient counselors were perceived to be significantly more attractive than the non-attractive counselor ($p < .05$). However, none of the other pair-wise comparisons achieved significance.

Finally, on the trustworthiness scale, the non-deficient (EAT) and the non-expert (AT˜E) counselor roles were grouped at .6 sd and .5 sd above the mean while the non-attractive (ET˜A) and the non-trustworthy (EA˜T) counselor roles clustered below

the mean at about -.5 sd. A significant difference between counselor roles was observed for both the omnibus test of differences between counselor roles [$F(3,132) = 17.86$, $p < .001$] and for the planned contrast between deficient and non-deficient counselor roles [$t(132) = 4.67$, $p < .001$]. When compared by pairs, the non-expert counselor did not differ from the non-deficient counselor, nor did the non-trustworthy differ from the non-attractive counselor. However, both the non-deficient and non-expert counselors were perceived to be significantly more trustworthy than either the non-trustworthy or the non-attractive counselors.

Barrett-Lennard Scales. Four of the five Barrett-Lennard scales showed a strong positive relationship to the nine social influence scales. Specifically, the social influence variables had a moderately strong, direct relationship with the Barrett-Lennard Level of Regard (BLRI-R) (range: .53 to .80), Empathic Understanding (BLRI-E) (range: .44 to .70), Congruence (BLRI-C) (range: .54 to .70), and Willingness to be Known (BLRI-W) (range: .44 to .69). Unconditionality of Regard (BLRI-U) was generally unrelated to the social influence variables (range: .03 to .20) yielding its highest correlations with the CRF-S expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness variables (range: .17 to .20). These correlations are presented in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here.

Four of the five BLRI scales (BLRI-R, BLRI-E, BLRI-C, and BLRI-W) significantly discriminated between the four counselor role conditions. The non-deficient counselor was judged to have greater empathic understanding (BLRI-E) and more congruence (BLRI-C) than the pooled deficient counselors. Further, the non-deficient counselor was viewed as having a greater level of regard (BLRI-R) than the non-attractive counselor, greater empathic understanding (BLRI-E) than the non-trustworthy counselor, and greater congruence (BLRI-C) than either the non-attractive or non-trustworthy counselors. The non-expert counselor was viewed as having greater empathic understanding (BLRI-E) than the non-trustworthy counselor and as having a greater level of regard (BLRI-R) and being more willing to be known (BLRI-W) than either the non-trustworthy or the not-attractive counselor.

Counselor Effectiveness Scales. The composite Counselor Effectiveness Scale (zAVG-CES) was highly related to all three social influence variables: expertness (range: .78 to .87), attractiveness (range: .78 to .80), and trustworthiness (range: .76 to .80). The omnibus test of this variable discriminated significantly between the counselor role conditions. In addition, the non-deficient counselor scored higher than the

pooled deficient counselors [$t(132) = 3.83$, $p < .05$]. Pair-wise comparisons revealed that the non-deficient counselor was perceived more positively than either the non-attractive or the non-trustworthy counselor ($p < .05$). Finally, the non-expert counselor was perceived more positively than the non-attractive counselor.

Counselor Evaluation Inventory. Of all the scales, the Counseling Climate (CEI-CLI), Counselor Comfort (CEI-COM), and Client Satisfaction (CEI-SAT) showed the greatest degree of independence (range: .29 to .35). Only the scale measuring counseling climate (CEI-CLI) yielded a consistent, modest, positive relationship with the social influence variables: expertness (range: .32 to .34), attractiveness (range: .39 to .41), and trustworthiness (range: .35 to .37). Additionally, only the counseling climate scale discriminated significantly between the counselor role conditions [$F(3, 132) = 3.03$, $p < .05$]. The non-deficient counselor scored significantly higher on CEI-CLI than the pooled deficient counselors [$t(132) = 2.29$, $p < .05$] and higher than the non-trustworthy counselor ($p < .05$).

Utility. The Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale includes a one item scale reported to measure counselor utility (CERS-U). This scale correlated remarkably highly with the social influence variables, irrespective of instrument employed (range: .57 to .70). It, too, was a significant discriminator of the four counselor role conditions [$F(3,132) = 4.19$, $p < .05$] and the non-

deficient counselor was perceived to have higher utility than the three deficient counselors [$t(132) = 2.97$, $p < .05$]. In addition, the non-deficient counselor was rated more highly than the non-attractive counselor ($p < .05$).

