

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNSELOR AND  
SUBJECT DOGMATISM AND THE SUBJECT'S  
PERCEPTION OF COUNSELOR EXPERTNESS,  
ATTRACTIVENESS AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

By

CLOVIS ELIZABETH STAIR

Bachelor of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1982

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1984

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
July, 1987



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNSELOR AND  
SUBJECT DOGMATISM AND THE SUBJECT'S  
PERCEPTION OF COUNSELOR EXPERTNESS,  
ATTRACTIVENESS AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

Thesis Approved:

*Alfred Halimji*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Joseph R. Pearl*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*George W. Perry*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*W. Bill Scott*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*John C. ...*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Durham*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to all those individuals who made this study possible.

I am especially grateful to Dr. Al Carlozzi for serving as my dissertation advisor. His guidance, concern and counsel was invaluable.

I am indebted to the other members of my doctoral committee who gave freely of their time and energy to this endeavor. Special thanks are due Dr. Katye Perry for her advisement in the organizational stage of the study. Also, special thanks to Dr. Sherry Maxwell for her willingness to complete details that could not be attended to by long distance.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Pat Lukosius for filming and editing the video-tapes as well as to the actors who agreed to participate in them.

Finally, I reserve my most grateful appreciation for my husband, R.E. His unwavering faith in me and understanding of my goals made this endeavor possible. His loving support gave me the strength to continue when the dream seemed a very long way off.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Definitions. . . . .	4
Significance of the Study. . . . .	5
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	6
Research Hypothesis. . . . .	7
Limitations. . . . .	7
Assumptions. . . . .	7
Summary of the Chapter . . . . .	8
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE. . . . .	9
Introductions. . . . .	9
Counselor Characteristics. . . . .	9
Dogmatism. . . . .	11
Counselor Dogmatism and Counseling Effectiveness. . . . .	13
Client Perceptions of the Counselor. . . . .	17
Expertness . . . . .	18
Attractiveness . . . . .	22
Trustworthiness. . . . .	26
Summary. . . . .	28
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	29
Introduction . . . . .	29
Subject Selection. . . . .	29
Instrumentation. . . . .	29
<u>The Dogmatism Scale</u> . . . . .	30
<u>The Counseling Rating Form (CRF)</u> . . . . .	32
Analysis of Data . . . . .	36
Summary. . . . .	37
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY. . . . .	38
Introduction . . . . .	38
Research Hypothesis . . . . .	38
Summary. . . . .	46
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	47
Summary. . . . .	47
Conclusions. . . . .	49
Recommendations. . . . .	50

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	53
APPENDIXES . . . . .	59
APPENDIX A - <u>THE DOGMATISM SCALE</u> . . . . .	60
APPENDIX B - <u>THE COUNSELOR RATING FORM (CRF)</u> . .	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Multivariate F's for Expertness, Attractiveness and Trustworthiness . . . . .	46
II.	Univariate F's for Expertness, Attractiveness and Trustworthiness . . . . .	46
III.	Stepdown F's and Univariate F's for Expertness, Attractiveness and Trustworthiness . . . . .	46
IV.	Means and Standard Deviations for Expertness, Attractiveness and Trustworthiness . . . . .	46

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Counselor characteristics have been examined often by many researchers (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; Mahon & Altmann, 1977; Rokeach, 1954; Rowe, Murphy, DeCipkes, 1975). Many personality factors and personal characteristics have been examined to discover what accounts for effective counseling. Mahon & Altmann (1977) report that the personality of the counselor is the single most important variable in counseling effectiveness. Rogers (1957) states that the person of the counselor is the most important element in therapy. He states that the counselor must be able to accurately identify the emotions of the client, empathize with them, and verbalize that understanding to the client in such a manner as to impart a sense of being fully heard, cared for and understood. To Rogers, the effective counselor is the one who can use himself or herself as a tool.

Many studies have supported the supposition that the personality of the counselor is the most important variable in counseling effectiveness (Mahon & Altmann, 1977). It has also been reported that dogmatism is one personality factor that has an inverse effect on counseling effectiveness

(Carlozzi, Campbell, & Ward, 1982; Kemp, 1962; Mezzamo, 1969; Milliken & Patterson, 1967; Russo, Kelz, & Hudson, 1964). Highly dogmatic counselors were found to be less permissive and understanding than less dogmatic counselors (Kemp, 1962). That study further stated that highly dogmatic counselors tended to be more evaluative and interpretive, and less supportive and facilitative.

Not surprisingly, it has been concluded that counselor dogmatism is one characteristic that has a negative effect on counseling effectiveness (Carlozzi et al., 1982; Kemp, 1962; Mezzamo, 1969; Milliken & Patterson, 1967; Russo et al., 1964). Rokeach (1954) defines dogmatism as the "relative openness or closedness of a person's cognitive framework for receiving, understanding, evaluating, and acting upon stimulus information." He further states that dogmatic persons are authoritarian, intolerant of others with different beliefs, attitudes, ideas, or opinions, and that they are rigid in their processing of information. Because of their rigidity and narrow framework, highly dogmatic persons tend to distort the meaning of the words and intentions of others. Therefore, according to Rokeach (1954), those people low in dogmatism are more open-minded and accepting in their interpersonal exchanges.

Not only are counselor characteristics an important part of counseling effectiveness, so also are client perceptions of the counselor. Heppner and Heesacker (1982) stated that the client perceptions of the counselor proved



more predictive of success in counseling than did actual counselor training and experience level.

Client perceptions of the counselor have been examined from a social influence process point of view (Strong, 1968). From this perspective, there are three main variables in client perceptions of the counselor: expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Expertness can be defined as the client's belief that the counselor has knowledge and skills in interpretation that will allow him/her to make the client's problems understandable and will be able to find an effective means of dealing with them (Strong & Dixon, 1971). Perceived attractiveness is the positive liking and admiring of the counselor and the desire to be like him/her and to gain his/her approval (Schmidt & Strong, 1971). Trustworthiness is the belief in the counselor's openness, sincerity, and absence of a motive for personal gain (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975; Strong, 1968). Studies have looked at such variables as counselor dress, office decor, and verbal and non-verbal behavior to discover what affects the manner in which the counselor is perceived by the client (Dell, 1982; Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Kerr & Dell, 1976; LaCrosse, 1975). Some of the literature is contradictory in nature, but several significant findings have been reported: expertness is enhanced by external variables such as displayed diplomas, books, and other professional props (Heppner & Pew, 1977; Kerr & Dell, 1976) while attractiveness and trustworthiness are enhanced more

by non-verbal and verbal behaviors of the counselor (Kaul & Schmidt, 1971; LaCrosse, 1975). These three variables have been studied both together and separately to determine their importance in the counseling session. Although there are some conflicting reports, most research supports Strong's (1968) original hypothesis that positive perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness are necessary in counseling to produce client change. Studies have looked at the variables independently to determine if any one is more important than the others. Nothing conclusive has been determined, but Heppner & Heesacker (1982) did determine that only counselors rated highly attractive had more power over clients than counselors rated only moderately attractive. Although much research has been done in the area of social influence, no studies have examined the relationship of dogmatism with the social influence variables.

#### Definitions

Expertness: The client's perceptions of the counselor to be in possession of knowledge and techniques of interpreting information that allows the client to make conclusions and deal effectively with their problems.

Attractiveness: The client's positive feelings toward the counselor, such as liking and admiring the counselor, as well as the desire to be like him/her and gain his/her approval and acceptance.

Trustworthiness: The degree to which the client perceives the counselor as open, sincere, and free from a motive of personal gain.

Dogmatism: The relative open or closed-mindedness of a person's cognitive framework for receiving, evaluating, and acting upon stimulus information.

Counselor: Counselors used in this study were graduate students in counseling psychology.

Subjects: Undergraduate students in a psychology course serve as subjects in this study. They serve as the raters of the counselor.

Client: The client in this study was a graduate student in counseling psychology who had been coached to present a role-played problem.

#### Significance of the Study

Although much research has been done in the areas of counselor dogmatism and client perceptions of the counselor, no study has specifically combined the two concepts to see how they are related. Counselor dogmatism has been researched to see how it affects counseling effectiveness and ability to respond in a facilitative and helpful manner. However, no study has been conducted to examine how dogmatism affects client perceptions of the counselor. Many variables have been researched to determine what affects client perceptions of the counselor, but counselor dogmatism has not been explored.

