

THE DYNAMICS OF COUNSELOR NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR
IN THE COUNSELING RELATIONSHIP

By

JOHN HAWKINS WOODYARD

Bachelor of Science
United States Military Academy
West Point, New York
1954

Master of Education
Boston University
Overseas Division
Heidelberg, Federal Republic of Germany
1974

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 EDUCATION
May, 1978

Thesis
1978 D
Wald
Cop-2



THE DYNAMICS OF COUNSELOR NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR
IN THE COUNSELING RELATIONSHIP

Thesis Approved:

Wm M. Sears
_____ Thesis Adviser

Philip M. ...

David ...

Joseph Pearl

Judith E. Dobson

Norman A. Durham
_____ Dean of the Graduate College

1016665

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This investigation was the product of many minds each of which contributed uniquely to its conclusion. Particularly deserving special mention is Dr. James M. Seals, my Thesis Adviser. His creative ideas and unflagging enthusiasm kept me plodding along inspite of organizational setbacks and unforeseen difficulties. To Dr. David Perrin, Dr. Judith Dobson, Dr. Joseph Pearl, and Dr. Phillip Murphy, I express my gratitude for a positive, supportive attitude without which I could not have succeeded.

My wife, Marianne, and my children, Catherine and Thomas, accepted my new role with understanding for which I am grateful and appreciative.

Finally I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my father for the pleasure of his good company over many cups of coffee.

I have been indeed fortunate to have associated with and to have received the blessings of so many good people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	2
Significance of the Study.	4
Statement of the Problem	5
Purposes of the study.	5
Definitions of Terms	5
Limitations.	6
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	8
Introduction	8
Manifestations of Nonverbal Behavior	9
Factors Affecting Nonverbal Behavior	13
Purposes of Nonverbal Behavior	14
Interpreting Nonverbal Behavior.	24
Summary of Nonverbal Behavior.	27
The Video-taping Process	27
Summary.	29
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	31
Introduction	31
Design	31
Subjects	32
Instrumentation.	33
Island's Taxonomy.	34
Statistical Analysis	35
Summary.	39
IV. RESULTS	40
Introduction	40
Nonverbal Behavior and Affect.	40
Nonverbal Behavior and Client Type	46
Client Type and Affect Score	49
Discussion	50
Summary.	57

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . .	59
Summary	59
Conclusions	60
Recommendations	61
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	63
APPENDIX A - ISLAND'S (1967) TAXONOMY.	67
APPENDIX B - APPLICATION FOR SUBJECTS.	73
APPENDIX C - CLIENT-COUNSELOR INSTRUMENT	75
APPENDIX D - INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGES	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Chi-square Contingency Table for Nonverbal Behavior Categories and Affect Level	42
II. Values of $K_{.j}$, K_{ij} , and $(O-E)^2$ Associated with Nonverbal Behavior Categories and Affect Level	43
III. Chi-square Contingency Table for Nonverbal Behavior Categories and Client Type	47
IV. Values of $K_{.j}$, K_{ij} , and $(O-E)^2$ Associated with Nonverbal Behavior Categories and Client Type	51
V. The Relationship Between Affect Score and Client Type	53
VI. Frequencies of Nonverbal Behavior Associated with Affect Level and Client Type	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Most authorities cite Charles Darwin's The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals as the first systematic observation of the phenomenon loosely labeled nonverbal behavior. However, he was far from being the first to notice such activity. Consider, "Yon Cassius hath a lean and hungry look. He thinks too much: Such men are dangerous." William Shakespeare's use of nonverbal behavior to heighten dramatic effect was not confined to The Tragedy of Julius Caesar. Other works contain similar passages.

In addition to the obvious components of facial expression, body position, and gestures; nonverbal behavior encompasses interaction distance, voice quality, choice of words, one's physical characteristics (the calloused hand), artifacts (a cane or the use of make up), one's environment (how the home or office is decorated), psychophysiological (blushing or sweating), the use of titles, and even entire behavior patterns such as constant lateness.

Nonverbal behavior communicates a multitude of concepts: It can enhance the spoken word with ritualistic actions like a handshake and with gestures which emphasize or punctuate, or which facilitate initiating or terminating conversations.

Some nonverbal behavior merely reflects a need to shift to a more comfortable position. Nonverbal behavior also can communicate information about one's cultural, social, and professional background. It can reflect unconscious personality factors. The relative power status between two people is mirrored in the nonverbal behavior. Some nonverbal behavior even hints at upcoming topics in the conversation. According to many researchers, Ekman and Friesen (1968); Mehrabian (1968); Shapirio and Foster (1968); Haase and Tepper (1972); and Speer (1972), nonverbal behavior is the primary means of communicating affect. It is the communication of affect which is of primary importance in this investigation.