Discussion

The results of this study have provided more evidence that the three instruments [i.e., the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), the Counselor Rating Form - Short Version (CRF-S), and the Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale (CERS)] designed to assess social influence dimensions (i.e., expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness) are, in fact, measuring the same phenomenon. The concurrent validities between subscales are very high. However, the subscales do not fare well on a discriminant validity test: the correlations between different subscales (e.g., between expertness and trustworthiness) are nearly as high as are the concurrent validities. Also, when correlated with instruments designed to assess other aspects of counselor effectiveness, the social influence variables tend to yield high relationships. Uncorrelated scales included only the Barrett-Lennard Unconditionality of Regard scale and the Counselor Evaluation Inventory's Counselor Comfort and Client Satisfaction Scales. Such remarkable consistency between ratings of differing scales appears to indicate that there is likely a common, underlying general evaluation factor that is important to any observer evaluation of a counselor.

Beyond the psychometric issues, this study has also established that untrained observers of counseling videotapes are able to discriminate between counselors who differ on the social influence variables of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The demonstration of this ability serves as both a content validation test of the counselor videotapes employed and a construct validation of the three combined scales that were used to measure expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (i.e., CRF, CRF-S, and CERS). In the specific case of each of the illustration videotapes, the observers rated the deficient counselors lower than a non-deficient counselor on the specific scale which had been the intended area of deficiency.

The counselor videotape which incorporated all three dimensions was rated consistently higher, both on scales designed to assess the three dimensions manipulated and on scales that had been developed for ratings on other dimensions of the counselor's performance [i.e., the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI), Counselor Evaluation Inventory (CEI), and the Counselor Effectiveness Scale (CES)].

Although earlier reviews (Corrigan et al., 1980; Heppner & Dixon, 1981) have suggested that the counselor's expertness was the most powerful of the three source variables, the results of the present study do not lend support to this conclusion. In fact, the non-expert videotape was rated as essentially similar

to the non-deficient videotape on all but one of the ten evaluative scales used in the study. The one exception, of course, was the combined expertness scale. On every other scale (including attractiveness, trustworthiness, four BLRI scales, and CES, CEI, and CERS scales), the observers rated the non expert counselor nearly as high as the non-deficient counselor.

The non-trustworthy and non-attractive counselors, on the other hand, were rated significantly below the non-deficient and non-expert counselors in many of the scales: trustworthiness, BLRI Level of Regard, BLRI Congruence, and the Counselor Effectiveness Scale.

Do the consistently poorer ratings of the counselors deficient in trustworthiness and attractiveness indicate that these dimensions are more powerful factors than expertness? Not necessarily. Since this was an analogue study, reactions of observers may be somewhat different from those of actual clients. Although the absence of trustworthiness and attractiveness affect the scale ratings more dramatically than the absence of expertness, in actual counseling, the expertness may be the factor critical to influencing client change. Further research is needed to address this issue.

The availability of content valid counselor videotapes illustrating a counselor with the same client who varies from one tape to the next on presence or absence of the social influence dimensions also creates a number of additional research

questions. For example, will differing observer populations react similarly in their evaluations of these counselor deficiencies (e.g., males vs. females, those with counseling experience vs. those without, clients with differing cultural backgrounds, older vs. younger observers)? These and other similar questions may now be addressed with the ready availability of the videotapes prepared for this investigation.

References

Anthony, W. & Drasgow, J. (1978). A human technology for human resource development. The Counseling Psychologist, 7, 58-65.

Atkinson, D. R., & Carskaddon, G. (1975). A prestigious introduction, psychological jargon, and perceived counselor credibility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 180-186.

Barak, A. & LaCrosse, M.B. (1975). Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 471-476.

Beck, T. D. & Yager, G. G. (1986, April). The empathic vs. the non-empathic counselor: Differences in evaluations by observers with experience as clients. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 678)

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (1962). Dimensions of therapist's response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 76 (Whole No. 43).

Beutler, L. E., Crago, M., & Arizmendi, T. G. (1986). Therapist variables in psychotherapy process and outcome. In S. L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change. (pp. 257-310). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Campbell, D. & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81-105.

Carkhuff, R. R. (1969a). Helping and human relations, Volume 1: Selection and training. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Carkhuff, R. R. (1969b). Helping and human relations, Volume 2: Research and practice. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Carkhuff, R. R. (1972). The development of systematic human resource development models. The Counseling Psychologist, 3, 4 - 10.

Corrigan, J. D., Dell, D. D., Lewis, K. N., & Schmidt, L. D. (1980). Counseling as a social influence process: A review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 395-441.

Corrigan, J. D., & Schmidt, L. D. (1983). Development and validation of revisions in the Counselor Rating Form. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 64-75.

Heppner, P. P., & Dixon, D. N. (1981). A review of the interpersonal influence process in counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59, 542-550.