Combining the two concepts of counselor characteristics and client perceptions has provided the impetus for additional research. Little has been done in this area and it is open for further investigation. Coupling the findings of Carlozzi et al. (1982) on the inverse relationship of dogmatism and counseling effectiveness with Strong and Schmidt's (1970) findings on the positive relationship of perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness with counseling effectiveness provided the stimulus for this research. This study examined the relationship of counselor dogmatism and subject's perception of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness.

#### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between counselor's dogmatism and subject's perception of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. An additional aspect of this study was to determine the role of subjects' dogmatism in influencing their perceptions of the counselor. Interaction effects between counselor dogmatism and the dogmatism of subjects was also examined.

The specific questions addressed in this study were the following: 1) Is there a relationship between counselor dogmatism and subjects' perceptions of the counselor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy? 2) Does subject's dogmatism affect how he or she perceives the counselor? 3)

Is there an interaction effect between counselor dogmatism that affects subjects' perception of the counselor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy?

#### Research Hypothesis

In order to carry out this study, the following hypothesis was formulated with an alpha level of .05:

There will be a significant interaction between counselor's and subjects' dogmatism levels and subjects' perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.

#### Limitations

Since counselors-in-training were used as counselors, results cannot be generalized to a professional population, but are limited to counselors-in-training.

There is a possible truncated range on the counselor dogmatism measure which would not include very high scorers. Since a student served as the client in the video-tape and the situation was role played, it might not be typical of a real-life counseling situation with actual clients.

Since students served as subjects, ratings may not be typical of a true client populations.

#### Assumptions

The basic assumptions of this study were as follows:

1. The counselors used are representative of

counselors-in-training.

2. Validity and reliability of the instruments used will be adequate for the study.

3. While subjects were not true clients, they were undergraduate college students, who would be representative of the client population seen at university mental health settings.

4. While the video-tapes were role played instead of an actual counseling session, they were representative of true counseling situations.

#### Summary of Chapter

Chapter one consisted of an introduction, significance of the study, statement of the problem and research hypothesis. Also included were definitions, limitations and assumptions of the study. Chapter two consists of a review of relevant literature. Chapter three contains the methodologies and descriptions of the study. Chapter four presents the results of the study. Results, conclusions and recommendations are contained in chapter five.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

In reviewing the research related to counselor characteristics and client perceptions of the counselor, it appears that both have an impact on counseling effectiveness. This investigation was designed to extend the current findings to determine the relationship between a specific counselor characteristic and specific client perceptions of that counselor. Those variables examined were counselor dogmatism and client perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.

The following review begins with a brief presentation of research findings about the general relationship between counselor characteristics and counseling effectiveness. Attention is then focused specifically on counselor dogmatism and counseling effectiveness. Finally, a review of research dealing with client perceptions of the counselor is reported, especially regarding client perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness.

#### Counselor Characteristics

Many researchers have examined the personal

characteristics of the counselor to determine their relationship to counseling effectiveness (Combs, Avila, & Purkey, 1971; Mahon & Altmann, 1977; Rowe, Murphy, & DeCsipkes, 1975). A large portion of the literature supports the hypothesis that there is a relationship between counselor characteristics and counseling effectiveness (Russo, Kelz, & Hudson, 1964; Foulds, 1971; Mezzano, 1969). However, some researchers have examined the topic and found no relationship (Rowe et al., 1975).

Many counselor characteristics have been studied and reported in the literature. Among the most researched are locus of control, machiavellianism, academic aptitude, gender, race, and dogmatism (Loesch, Crane, & Rucker, 1978; Foulds, 1971; Milliken & Patterson, 1967). Briefly, no correlation between gender, race, academic aptitude, or machiavellianism with counseling effectiveness has been reported (Loesch et al., 1978; Milliken & Patterson, 1967). However, locus of control and dogmatism both have been reported to be related to counseling effectiveness (Carlozzi, Campbell, & Ward, 1982; Milliken & Patterson, 1967). Mezzano (1969) found that counselors low in dogmatism were found to be more effective counselors than their highly dogmatic co-workers. Although not all counselor characteristics can be said to influence counselor effectiveness, continued research on dogmatism, which has shown to be related to counseling effectiveness, seems warranted.



### Dogmatism

Rokeach (1954) defined dogmatism as "a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, provides a framework for patterns of intolerance toward others" [p.195]. Rokeach's concept of dogmatism was described as a generalized theory of authoritarianism (Rokeach, 1960). According to Rokeach (1960) the more closed a person's belief system, the more difficulty he or she has in discriminating between the information received and the source or authority of the information. Harvey and Hays (1982) support this finding and conclude that this suggests that the dogmatic individual confuses the truth of the information with the status of the authority.

Other differences between high and low dogmatics have been reported in the literature. Plant, Telford, and Thomas (1965) compared high dogmatics with low dogmatics on the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). Five scales from the CPI were used: Sociability, Self-Control, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency, and Responsibility. Subjects could be differentiated by their CPI scores. High dogmatics were found to be psychologically immature, and characterized as being impulsive, defensive, and stereotyped in their thinking. Low dogmatics were described as calm, mature, efficient, clear thinking, responsible, and more likely to succeed in an academic

setting. Plant et al. (1965) concluded that the more dogmatic an individual is, the less tolerant, flexible, and secure he or she is.

Vacchiano, Strauss, and Schiffman (1968) found clusters of scales which seemed to identify dogmatic individuals on three instruments: Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Dogmatism was found to be related to need for succorance, conformity, restraint, and conservatism; and inversely related to needs for change and intraception.

In another study, Burke (1966) found dogmatism and interpersonal sensitivity to be related. The dogmatic individuals were rated as less sensitive in interpersonal exchanges than low dogmatics. The degree to which a person was perceived as being empathic and positive in his or her regard to others was found to be related to their level of dogmatism.

Rokeach and Fruchter (1956) reported that dogmatism was related to anxiety. In that study they stated that dogmatism is "nothing more than a psychoanalytic defense mechanism". It was suggested that dogmatic individuals were more threatened by belief-discrepant information. Kleck and Wheaton (1967) supported that position. They demonstrated that high dogmatics had less recall of inconsistent information and were more likely to evaluate consistent information more positively. Foulkes and Foulkes (1965)

reported similar findings. That study stated that high dogmatics tended to avoid compromise solutions when faced with discrepant information by either changing their original stance or strongly adhering to it regardless of new information.

#### Counselor Dogmatism and Counseling Effectiveness

Several studies have examined the relationship between counselor dogmatism and counseling effectiveness (Carlozzi et al., 1982; Kemp, 1962; Milliken & Patterson, 1967; Mezzano, 1969;). Kemp (1962) examined the relationship between dogmatism and type of counselor responses in both actual and hypothetical situations, using counselor candidates as subjects. In the real life counseling situation, he reported that dogmatics were more evaluative, interpretive, probing and diagnostic. Low dogmatics tended to be more permissive, understanding and supportive in their responses. In the hypothetical situation, however, students could not be clearly differentiated into high and low dogmatic groups. Both groups utilized permissive, understanding and supportive responses. The low dogmatics did not make significant changes in their responses from the hypothetical situation to the actual counseling situation. The high dogmatics did make significant changes in their responses. In the hypothetical situation, they responded much as the low dogmatics did but the change was not maintained during an actual counseling interaction. Kemp

suggested that this is in keeping with high dogmatics' expected way of responding to an external authority source. In the hypothetical situation, the high dogmatics made the responses that they perceived the instructor wanted to hear; but in the actual counseling situation, they reverted to their more normal type of responses.

Mezzano (1969) found results similar to those in the Kemp (1962) study. Mezzano had supervisors rate counselor candidates on understanding, congruence, and acceptance demonstrated in counseling interviews. He reported a significant negative correlation between degree of dogmatism and counseling effectiveness.

Milliken and Patterson (1967) also had supervisors rate counseling students in terms of effectiveness. That study supported the hypothesis that good counselors were open-minded and not dogmatic in their beliefs and interpersonal exchanges.

In a study by Carlozzi, Edwards, and Ward (1978), an inverse relationship was reported between level of dogmatism and ability to communicate in a facilitative and helpful manner. Counseling candidates could be clearly differentiated as being either high or low dogmatics by their responses to audio-taped client stimulus statements.

In 1982, a similar study conducted by Carlozzi, Campbell, and Ward found results that continued to support the hypothesis that dogmatism was inversely related to counseling effectiveness. A sample of 215 master's level

counseling students from three universities comprised the sample for this study. In this study, counseling effectiveness was measured in terms of facilitative responding as measured by the Gross Rating of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning Scale. This study suggested that not only do highly dogmatic counselor trainees have difficulty responding in a facilitative manner with clients, but that they may also have difficulty accepting personal responsibility for their part in communication with clients. Because dogmatic individuals feel a great deal of anxiety (Rokeach, 1960), but project that anxiety rather than internalize it, Carlozzi et al. (1982) suggest that dogmatic counselors may be prone to blame their clients for their difficulties and anxieties in the counseling relationship.