Counselor affect is regarded by some as an essential ingredient in the counseling relationship. Rogers (1962) concluded that the quality of the personal encounter and the attitudinal ingredients of congruence, empathy, and unconditional positive regard, more than anything else, determine the effectiveness of the counseling process. Truax (1963) expressed the same idea writing that positive client personality changes were facilitated by counselor empathy, self congruence, and unconditional positive regard. It follows, then, that counselor success is, in part, a function of his affective qualities which may be communicated through his nonverbal behavior.

Counselor success depends also on self-congruence which is matching his affect with his behavior. This

requires that the counselor know and accept himself. Counselor trainees may find it difficult to engage in sufficient introspection to determine their state of feelings at any one moment. It would benefit the counselor-supervisor if some aspect of nonverbal behavior could be linked to a given affective state. If that link could be identified, a supervisor could critique a trainee by remarking that during the first portion of the interview counselor's nonverbal behavior appeared to reflect an element of dislike/avoidance; therefore, the counselor should review his feelings for that portion of the interview to determine if there was some avoidance/dislike, and if so, why.

The foundations for this investigation were laid down by many pioneers in the field of nonverbal behavior research. Birdwhistell (1952) developed a comprehensive system for categorizing nonverbal behavior. His system, Kinesics, is modeled closely on the structure of human speech. Feldman (1959), Mahl (1968), and Ekman and Friesen (1968) reported extensively on the psychoanalytical referents of nonverbal behavior. Ekman (1965), Ekman and Friesen (1967, 1971), and Ekman, Friesen, and Ellsworth (1972) also investigated the communication of affect by nonverbal behavior. Hall (1963) related the interaction distance between two people and affective state. Ekman and Friesen (1969), Mehrabian (1972), and Birdwhistell (1974) investigated other functions of nonverbal behavior besides the communication of affect. Seals and Pritchard (1973) investigated counselor

nonverbal behavior in the counseling relationship. They related counselor sub-roles to nonverbal behavior.

In spite of these imaginative beginnings there is a need to further explore the dynamics of nonverbal behavior within the counseling relationship. Earlier research has uncovered some fascinating leads and established a structure for nonverbal behavior. It is time to put those data to work and see how they fit into the counseling relationship.

Knowledge of counselor nonverbal behavior is knowledge of his affective state. Knowledge of his affective state facilitates counselor self-congruence and inhibits inconsistencies between the verbal and the nonverbal message. In short, if the counselor-trainee and the counselor-supervisor are aware of some of the possible referents of nonverbal behavior, counseling skills may be enhanced.

Significance of the Study

The present study of counselor nonverbal behavior is significant because the results could illuminate that shadowy process referred to as the counseling process. Specifically, if counselor affect, within the counseling process is expressed by his nonverbal behavior, then the counselor and the counselor-supervisor can quickly evaluate the general emotional state of the counselor in relation to his client. If the affect is negative, those dynamics should be explored to determine why this barrier to successful counseling exists.

It is hoped that the results of this investigation will be specific to the counseling process. Rather than generalizing from clinical observation the results of this experiment should apply directly to all counselors.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in the present investigation is stated as follows: Is there a relationship between counselor affect and counselor nonverbal behavior during the counseling relationship?

Purposes of the Study

There are three major objectives in this investigation: (1) To determine if there is a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and counselor affect during the counseling relationship, (2) To determine if there is a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and client type, and (3) To determine if there is a relationship between affect level and client type.

Definitions of Terms

(1) Affect-an emotional attitude or the emotional response of one person toward another. For the purpose of this investigation, affect will be limited to a gross affective state as described by the dimension of "like-dislike."

(2) Counselor-a trained individual capable of helping another person achieve a change in behavior, facilitating

another's personal growth, or guiding another towards the solution of personal problems.

(3) Counseling Relationship-a dynamic interpersonal relationship between a counselor and another person. The counselor assists the other to achieve a change in behavior, personal growth, or mastery over personal problems.

(4) Nonverbal Behavior-any one of eleven specific body movements, i.e. head movement, head support, lower face movement, smile only, upper face movement, hand movement, arm movement, head support shift, body position shift, talk, and talk shift. A complete description of these terms is in Appendix A.

Limitations

The data used in this investigation was gathered from graduate students enrolled in the Masters Degree program in counseling at Oklahoma State University. Even though these students may be considered typical counselor-trainees, any attempt to generalize their characteristics to other populations must be accomplished with caution. Additional details are included in Chapter III, under the heading, Subjects.