Ivey, A. E., & Authier, J. (1978). Microcounseling: Innovations in interviewing, counseling, psychotherapy, and psychoeducation (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). Multiple regression in behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Linden, J. D., Stone, S. C., & Shertzer, B. (1965). Development and evaluation of an inventory for rating counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 44, 267-276.

Ponterotto, J. G. & Furlong, M. J. (1985). Evaluating counselor effectiveness: A critical review of rating scale instruments. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32, 597-616.

Strong, S. R. (1968). Counseling: An interpersonal influence process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15, 215-224.

Yager, G. G., Heilman, S. B., & Melchior, W. C. (1984, April). Good counseling; bad counseling: Who can tell the difference? Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 352)

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients for Social Influence Variables (n = 136) from the Counselor Rating Form (CRF), the Counselor Rating Form - Short Version (CRFS), and the Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale (CERS)

	Expert			Attractive			Trustworthy		
	CRF	CRFS	CERS	CRF	CRFS	CERS	CRF	CRFS	CERS
Expert									
CRF-E	--								
CRFS-E	.82*	--							
CERS-E	.85*	.85*	--						
Attractive									
CRF-A	.70*	.57*	.66*	--					
CRFS-A	.70*	.63*	.67*	.89*	--				
CERS-A	.70*	.61*	.66*	.83*	.88*	--			
Trustworthy									
CRF-T	.68*	.55*	.63*	.76*	.66*	.67*	--		
CRFS-T	.73*	.64*	.68*	.73*	.73*	.71*	.84*	--	
CERS-T	.68*	.53*	.65*	.73*	.71*	.70*	.83*	.86*	--
Normative Data									
M	40.4	11.0	9.4	39.0	11.3	8.7	47.4	14.8	11.1
sd	14.6	5.3	4.1	12.4	5.6	4.2	13.0	5.1	4.7

* $p < .001$

Note: Concurrent validity coefficients are underscored.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Counselor Role Groups [Expert, Attractive and Trustworthy (EAT), Expert and Attractive but not Trustworthy (EA~T), Expert and Trustworthy but not Attractive (ET~A), and Attractive and Trustworthy but not Expert (AT~E)] (n = 34 per group).

	Counselor Role Conditions							
	EA~T		ET~A		AT~E		EAT	
Variable	M	sd	M	sd	M	sd	M	sd
Social Influence Scales - Averaged z scores								
Expert	0.05	0.98	-0.45	0.60	-0.09	0.85	0.49	1.07
Attractive	-0.21	0.88	-0.36	0.61	0.34	0.97	0.23	1.14
Trustworthy	-0.52	0.96	-0.49	0.56	0.45	0.83	0.56	0.83
Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Scales								
Regard	-7.47	24.25	-12.68	17.31	8.44	20.52	3.06	20.00
Empathy	-10.41	12.93	-7.35	12.27	-0.94	13.72	-0.62	12.60
Congruence	-7.41	15.53	-6.94	12.47	-0.82	16.56	2.29	11.94
Uncndtnl.	3.03	13.09	8.09	12.32	5.56	12.36	9.15	13.17
Willingness	-4.79	14.02	-3.47	8.59	4.35	11.70	1.88	9.81
Counselor Effectiveness Scale								
z-score	-0.69	1.00	-0.60	0.57	0.14	0.86	0.52	1.11
Counselor Evaluation Inventory								
Climate	8.29	2.59	8.56	1.99	9.59	2.90	10.12	3.74
Co. Comfort	3.79	2.08	4.26	1.56	4.29	2.11	4.44	1.79
Cl. Satfctn.	5.15	1.42	5.23	1.61	5.50	2.03	5.35	1.72
Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale								
Utility	1.73	1.33	1.23	0.43	1.88	1.53	2.47	2.02

Table 3

Tests of Omnibus Univariate Differences between Counselor Role Groups [Expert, Attractive and Trustworthy (EAT), Expert and Attractive but not Trustworthy (EA~T), Expert and Trustworthy but not Attractive (ET~A), and Attractive and Trustworthy but not Expert (AT~E)] and Planned Contrast between the Non-Deficient Counselor Role (EAT) and the Pooled Deficient Counselor Roles (EA~T, ET~A, and AT~E).