Russo, Kelz, and Hudson (1964) had expert judges rate counseling candidates. Dogmatism scores were found to be related to perceptions by experts as to degree of effectiveness of counselors. Those candidates judged most effective had the lowest dogmatism scores, while those judged least effective had the highest scores.

While the bulk of the literature supports the hypothesis that dogmatism is inversely related to counseling effectiveness, a few studies reported conflicting results. Foulds (1971) studied the relationship between dogmatism and ratings of empathy, understanding, respect, and genuineness that was communicated toward clients on tape recorded sessions. That study found no relationship to

exist. However, they were careful to cite Kemp's (1962) findings, and to suggest that since counselor candidates knew they were being rated, they responded to the authority of the supervisor and learned to make more facilitative responses.

In response to a research review by Rowe, Murphy and DeCsipkes (1975), Loesch, Crane, and Rucker (1978) studied several counselor characteristics to discover their relationship to counseling effectiveness. Rowe et al. (1975) stated that "based on a thorough and comprehensive review of the related literature since 1960, the search for meaningful relationships between counselor characteristics and counseling effectiveness should be abandoned because the results of previous studies have been generally disappointing, often contradictory, and only tentative" [p. 241]. Loesch et al. (1978) studied several counselor characteristics to discover which, if any, did in fact affect counseling effectiveness. Dogmatism was one of the characteristics examined. In that study, no significant relationship was discovered between dogmatism and counseling effectiveness. Supervisors rated counseling candidates on the Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale (CERS). While no significant differences were noted between dogmatic and nondogmatic counselors as measured on the CERS, this study did acknowledge poor interrater reliability on the instrument and suggested that this might have compromised the meaningfulness of the results.

In summary, dogmatism has been shown to be inversely related to counseling effectiveness in several studies (Carlozzi et al., 1978; Carlozzi et al., 1982; Kemp, 1962; Mezzano, 1969; Milliken & Patterson, 1967; Russo, Kelz, & Hudson, 1964;). The studies that do not support that stance usually qualify their results as tentative and cite circumstances that may have confounded their findings (Foulds, 1971; Loesch et al., 1978;).

#### Client Perceptions of the Counselor

A general goal in counseling of any sort is to facilitate change in the client (Heppner & Dixon, 1981). This goal implies that the counselor has the power to influence the behaviors and attitudes of the client (Strong & Matross, 1973). The process of one person influencing another and facilitating changes in that person has been labeled the interpersonal or social influence process (Strong, 1968).

The idea of counseling as an interpersonal influence process was initially conceived of by Strong (1968) as he combined social psychology with counseling theory. Since Strong's (1968) original work, much research has been done to determine what affects the interpersonal influence process in counseling. Many variables have been examined to determine what affects the counselor's ability to facilitate change in the client (Carter, 1978; Heppner & Pew, 1977; Kerr & Dell, 1976; LaCrosse, 1975; Scheid, 1976). Counselor

expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness are the three variables that Strong (1968) postulated as core conditions in psychotherapy. Following that theory, research then sought to determine what counselor characteristics, behaviors, and environmental conditions contribute to a client's perception of the counselor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy (Siegel & Sell, 1978; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a; Strong & Schmidt, 1970b;). Looking at the social influence variables independently might assist the reader in organizing the abundant literature in this area.

### Expertness

Perceived counselor expertness has been defined as "the client's belief that the counselor possesses information and means of interpreting information which allow the client to obtain valid conclusions about and to deal effectively with his problems" (Strong & Dixon, 1971). Expertness has been reported to be influenced by at least three categories: (1) objective evidence of special training and expertise such as diplomas, certificates, awards, and titles (Strong & Dixon, 1971), (2) behavioral cues of expertness such as rational and knowledgeable discussions, and confidence in presentation of ideas (Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Kerr & Dell, 1976), and (3) a reputation as expert in the field of psychology (Guttman & Haase, 1972; Haase & DiMattia, 1976;).

Research has long presented the importance of visual,



objective evidence of expertness of the counselor for effective counseling to take place (Heppner & Pew, 1977). That study reported that evidence such as awards, diplomas, certificates, and so forth favorably affected the clients' initial impression of the counselor as expert. Gelso and Karl (1974) found that the title "psychologist" also favorably affected initial expert impressions held by the client. That study further reported that if the title of psychologist was omitted, students rated the counselor as "inappropriate for help with personal problems."

The combination of title and initial introductions has also been examined to determine the effect on client perception of counselor expertness (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977). In that study it was shown that when the same counselor was introduced with expert credentials as opposed to inexperienced credentials, the counselor was perceived as more expert. Scheid (1976) found that client characteristics confounded the results of such research.

Many researchers have looked further into the notion of characteristics that affect client perception of counselor expertness (Dell, 1982; Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a). Counselor gender was examined by Dell and Schmidt (1976) and found to have no effect on perceived expertness. Heppner and Pew (1977) found similar results. When gender and office decor were examined together, an interaction effect was noted (Bloom, Weigel, & Trautt, 1977). That study reported that females in traditionally

decorated offices were considered more expert than females in humanistic offices. The reverse was discovered for male counselors.

Race is another characteristic that has been investigated (Sattler, 1970). Research is contradictory in this area. Cimboric (1972) found that black students did not rate black or white counselors differently on expertness. However, Peoples and Dell (1975) found significantly different expert ratings for black and white counselors by both black and white students.

Counselor attire was examined to determine its effect on perceived expertness (Kerr & Dell, 1976). That study found that attire interacted with counselor behaviors to affect perceived expertness, but that behavior accounted for most of the effect.

Strong and Schmidt (1970) were interested in what behaviors affected client perception of counselor expertness. The results they recorded were behaviors including appearing attentive, interested, confident and organized. They also included using hand gestures, leaning forward, nodding, and using direct eye contact. Stiff formal gestures were considered inexperienced by clients. Dell and Schmidt (1976) discovered very similar results in their study. In addition, they found that being relaxed and responsive increased ratings of expertness.

Other studies have focused on counselor verbal behaviors as cues to expertness (Atkinson & Carkskadde,

1975; Claiborn, 1979; Merluzzi, Banikotes, & Missbach, 1978;). Merluzzi et al. (1978) found that level of talking (low, medium, or high) had no effect on expert ratings. In that same study, however, amount of self-disclosing did have an effect, with high levels of self-disclosure resulting in higher expert ratings by clients. The use of psychological jargon was found to increase perceptions of the counselor as expert according to Atkinson and Carskadden (1975). Counselors utilizing interpretative verbal statements were considered more expert by clients than counselors who used only restatements (Claiborn, 1979).

Other researchers were interested in combining several expert cues to discover their combined effect on client ratings of counselor expertness (Heppner & Dixon, 1978; Kerr & Dell, 1976). Investigations indicated that expertness was significantly enhanced when more than one expert cue was employed (Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975; Heppner & Dixon, 1978). One study used prestigious introductions and psychological jargon by the counselor and found that the counselor received very high expert ratings (Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975). Heppner and Dixon (1978) found that when counselor behavior, titles and prestigious introductions were all combined, the counselor was seen as even more expert.

According to Strong and Schmidt (1970a) there is considerable evidence supporting the use of objective evidence of training, counselor behaviors, and prestigious

introductions to increase expert ratings. Characteristics such as gender and race, however, do not seem to significantly affect the perception of expert by the client (Cimboric, 1972). Combining more than one expert cue has been shown to be an effective way to increase expert ratings by clients (Atkinson & Carkner, 1975; Heppner & Dixon, 1978).

### Attractiveness

Attractiveness has been defined as the client's "liking and admiration for the counselor, desire to gain his approval, and desire to become more similar to him (Schmidt & Strong, 1971, p. 348). Strong (1968) stated that perceived attractiveness was based more on the counselor's behaviors within the session than on external cues. Specifically, behaviors expressing unconditional positive regard and accurate empathy increased counselor attractiveness (Rogers, 1957; Strong, 1968; Truax & Carkner, 1967;). Also, direct self-disclosure of feelings, experiences, attitudes, and problems similar to those of the client increased client ratings of counselor attractiveness (Merluzzi et al., 1978; Nilsson, Strassberg, & Bannon, 1979). A review of the literature revealed that there are at least four variables affecting client ratings of the counselor in the area of attractiveness: (1) pre-session introductions of the counselor (Greenburg, 1969), (2) counselor characteristics (Cash, Begley, McCown &

Weise, 1975), (3) nonverbal counselor behaviors (LaCrosse, 1975), and (4) counselor verbal behaviors (Strong & Schmidt, 1971).

The effects on the pre-session description or introduction of the counselor has been shown to be significant in the client's initial perception of the counselor as attractive or unattractive (Greenburg, 1969). In that study, counselors were described as being either warm or cold. Then students rated the counselor after meeting them. Students being told that the counselor was warm, rated the counselor more attractive than did students being told that the same counselor was cold. Prestigious introductions did not affect the perceptions of the client in terms of attractiveness, but did in terms of expertness (Clalborn & Schmidt, 1977).

Research has also examined the relationship between counselor characteristics and perceived attractiveness. Specifically, physical attractiveness, counselor age and counselor gender has been examined (Cash et al., 1975; Kerr & Dell, 1976). Cash et al. (1975) produced findings supporting the hypothesis that physically attractive counselors are rated as more interpersonally attractive than physically unattractive counselors. Carter (1978) found somewhat similar results. In that study, physical attractiveness was related to ratings of attractiveness only in female counselors and only by female clients. Carter (1978) postulates that it is the interaction of gender and

attractiveness that accounts for the higher ratings on the attractiveness dimension. A study examining only counselor gender (Fretz, Corn, Tuemmler, & Bellet, 1979) found no relationship between counselor gender and client ratings of counselor attractiveness. Kerr & Dell (1976) report no relationship between counselor attire (casual vs. formal) or office decor (professional or casual) and client ratings of counselor attractiveness. The age of the counselor differentially affects client perceptions of attractiveness in only limited areas (Lasky & Solomone, 1977). That study found that psychiatric inpatients under 30 tended to view younger therapists as more attractive than older therapists. No other relationship between counselor age and client ratings were discovered in that study.

Strong, Taylor, Bratton, and Loper (1971) reported that high frequency of counselor non-verbal behaviors within the session correlated with higher ratings in perceived attractiveness. The non-verbal behaviors of the counselor in that study included changing body position, smiling, frowning, gesturing, changing head and eye orientation, and crossing and uncrossing their legs. Lacrosse (1975) investigated other non-verbal behaviors with similar results. In that study the non-verbal behaviors included smiles, head nods, gesturing, eye contact, and body lean. Fretz et al. (1979) investigated nonresponsive and responsive non-verbal behaviors to discover their impact on client evaluations of the counselor. That study reported a

clear difference in the two types of non-verbal behaviors. Only responsive behaviors affected the attractiveness ratings by clients.

Counselor verbal behaviors have also been investigated to uncover their relationship to client perceptions of counselor attractiveness. Merluzzi et al. (1978) reported counselor self-disclosures to have a positive affect on client ratings of counselor attractiveness. Nilsson et al (1979) replicated and supported these research findings. Specifically, counselor self-disclosures of similar experiences, feelings, attitudes, and problems have been found to increase client perceptions of counselor attractiveness (Strong & Schmidt, 1971). Kleinke & Tully (1979) temper these findings by reporting that clients perception of counselor attractiveness decreases as counselor talking level increases.

In conclusion, the research suggests that several variables influence client perceptions of counselor attractiveness (Heppner & Dixon, 1981). According to Heppner and Dixon (1981) nonverbal and verbal behaviors of the counselor account for most of the rating differences. Specifically, the nonverbal behaviors must be participatory (smiling, frowning, leaning forward, eye contact, gestures, and body movement) during the session (Fretz et al., 1979; LaCrosse, 1975). Specific verbal behaviors include self-disclosure of similar attitudes, experiences, feelings, and problems; and low levels of talking (Kleine &

Tully, 1979; Strong & Schmidt, 1971). Also increasing client ratings are pre-session introductions expressing counselor warmth, counselor physical attractiveness, and, for female client, counselor gender (Carter, 1978; Cash et al., 1975; Greenburg, 1969). Age, counselor attire, and office decor did not significantly affect client ratings of counselor attractiveness (Kerr & Dell, 1976; Lasky & Solomone, 1977).

### Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is the third and final variable postulated by Strong (1968) as important in counseling to produce client change. Trustworthiness is defined as the belief in the counselor's openness, sincerity, and absence of a motive of personal gain (Barak & LaCross, 1975; Strong, 1968). Less research has been done in this area than in the other two, therefore, results are less expansive (Heppner & Dixon, 1981). Verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the counselor are reported to have the greatest affect on client ratings of counselor trustworthiness (Heppner & Dixon, 1981). Counselor characteristics play a minor role (Merlozzi et al., 1978).

Verbal behaviors of the counselor affect client perceptions of counselor trustworthiness (Strong, 1968). Specific verbal behaviors which increase trustworthiness ratings are "paying close attention to the client's statements and other behaviors, communicating concern for



the client's welfare, avoiding statements indicating exhibitionism or perverted curiosity, and assuring confidentiality of all transactions" (Strong, 1968, p. 222).

Kaul and Schmidt (1972) found that while verbal behaviors do increase trustworthiness ratings, they have less impact than do nonverbal behaviors. Claiborn (1979) found that nonverbal behaviors were found to be especially impactful on client ratings when those behaviors were responsive behaviors (smiling, nodding, leaning forward, gesturing, frowning, and body movement).

Claiborn (1979) also investigated several verbal behaviors to determine which were more effective in increasing counselor trustworthiness. That study reported that interpretative statements by the counselor produced higher attractiveness ratings than did restatements by the same counselor. Low disclosing counselors were rated as more trustworthy in a study by Merluzzi et al. (1978). In that same study, however, an interaction effect between counselor gender and level of disclosing was noted. Low disclosing females were rated more trustworthy than high disclosing females. No differences were found for male counselors.

Although there is much less literature available on the trustworthiness variable, several conclusions have been reached (Heppner & Dixon, 1981). Responsive nonverbal behaviors and interpretative statements by the counselor both increase client perceptions of counselor attractiveness

(Clalborn, 1979; Kaul & Schmidt, 1972;). Verbal behaviors related to concern for client and assurance of confidentiality increase trustworthiness ratings (Strong, 1968). Few self-disclosures and, in some cases the gender of the counselor, also increase client perceptions of counselor trustworthiness (Merlozzi et al., 1978).

### Summary

Although there is an abundance of research on both dogmatism and also on the social influence variables, nothing has been done to determine if a relationship exists between the two concepts. Both dogmatism and the social influence variables have been shown to be related to counseling effectiveness (Carlozzi et al., 1982; Heppner & Dixon, 1981). Further research is warranted to determine if counselor dogmatism is related to client perceptions of the counselor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

This chapter consists of a presentation and description of the methods and procedures utilized in this study. The selection procedure for obtaining subjects is detailed along with a demographic description of the sample. Instruments used in the study are described as well. The chapter concludes with a description of the procedures for collecting and analyzing the data.

#### Subject Selection

The subjects for this study were undergraduate students in psychology from a large midwestern university. The subjects were all volunteers who agreed to participate in a psychological study.

Of the 120 persons who served as subjects, 65 were female and 55 were male. The ages ranged from 19 to 45 with a mean age of 27. There were no international students in the sample.

#### Instrumentation

There were two instruments used in this study.

Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale, Form E (see Appendix A) was to measure both subjects' dogmatism and counselors' dogmatism levels. The Counselor Rating Form (CRF) (see Appendix B) was used to measure subjects' perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness.

### Dogmatism Scale

The Dogmatism Scale, Form E (see Appendix A) was designed by Rokeach (1956) to measure individual differences in the degree of openness or closedness of belief systems. Openness is defined as "the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act upon relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside" (Rokeach, 1960, p. 57). The Dogmatism Scale was used in this study to measure the openness of both the counselor and the subjects who evaluated the counselor.

The Dogmatism Scale, Form E, consists of 40 declarative statements to which six response alternatives are possible: (+1) I agree a little, (+2) I agree on the whole, (+3) I agree very much, (-1) I disagree a little, (-2) I disagree on the whole, and (-3) I disagree very much. The (0) score was excluded to reduce central tendency. The scores were converted to a 1 to 7 scale by adding the constant 4 to each response. Therefore, the range of possible scores was from 40 to 280 such that a high score indicated a high degree of

dogmatism and a low score the converse.

Norms. The instrument was originally normed by Rokeach (1956) on several different samples. Each form was normed on its own sample. Form E was normed on 80 students at Birbeck College in England and on 60 English workers. No mention is made of age ranges or gender of subjects. Zagona and Zurcher (1965) normed the test on 517 freshman and sophomore psychology students at the University of Arizona. Males and females were equally represented.