	Omnibus Test Across Counselor Role Groups				Non-Deficient Counselor Role vs. Pooled Deficient Counselor Roles	
Variable	MS_{Hyp}	MS_{Err}	F(3,132)	p	t(132)	p
Social Influence Scales - Averaged z scores						
Expert	5.15	0.80	6.45	.001*	3.68	.001*
Attractive	3.92	0.84	4.65	.004*	1.71	.089
Trustworthy	11.65	0.65	17.86	.001*	4.67	.001*
Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Scales						
Regard	3155.42	427.29	7.38	.001*	1.70	.091
Empathy	797.73	166.17	4.80	.003*	2.20	.029*
Congruence	765.75	203.41	3.76	.012*	2.60	.010*
Uncndtnl.	254.46	162.32	1.56	.200	1.42	.157
Willingness	640.22	125.86	5.09	.002*	1.43	.154
Counselor Effectiveness Scale						
z-score	7.32	0.82	8.86	.001*	3.83	.001*
Counselor Evaluation Inventory						
Climate	25.05	8.27	3.03	.032*	2.29	.024*
Co. Comfort	2.67	3.62	0.74	.531	0.86	.392
Cl. Satfctn.	0.79	2.93	0.27	.846	0.17	.862
Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale						
Utility	8.79	2.10	4.19	.007*	2.97	.003*

* $p < .05$

Table 4

Tukey Post-Hoc Comparisons for (a) a Planned Contrast between the Non-Deficient Counselor Videotape and the Average of the Deficient Counselor Videotapes (NON-DEF > DFCT), and (b) Pairwise Comparisons between all four Counselor Role Groups [Expert, Attractive and Trustworthy (EAT), Expert and Attractive not Trustworthy (EA~T), Expert and Trustworthy not Attractive (ET~A), and Attractive and Trustworthy but Expert (AT~E)]

	Planned A Priori Comparison	Tukey Pairwise Comparisons					
Variable	NON-DEF > DFCT	EA~T > ET~A	AT~E > EA~T	AT~E > ET~A	EAT > EA~T	EAT > ET~A	EAT > AT~E
Social Influence Variables - z-score averages							
Expert	*	-	-	-	-	*	*
Attractive	-	-	-	*	-	*	-
Trustworthy	*	-	*	*	*	*	-
Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Scales							
Regard	-	-	*	*	-	*	-
Empathy	*	-	*	-	*	-	-
Congruence	*	-	-	-	*	*	-
Uncndtnlty.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Willingness	-	-	*	*	-	-	-
Counselor Effectiveness Scale							
z-score ave.	*	-	-	*	*	*	-
Counselor Evaluation Inventory							
Climate	*	-	-	-	*	-	-
Co. Comfort	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cl. Satfctn.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale							
Utility	*	-	-	-	-	*	-

* $p < .05$.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship between Social Influence Variables and other Counseling Effectiveness Variables

	BLRI					CES	CEI			CERS
	R	E	C	U	W		CLI	COM	SAT	U
Expert										
CRF-E	.68*	.62*	.61*	.11	.51*	.87*	.34*	-.02	-.13	.66*
CRFS-E	.53*	.44*	.54*	.08	.44*	.78*	.25*	-.07	-.12	.67*
CERS-E	.61*	.54*	.56*	.05	.48*	.82*	.32*	-.04	-.14	.70*
Attractive										
CRF-A	.80*	.70*	.67*	.09	.69*	.79*	.41*	-.05	-.10	.68*
CRFS-A	.75*	.59*	.62*	.03	.66*	.79*	.40*	-.06	-.09	.70*
CERS-A	.70*	.55*	.58*	.06	.58*	.80*	.39*	-.09	-.06	.68*
Trustworthy										
CRF-T	.76*	.68*	.70*	.20	.67*	.79*	.35*	-.02	-.11	.57*
CRFS-T	.74*	.63*	.69*	.17	.63*	.80*	.37*	-.03	-.18	.60*
CERS-T	.77*	.66*	.67*	.18	.65*	.77*	.35*	.02	-.10	.62*
Normative Data										
M	-2.2	-4.8	-3.2	6.4	-0.5	0.0	9.1	4.2	5.3	1.8
sd	22.1	13.4	14.7	12.8	11.7	1.0	2.9	1.9	1.7	1.5

** $p < .001$

KEY:

BLRI = Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (includes subscales: R -- Regard, E -- Empathy, C -- Congruence, U - Unconditionality of Regard, W -- Willingness to be Known)
CES = Counselor Effectiveness Scale
CEI = Counselor Evaluation Inventory (includes subscales: CLI - Counseling Climate, COM -- Counselor Comfort, SAT - Client Satisfaction)
CERS = Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale (includes subscales: U -- Utility, E -- Expertness, A -- Attractiveness, T -- Trustworthiness)
CRF = Counselor Rating Form (includes subscales: E -- Expertness, A -- Attractiveness, T -- Trustworthiness)
CRFS = Counselor Rating Form - Short Version (includes subscales: E -- Expertness, A -- Attractiveness, T -- Trustworthiness)