Validity. An item analysis was done to establish construct validity. The forms were correlated to determine concurrent validity. In every sample dogmatism correlated negligibly with liberalism-conservatism, ( $p < .05$ ); and more highly with total opinionation than with either left or right opinionation ( $p < .05$ ). Evidence of construct and concurrent validity is reported in numerous other studies (Davis, Frye, & Joure, 1975; Ward, Cunningham, & Summerlin, 1978). Zagona and Zurcher (1965) assessed the predictive utility of the test by administering the test to 517 freshman and sophomore psychology students, and predicting behaviors in the classroom and small group experiences based on the test scores. That study reported that the authors were able to successfully predict behavior based on scores obtained on the Dogmatism Scale ( $p < .05$ ).

Reliability. Split-half reliabilites were obtained for each form. Form E obtained reliability coefficients

from .78 to .81 (Rokeach, 1960). Test-retest reliability coefficients were reported by Rokeach (1960) that ranged from .68 to .93 for intervals ranging from one to six months. Zagona and Zurcher (1965) replicated the study and found similar results using a larger sample size (517 subjects) than the original study. In that study, reliability coefficients were recorded for the highest one-third of the scorers, the lowest one-third, and for the entire sample. A retest fifteen weeks after the original administration provided reliability coefficients ranging from .47 to .70.

#### Counselor Rating Form

In order to measure subject perception of the counselor, the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) was used (see Appendix B). The CRF is a 36-item instrument designed by Barak and LaCrosse in 1975 to measure the dimensions of perceived counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.

The CRF consists of 36 bi-polar adjectives, which are divided into three dimensions with 12 items each. Using a seven point semantic differential scaling procedure, the subjects are asked to respond to each item. The responses are scored on a one to seven basis with the left-most space being either one or seven as explained in the scoring sheet (see Appendix B). The scoring sheet also tells what items go with what dimensions so that the end results are three divisions of 12 paired adjectives and a range on each

dimension of 12 to 84, with high scores indicating high perceptions of that dimension.

Norms. The instrument was normed on 202 undergraduate students in an introductory psychology course at Ohio State University in 1975. The students were all volunteers who received extra credit for participating in this psychological study. Male and female subjects were equally represented in the sample. No further demographic data on the subjects were reported.

Validity. The CRF has been shown to be useful as both a research tool and as an instrument with clinical utility (LaCrosse, 1980). Its construct validity was assessed by Barak and LaCrosse (1975) utilizing a factor analysis technique. The factor analysis yielded three distinct factors entitled expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. LaCrosse (1980) assessed its predictive validity with a Goal Attainment Scaling. Coefficients were found to range from .53 to .58. Also noted in that study, the concurrent validity coefficients were found to range from .47 to .62 when compared to the Counselor Effectiveness Rating Form.

Reliability. A split-half reliability analysis by Barak and LaCrosse (1975) yielded the following coefficients: expertness .874, attractiveness .850, and trustworthiness .908. Atkinson and Wampold (1982) did a follow-up on the reliability of the CRF and found very

similar results. In their study, they obtained coefficients of .870 to .910 using a split-half format. Internal consistency was reported to range from .86 to .91 using Cronbach Alphas in a study by Barrn, Goodnight, Sall and Helwig (1976).

### Procedures

Several graduate students in counseling psychology were asked to complete the Dogmatism Scale. From this group of respondents, six high and six low scorers were asked to make a video-taped counseling session using a role played situation. High scorers were defined as those receiving a score of 200 or higher on the Dogmatism Scale, while low scorers obtained a score of 120 or lower. These scores represent the top one-third and the bottom one-third of the Dogmatism Scale. Each of the twelve counseling students made a counseling tape using the same client and the same presenting concern. The client was a graduate student in counseling psychology who had been coached with a presenting concern of depression and loneliness. These tapes were presented to a panel of expert judges, consisting of one faculty person and two doctoral students all from a counseling psychology department. The judges were asked to place the tapes into one of three categories: highly dogmatic counselor, moderately dogmatic counselor or low dogmatic counselor. The counselors' dogmatism scores were not revealed to the judges. Of the original twelve tapes,



four were used in the study: two depicting high dogmatism in the counselor and two depicting low counselor dogmatism. The four tapes were selected when the panel of Judges unanimously agreed on a category for the tape (high counselor dogmatism or low counselor dogmatism) and that agreement matched the counselor's dogmatism category based on their dogmatism scores. All tapes judged as moderately dogmatic counselor were eliminated from the study. When the tapes had been correctly and unanimously categorized by the panel, they were then ready for use in the study.

Data were collected during the fall 1986 academic semester. The 120 participants were requested to complete the Dogmatism Scale, Form E. Directions for self-administration are written at the beginning of the test and no oral instructions are required. After completion of the above scale, the investigator requested the participants to view two video-taped counseling sessions, rating each counselor on the Counselor Rating Form after each session. Each subject then viewed one tape of a dogmatic counselor and one tape of a non-dogmatic counselor. Subjects were randomly assigned a tape from each category. Tapes were randomly presented, sometimes showing the dogmatic counseling tape first, sometimes showing the non-dogmatic tape first. No information was given about the counselor. Subjects were instructed to base their responses solely on the impressions gained from viewing the video-tapes. The students received the following oral instructions prior to

viewing the tapes:

You are about to view two short video-taped counseling sessions. After each tape, you will be given time to fill out the CRF on that counselor. There are no right or wrong answers. I am interested only in your impressions. Your first impression is usually your answer. Instructions for filling out the form are printed on the first page of the form. Please read that over now to make sure you understand what to do. The client in the tape is role-playing and the problem is not real. The client and the presenting concern will be the same in both tapes.

Participants' Dogmatism Scale score and their two CRF's were given a code number for scoring purposes and the only identifying data was age, gender and citizenship status of the participants. The participants were assured of confidentiality of all the information gathered.

#### Analysis of Data

Data was subjected to a two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). MANOVA was selected for two reasons: 1) MANOVA is specifically meant to be used with multiple dependent variables and 2) the risk of a Type I error is reduced. Appropriate tests for the evaluation assessment of multicollinearity, singularity, normality, and homogeneity of variance were utilized. The hypothesis error rate was set at .05. The experimentwise error rate was set at .15. The

three dependent variables were client perception of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness as measured by the CRF. The categorical independent variables were two levels (high, low) of counselor and subject dogmatism levels. High dogmatism was defined as a score of 200 or higher (out of a possible 280) which is the top one third of the scale. Low dogmatism was defined as a score of 120 or lower (with the lowest possible score being 40) which is the bottom one third of the scale. Scores falling between 121 and 199 were considered moderate levels of dogmatism and were omitted from the study.

#### Summary

Subjects for this study were 65 female and 55 male undergraduate students in psychology at a large southeastern university. Procedures for the collection of data were discussed. The two instruments which were used in this study were also discussed. A description of the statistical procedures used to analyze the data was provided. Details of the findings resulting from the application of statistical techniques to the data obtained are presented in Chapter IV. Results, conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between counselor's and subjects' dogmatism on subjects' perception of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. The data consisted of counselors' and subjects' dogmatism scores as obtained from Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale and client perception of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness as obtained from the Counselor Rating Form. The procedure involved showing the subject two videotaped counseling vignettes which portrayed one high dogmatic counselor and one low dogmatic counselor. Subjects were asked to respond to the Counselor Rating Form after each videotaped counseling session.

This chapter states the hypothesis and summarizes the findings. Results of the multivariate and univariate analyses are provided.

#### Research Hypothesis

There will be a significant interaction between counselor's and subjects' dogmatism levels and subjects'

perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness.

A 2 X 2 between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the three dependent variables: expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Independent variables were counselor dogmatism (high and low) and client dogmatism (high and low).

The SPSSX MANOVA was used for the analyses with the hierarchical adjustment for nonorthogonality. Order of entry of the independent variables was counselor dogmatism, then subject dogmatism. Total N = 120 remained unchanged with no within-cell outliers with  $p < .01$ . Results of evaluation of assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfactory.

Significant multivariate  $F$ 's were found for the two-way interaction of counselor dogmatism and client dogmatism ( $F(3, 114) = 116.90, p < .05$ ). Significant multivariate  $F$ 's were also obtained for the main effects of counselor dogmatism ( $F(3, 114) = 113.11, p < .05$ ) and client dogmatism ( $F(3, 114) = 11.64, p < .05$ ). Results of multivariate  $F$ 's are reported in Table 1.

Subsequent univariate analyses supported the significance of the main effect of counselor dogmatism and indicated that expertness ( $F(1, 116) = 119.38, p < .05$ ), attractiveness ( $F(1, 116) = 202.07, p < .05$ ), and trustworthiness ( $F(1, 116) = 240.62, p < .05$ ) were all

Table 1

Multivariate F's for Expertness, Attractiveness and Trustworthiness

---

Source	df	F Value Wilks Lambda
Counselor Dogmatism X Client Dogmatism	3	116.91*
Counselor Dogmatism	3	113.11*
Subject Dogmatism	3	11.64*

---

\*p < .05

contributors to the construct of subject perceptions (see Table 2).

Following the same procedure for the main effect of client dogmatism, univariate analyses supported the main effect and found expertness ( $F(1, 116) = 17.97, p < .05$ ) to be the major contributor (see Table 2).

To investigate the effects of each main effect and the interaction on the individual dependent variables, a stepdown analysis was performed. Homogeneity of regression was achieved for all components of the stepdown analysis. All three dependent variables were found to be sufficiently reliable to justify stepdown analysis. Results of this analysis are summarized in Table 3. An experimentwise error rate of 5% was achieved by the apportionment of alpha as shown in the final column of table 3 for each dependent variable.

For the interaction of counselor dogmatism and client dogmatism, the Roy-Bargman Stepdown F showed that all three dependent variables were significant contributors to the construct as follows: expertness ( $F(1, 116) = 83.44, p < .05$ ); attractiveness ( $F(1, 115) = 79.68, p < .05$ ); and trustworthiness ( $F(1, 114) = 45.65, p < .05$ ) as shown in table 3.

All three dependent variables made unique contributions to the composite dependent variable that distinguished between those high and low in counselor dogmatism. The greatest contribution was made by expertness, ( $F(1, 116)$

Table 2

Univariate F's for Expertness, Attractiveness and Trustworthiness

Source	SS	SSe	MS	MSe	F
Univariate for Counselor Dogmatism X Subject Dogmatism with (1,116 D. F.)					
Expertness	195.07	271.16	195.07	2.35	83.45*
Attractiveness	504.30	267.00	504.30	2.30	219.09*
Trustworthiness	572.03	200.80	572.03	1.73	330.75*
Univariate for Counselor Dogmatism with (1,116 D. F.)					
Expertness	279.07	271.16	279.05	2.33	119.38*
Attractiveness	472.03	267.00	472.03	2.30	205.07*
Trustworthiness	589.63	200.80	589.63	1.73	340.62*
Univariate for Subject Dogmatism with (1,116 D. F.)					
Expertness	42.00	271.16	42.00	2.33	17.97*
Attractiveness	.53	267.00	.53	2.30	.23
Trustworthiness	.03	200.80	.02	1.73	.02

\*p < .05

df = degrees of freedom

SS = Sums of Squares

SSe = Sums of Squares error

MS = Mean Square

MSe = Mean Square error

F = Wilks Lambda F value



Table 3

Stepdown F's and Univariate F's for Expertness,  
Attractiveness and Trustworthiness

Source	Univariate F	df	Stepdown F	df	alpha
Effect...Counselor Dogmatism X Subject Dogmatism					
Expertness	83.44*	1/116	83.44*	1/116	.01
Attractiveness	219.09*	1/116	79.68*	1/115	.01
Trustworthiness	333.45*	1/116	45.65*	1/114	.001
Effect...Counselor Dogmatism					
Expertness	119.38*	1/116	119.38*	1/116	.01
Attractiveness	205.07*	1/116	42.76*	1/115	.01
Trustworthiness	340.62*	1/116	48.84*	1/114	.001
Effect...Client Dogmatism					
Expertness	17.97*	1/116	17.97*	1/116	.01
Attractiveness	.23	1/116	.23	1/115	.01
Trustworthiness	.02	1/116	.02	1/114	.001

\*p < .05

= 119.38,  $p < .05$ ). Also contributing to the construct were attractiveness, ( $F(1, 115) = 42.76, p < .05$ ) and trustworthiness, ( $F(1, 114) = 48.84, p < .05$ ).

A unique contribution to predicting differences between those low and high in client dogmatism was made by expertness, stepdown( $F(1, 116) = 17.97, p < .05$ ). Clients high in dogmatism tended to rate counselors as more expert ( $\bar{X} = 80.01$ ) than clients low in dogmatism ( $\bar{X} = 78.83$ ). All other differences were already represented in the stepdown analysis by the higher-priority dependent variable.

An examination of combined means revealed that low counselor dogmatism obtained higher ratings in expertness ( $\bar{X} = 80.95$ ) than high counselor dogmatism ( $\bar{X} = 77.89$ ). Likewise, low counselor dogmatism received higher scores in attractiveness ( $\bar{X} = 80.35$ ) than high counselor dogmatism ( $\bar{X} = 76.38$ ). Finally, low counselor dogmatism obtained higher ratings in trustworthiness ( $\bar{X} = 80.47$ ) than high counselor dogmatism ( $\bar{X} = 76.03$ ). Also, it is noted that the highest ratings were obtained for low dogmatic counselors by low dogmatic subjects ( $\bar{X} = 81.63$  expertness,  $\bar{X} = 82.33$  attractiveness, and  $\bar{X} = 82.66$  trustworthiness). Conversely, lowest ratings were obtained for high dogmatic counselors by low dogmatic subjects ( $\bar{X} = 76.03$  expertness,  $\bar{X} = 74.27$  attractiveness and  $\bar{X} = 73.87$  trustworthiness) as shown in table 4. Eta squared revealed that 5% of the variability of expertness, 4% of the variability of attractiveness, and 4% of the variability of trustworthiness were due to the level

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of Expertness, Attractiveness and Trustworthiness

	High Subject Dogmatism	Low Subject Dogmatism
High Counselor Dogmatism	N = 30	N = 30
Expertness		
$\bar{X}$	79.76	76.03
SD	1.25	2.15
Attractiveness		
$\bar{X}$	78.50	74.27
S	1.33	2.08
Trustworthiness		
$\bar{X}$	78.20	73.87
SD	1.09	1.85
Low Counselor Dogmatism	N = 30	N = 30
Expertness		
$\bar{X}$	80.26	81.63
SD	1.52	.89
Attractiveness		
$\bar{X}$	78.37	82.33
SD	1.47	.96
Trustworthiness		
$\bar{X}$	78.27	82.66
SD	1.28	.81

of counselor dogmatism.

### Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between counselor's dogmatism and subjects' dogmatism on subjects' perception of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Multivariate analyses of the two-way interaction of counselor dogmatism and client dogmatism revealed significant results. Significant main effects were found for client dogmatism on the dimension of expertness and counselor dogmatism on all three dimensions of expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness.

Chapter V will contain the summary, conclusions and recommendations of this study

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of counselor and subject dogmatism levels in determining subjects' perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness.

The subjects in this study were 120 undergraduate students in a large southeastern university. 65 subjects were male and 55 subjects were female. All subjects were volunteers and were selected from introductory psychology courses.

Test data consisted of the subjects' and the counselors' dogmatism scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the subjects' ratings of the counselor on the Counselor Rating Form.

The hypothesis for this study stated that there would be a significant interaction between counselor's and subjects' levels of dogmatism and subjects' perception of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Multivariate analysis of variance was used to determine whether the relationship existed. A significant interaction was found between counselor dogmatism and subject dogmatism

as well as significant main effects for counselor dogmatism and subject dogmatism.

Subsequent univariate analysis of variance showed that both the interaction effect and the main effect of counselor dogmatism resulted in significant differences in all three dependent variables. The main effect of subject dogmatism resulted in a significant difference in the expertness variable only.

A similar finding was discovered using the Roy-Bargman Stepdown F technique. All three dependent variables made unique contributions to the composite dependent variable when looking at both the interaction effect and the main effect for counselor dogmatism. When looking at the main effect of subject dogmatism, however, only expertness made a unique contribution to the construct. All other differences were already represented in the stepdown analysis by this higher-priority dependent variable.

Counselors with low dogmatism scores were rated higher on all three dependent variables than counselors high in dogmatism. Highest ratings were obtained when both counselor and subject were low in dogmatism. Lowest ratings were given to high dogmatic counselors by low dogmatic subjects. Subjects high in dogmatism tended to rate the counselors the same whether the counselor was high or low in dogmatism. Only on the variable expertness, were high dogmatic subjects able to significantly differentiate between counselors. Then, they rated low dogmatic counselors as more expert than

high dogmatic counselors.

### Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that level of dogmatism in both the counselor and subject affects how the counselor is perceived. When looking at the main effect of subject dogmatism, the perception that is significantly affected is counselor expertness. Subjects both high and low in dogmatism rated counselors as more expert if the counselor was low in dogmatism. Subjects high in dogmatism did not differentiate between counselors on the attractiveness and trustworthiness variables. Low dogmatic subjects, however rated low dogmatic counselors higher on both variables than high dogmatic counselors.

Level of counselor dogmatism affected the subjects' perception of all three dependent variables. Low dogmatic counselors were rated significantly more expert, more attractive and more trustworthy than high dogmatic counselors. This finding is in keeping with earlier research in the area of dogmatism which found that dogmatism had an inverse effect on counseling effectiveness (Carlozzi et al., 1982; Kemp, 1962; Mezzamo, 1969).

The interaction of counselor dogmatism and subject dogmatism significantly affected the subjects' perception of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Most of this seems to be accounted for by the counselor's dogmatism level since subjects high in dogmatism were not

able to differentiate between the high and low dogmatic counselor, while level of counselor dogmatism was a significant predictor on all three variables. Subjects low in dogmatism showed strong preferences to counselors low in dogmatism, rating them significantly higher on all three variables. In looking at the table of means and standard deviations (table 4) it becomes obvious that the highest ratings were given to counselors low in dogmatism by subjects in the low dogmatism cell while lowest ratings were given to the counselors high in dogmatism by subjects in the low dogmatism cell. There was virtually no difference in the cells containing high counselor dogmatism by either high or low dogmatic subjects. High dogmatic subjects were unable to differentiate between counselors high or low in dogmatism. This is no doubt due to the high dogmatic subject's inability to receive incoming messages or information on their own merits. These results suggest that while high dogmatic subjects probably will have little preference about the dogmatism level of the counselor, low dogmatic subjects will work significantly better with low dogmatic counselors.

#### Recommendations

The following recommendations are related to practical application:

1. Counseling graduate students are encouraged to examine their dogmatism level and become aware of how it



impacts on the counseling situation.

2. While personal characteristics cannot be used to determine selection into a counseling program, students interested in a career in counseling might consider their dogmatism level as a self-selection indicator of possible future success in counseling.

3. Counseling programs are encouraged to be aware of the impact of this variable on the counseling situation. As a part of the academic curriculum emphasis could be placed on the importance of the personal characteristics of the counselor, especially concerning dogmatism level.

The following recommendations relate to research:

4. A replication study is encouraged using a real client instead of a bogus client since a counseling student role-played the client in this study.

5. Since students were used as subjects in this study, results can only be generalized to a college population that might be seen in a counseling center. Further research is warranted using real clients as subjects to determine further generalization of the study.

6. A replication of this study is encouraged utilizing professional counselors to determine if results generalize past counselors-in-training to a professional population.

7. Finally, a future study is recommended to examine the interaction between gender and dogmatism level on subjects' perceptions of the counselor as expert, attractive

and trustworthy.

It is hoped that this study, by examining the relationship between counselor and subject dogmatism on subjects' perception of the counselor, may have contributed new understanding to the previous knowledge about how personal characteristics of the counselor affect client perceptions. Perhaps it will serve as a stimulus for future research in the area of dogmatism and its impact on the counseling situation.

## References

- Atkinson, D.R., & Carlskadden, E. (1975). A prestigious introduction, psychological jargon, and perceived counselor credibility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 180-186.
- Barak, A., & Dell, D.M. (1977). Differential perceptions of counselor behavior: Replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 288-292.
- Barak, A. & LaCross, M.B. (1975). Multidimensional perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 471-476.
- Barak, A. & LaCrosse, M.B. (1977). Comparative Perceptions of practicum counselor behavior. Counselor Education and Supervision, 17, 202-207.
- Barr, A.J., Goodnight, J.H., Sall, J.P., & Helwig, J.T. (1976). A user's guide to SAS. North Carolina: SAS Institute.
- Bloom, L.J., Weigel, R.G., & Trautt, G.M. (1977). "Therapeugenic" factors in psychology: Effects of office decor and subject-therapist sex pairings on perception of credibility. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 867-873.
- Bryson, S. & Bardo, H. (1975). Race and the counseling process: An overview. Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance, 4, 5-15.
- Burke, W.W. (1966). Social perception as a function of dogmatism. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 23, 863-868.
- Carlozzi, A. F., Edwards, D.D., & Ward, G.R. (1978). Dogmatism as a correlate of ability in facilitative communication of counselor trainees. Humanist Educator, 16, 114-119.
- Carlozzi, A.F., Campbell, N.J., & Ward, G.R. (1982). Dogmatism and externality in locus of control as related to counselor trainee skill in facilitative responding. Counselor Education and Supervision, 21, 227-236.

- Carter, J.A. (1978). Impressions of counselors as a function of counselor physical attractiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 28-34.
- Cash, T.F., Begley, P.J., McCown, D.A., & Weise, B.C. (1975). When counselors are heard by not seen: Initial impact of physical attractiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 273-279.
- Cimboric, P.T. (1972). Counselor race and experience: Effects on Black clients. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39, 328-332.
- Claiborn, C.D. (1979). Counselor verbal interaction, nonverbal behavior, and social power. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 378-383.
- Claiborn, C.D., & Schmidt, L.D. (1977). Effects of pre-session information on the perception of the counselor in an interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 259-263.
- Corrigan, J.D., Dell, D.M., Lewis, K.N., & Schmidt, L.D. (1980). Counseling as a social influence process: A review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 395-383.
- Dell, D.M. (1982). Effects of certain counselor behaviors on perceived expertness and attractiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 261-267.
- Dell, D.M. & Schmidt, L.D. (1976). Behavioral cues to counselor expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 197-201.
- Foulds, M.L. (1971). Dogmatism and ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 11, 110-114.
- Foulks, D., & Foulks, S.H. (1965). Self-concept, dogmatism and tolerance of trait inconsistency. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 104-111.
- Fretz, B.R., Corn, R., Tuemmler, J.M., & Bellet, W. (1979). Counselor nonverbal behavior and client evaluations. Journal Counseling Psychology, 26, 304-311.
- Gelso, C.J., & Karl, N.J. (1974). Perceptions of "Counselors" and other help-givers: What's in a label? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21,

243-247.

- Greenberg, R.P. (1969). Effects of pre-session information on perception of the therapist and receptivity to influence in a psychotherapy analogue. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 33, 425-429.
- Guttman, M.A., & Haase, R.F. (1972). Effect of experimentally induced sets of high and low "expertness" during brief vocational counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 3, 171-177.
- Haase, R.F., & DiMattia, D.J. (1976). Spatial environments and verbal conditioning in a quasi-counseling interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 414-421.
- Harvey, J., & Hays, D. (1972). Effect of dogmatism and authority of the source of communication upon persuasion. Psychological Reports, 30, 119-122.
- Heppner, P.P., & Dixon, D.N. (1981). A review of the interpersonal influence process in counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59, 542-550.
- Heppner, P.P., & Heesacker, M. (1982). Interpersonal influence process in real life counseling: Investigating client perceptions, counselor experience level, and counselor power over time. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 215-223.
- Heppner, P.P., & Pew, S. (1977). Effects of diplomas, awards, and counselor sex on perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 147-149.
- Jacoby, J. (1971). Interpersonal perceptual accuracy as a function of dogmatism. Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 7, 221-236.
- Kaul, T.J., & Schmidt, L.D. (1971). Dimensions of interviewer trustworthiness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 542-548.
- Kerr, B.A., & Dell, D.M. (1976). Perceived interviewer expertness and attractiveness: Effects of interviewer behavior and attire and interview setting. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 553-556.
- Kemp, C.G. (1962). Influence of dogmatism on the training of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 2, 155-157.
- Kleck, R.E., & Wheaton, J. (1967). Dogmatism and

- response to opinion-consistent information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 249-252.
- Kleinke, C.L., & Tully, T.B. (1979). Influence of talking level on perceptions of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 23-29.
- LaCrosse, M.B. (1975). Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor attractiveness and persuasiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 563-566.
- LaCrosse, M.B. (1977). Comparative perceptions of counselor behavior: A replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 464-471.
- LaCrosse, M.B. (1980). Perceived counselor social influence and counseling outcomes: Validity of the Counselor Rating Form. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 320-327.
- LaCrosse, M.B., & Barak, A. (1976). Differential perception of counselor behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 170-172.
- Lasky, R.G., & Salomone, P.R. (1977). Attraction to psychotherapy: Influences of therapist status and therapist-patient age similarity. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 511-516.
- Loesch, L.C., Crane, B.B., & Rucker, B.B. (1978). Counselor trainee effectiveness: More puzzle pieces? Counselor Education and Supervision, 17, 195-204.
- Mahon, B.R., & Altmann, H.A. (1977). Skill training: Cautions and recommendations. Counselor Education and Supervision, 17, 42-50.
- Merluzzi, T.V., Banikiotes, P.G., & Missbach, J.W. (1978). Perceptions of counselor sex, experience, and disclosure level. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 479-482.
- Mezzano, J. (1969). A note on dogmatism and counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 2, 64-65.
- Milliken, R.L., & Paterson, J.J. (1967). Relationships of dogmatism and prejudice to counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 6, 124-129.
- Nilsson, D.E., Strassberg, D.S., & Bannon, J. (1979). Perceptions of counselor self-disclosure: An analogue

- study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 399-404.
- Norman, R.P. (1966). Dogmatism and psychoneurosis in college women. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 30, 278.
- Peoples, V.Y., & Dell, D.M. (1975). Black and White students preferences for counselor roles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 529-534.
- Plant, W.T., Telford, C.W., & Thomas, J.A. (1965). Some personality differences between dogmatic and non-dogmatic groups. Journal of Social Psychology, 67, 67-75.
- Rebhun, M.T. (1966). Dogmatism and test anxiety. Journal of Psychology, 62, 39-40.
- Rogers, C.R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of the therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 95-103.
- Rokeach, M. (1954). The nature and meaning of dogmatism. Psychological Review, 61, 194-204.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Rokeach, M., & Fruchter, B. (1956). A factorial study of dogmatism and related concepts. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53, 356-360.
- Rowe, W., Murphy, H.B., & DeCsipkes, R.A. (1975). The relationship of counselor characteristics and counseling effectiveness. Review of Educational Research, 45, 231-246.
- Russo, J.R., Kelz, J.W., & Hudson, G.R. (1964). Are good counselors open-minded? Counselor Education and Supervision, 3, 74-77.
- Sattler, J. (1970). Racial "experimental effects" in experimentation, testing, interviewing and psychotherapy. Psychological Bulletin, 73, 137-160.
- Scheld, A.B. (1976). Client's perception of the counselor: The influence of counselor introduction and behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 503-508.
- Schmidt, L.D., & Strong, S.R. (1971). Attractiveness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling

- Psychology, 18, 348-351.
- Siegel, J.C., & Sell, J.M. (1978). Effects of objective evidence of expertness and nonverbal behavior on client perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 188-192.
- Spiegel, S.B. (1976). Expertness, similarity and perceived counselor competence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 436-441.
- Strong, S.R. (1968). Counseling: An interpersonal process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 170-172.
- Strong, S.R., & Dixon, D.N. (1971). Expertness, attractiveness, and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 562-570.
- Strong, S.R., & Matross, R.P. (1973). Change processes in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 28-37.
- Strong, S.R., & Schmidt, L.D. (1970a). Expertness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 81-87.
- Strong, S.R., & Schmidt, L.D. (1970b). Trustworthiness and influence in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 197-204.
- Strong, S.R., Taylor, R.G., Bratton, J.C., & Loper, R.G. (1971). Nonverbal behavior and perceived counselor characteristics. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 554-561.
- Truax, C.B., & Carkhuff, R.R. (1967). Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago: Aldine.
- Vacchiano, R.B., Strauss, P.S., & Schiffman, D.C. (1968). Personality correlates of dogmatism. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 883-885.
- Zagona, S.V., & Zurcher, L.A. (1965). Notes on the reliability and validity of the dogmatism scale. Psychological Reports, 16, 1234-1236.



**APPENDIXES**

APPENDIX A

DOGMATISM SCALE

## DIRECTIONS

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one of the items.

Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE	-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE	-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH	-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

- \_\_\_ 1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
- \_\_\_ 2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
- \_\_\_ 3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
- \_\_\_ 4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
- \_\_\_ 5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
- \_\_\_ 6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
- \_\_\_ 7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
- \_\_\_ 8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
- \_\_\_ 9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

- \_\_\_10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- \_\_\_11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- \_\_\_12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
- \_\_\_13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
- \_\_\_14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
- \_\_\_15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein or Beethoven or Shakespeare.
- \_\_\_16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
- \_\_\_17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
- \_\_\_18. In the history of mankind there have been just a handful of really great thinkers.
- \_\_\_19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
- \_\_\_20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- \_\_\_21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- \_\_\_22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- \_\_\_23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of a person.
- \_\_\_24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- \_\_\_25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

- \_\_\_26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
- \_\_\_27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
- \_\_\_28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
- \_\_\_29. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exit for long.
- \_\_\_30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
- \_\_\_31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
- \_\_\_32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- \_\_\_33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays are not worth the paper they are printed on.
- \_\_\_34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
- \_\_\_35. It is often desirable to reserve judgement about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
- \_\_\_36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
- \_\_\_37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- \_\_\_38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life, it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all".
- \_\_\_39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
- \_\_\_40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

### Scoring the Dogmatism Scale

1. Add the constant 4 to each response.
2. Add the responses to obtain the final score.
3. Scores range from 40 to 280. Low scores indicate a low degree of dogmatism. High scores indicate a high degree of dogmatism.

APPENDIX B

COUNSELOR RATING FORM

## COUNSELOR RATING FORM

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

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

fair \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: unfair  
   or  
 fair \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: unfair

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

rough \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: smooth  
   or  
 rough \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: smooth

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

active \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: inactive  
   or  
 active \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: inactive

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

hard \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: soft

Your first impression is the best answer.



agreeable \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: disagreeable  
unalert \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: alert  
analytic \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: diffuse  
unappreciative \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: appreciative  
attractive \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: unattractive  
casual \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: formal  
cheerful \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: depressed  
vague \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: clear  
distant \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: close  
compatible \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: incompatible  
unsure \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: sure  
suspicious \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: believable  
undependable \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: dependable  
indifferent \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: enthusiastic  
inexperienced \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: experienced  
inexpert \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: expert  
unfriendly \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: friendly  
honest \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: dishonest

informed \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: ignorant  
 insightful \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: insightful  
 stupid \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: intelligent  
 unlikeable \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: likeable  
 logical \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: illogical  
 open \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: closed  
 prepared \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: unprepared  
 unreliable \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: reliable  
 disrespectful \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: respectful  
 irresponsible \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: responsible  
 selfless \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: selfish  
 sincere \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: insincere  
 skillful \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: unskillful  
 sociable \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: unsociable  
 deceitful \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: straightforward  
 trustworthy \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: untrustworthy  
 genuine \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: phony  
 warm \_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_: cold

## Scoring the CRF

1. Number the items from 1 to 36
2. Score the answer to each item from 1 to 7. The left-most space is either 1 or 7 as follows:

1.	7	13.	1	25.	7
2.	1	14.	1	26.	1
3.	7	15.	1	27.	1
4.	1	16.	1	28.	1
5.	7	17.	1	29.	7
6.	7	18.	7	30.	7
7.	7	19.	7	31.	7
8.	1	20.	7	32.	7
9.	1	21.	1	33.	1
10.	7	22.	1	34.	7
11.	1	23.	7	35.	7
12.	1	24.	7	36.	7

3. Determine factor scores E, A, T, by adding the scores of the 12 items in each factor as follows:

<u>Expertness</u>	<u>Attractiveness</u>	<u>Trustworthiness</u>
2	12	1
3	13	4
8	18	5
11	24	6
15	26	7
16	27	9
19	28	10
20	29	14
21	30	17
23	33	22
25	34	32
31	35	36

VITA<sup>2</sup>

Clovis Elizabeth Stair

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

**Thesis:** THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNSELOR AND SUBJECT  
DOGMATISM AND SUBJECT'S PERCEPTION OF COUNSELOR  
EXPERTNESS, ATTRACTIVENESS AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

**Major Field:** Counseling Psychology

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in South Bend, Indiana, December 18, 1955, the daughter of Albert M. and Bonnie L. Gwin. Married to R. E. Stair on July 6, 1976.

**Education:** Graduated from Brandywine High School, Niles, Michigan, in May, 1974; received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Secondary Education from Oklahoma State University in January, 1982; received a Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in July, 1984; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1987.

**Professional Experience:** Teaching Assistant, Applied Behavioral Studies, August 1984 to July 1986; Practicum Experience, Student Mental Health Clinic at Oklahoma State University, August, 1982 to May, 1986; Psychological Staff position, Student Mental Health Clinic at Oklahoma State University, 1985 to July, 1986; Psychological Internship at Lakeshore Mental Health Clinic, September, 1986 to August, 1987.