The remainder of this report is organized in the following manner. Chapter II is a review of the most relevant, recent literature pertaining to nonverbal behavior, the counseling process, affect, and the video-taping process. Chapter III, Research Design, enumerates the step-by-step

process of this investigation. Chapter IV details the specific results, and Chapter V contains the conclusions and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Introduction

The professional and popular literature abound with data and misinformation pertaining to nonverbal behavior. So much exists that any comprehensive review of the literature would obscure the pertinent data by submerging it within the irrelevant or the trivial.

Gladstein (1974) performed such a comprehensive review of literature concerning nonverbal behavior and the counseling process. Scrutinizing 115 references he found great variations among conclusions. However, he did advance some of his own empirically based findings. First, nonverbal behavior can be classified in a counseling situation. Second, the most available knowledge concerns paralanguage. Third, paralanguage and kinesics are related to counseling and emotion. Finally, counselors must use nonverbal behavior as a tool in the therapeutic process.

In an effort to clarify a complicated phenomenon, this chapter will be organized to provide a general overview of the entire spectrum of nonverbal behavior manifestations. After the overview, the scope will narrow to focus on the

communication of affect by nonverbal means. An appropriate portion of this chapter will include data concerning the impact of the video-tape process on counseling interviews. To this end, the following questions will be addressed in the subsequent paragraphs: What are the manifestations of nonverbal behavior? What factors affect nonverbal behavior? What are the dynamics of the communication of affect by nonverbal means? How does one interpret nonverbal behavior, and what effect does the video-tape process have on the counseling interview? It must be emphasized that this model for describing the phenomenon of nonverbal behavior is based solely on the investigator's concept of communication clarity.

Manifestations of Nonverbal Behavior

Pei (1960), a noted linguist, estimated that man's repertoire of gestures includes 700,000 manifestations. He also estimated that gestural communication preceded "man" by almost one million years.

Ruesch and Kees (1956) described nonverbal behavior using three categories: sign language, action language, and object language. Sign language refers to replacing words with gestures, i.e., the hitchhiker's thumb. Action language includes indirectly communicating data by the peculiarities of one's gait, the use of a cane or badge, and even one's muscular development. Object language includes the way one dresses, how one decorates his home or

office, or in general how one modifies the environment around himself.

Feldman (1959) itemized 46 gestures and other nonverbal components which covered not only the expressive features of head movement, but also specific acts such as gestures of disgust, tickling, and yawning. These items represent data obtained from clinical observations, and there is a distinct psychoanalytical flavor in his approach.

Island (1967) developed a taxonomy of counselor nonverbal behavior identifying 17 categories which he considered distinct and succinctly measureable. These categories are head movements, head nods, head turned away, head support, upper face movement, lower face movement, hand gestures only, smiles only, hand movement, arm movement, body position backward, body position upright, body position forward, talk, head support shift, body position shift, and talk shift. These categories are fully described in Appendix A.

Mehrabian (1968) estimated that in any message of feeling, only 7% of the message is transmitted verbally. Voice quality (paralanguage) transmits 38% and the remaining 55% is transmitted through facial expressions.

Lifton (1971) included entire behavior patterns as manifestations of nonverbal behavior. For instance, in group dynamics, that person who is constantly late, or occupies himself with notetaking, or volunteers to go for coffee may be expressing avoidance nonverbally.

Dittman (1972) recognized facial expressions, body movements, psychophysiological responses (blushing or sweating) and vocal qualities (paralanguage).

Knapp (1972), while summarizing the work of many, included touching behavior--caressing, poking, or hugging.

Mehrabian (1972) used the descriptive word, immediacy, to encompass all aspects of nonverbal behavior which imply an attraction-repulsion, closeness-apartness, and/or an approach-avoidance. In general one approaches that which is liked and avoids that which has no appeal or is painful. Any nonverbal behavior which is compatible with those criteria reflects a degree of immediacy. Some of these behaviors are eye contact, nearness, touching, and even one's choice of words. When one refers to another group as "those people," the words lack immediacy; hence one indirectly expresses avoidance, distance, and perhaps a degree of dislike. If, however, "those people" become "they," and "they," become Scandinavians, and Scandinavians become Danes, and Danes become you, and you become Peter and Paul, then one hears an increasing order of liking, approach, and immediacy.

Gazda (1973) categorized nonverbal behavior in his book Human Relations Development. He subdivided nonverbal behavior into four major categories: nonverbal behaviors using time, nonverbal behaviors using the body, nonverbal behaviors using vocal media, and those nonverbal behaviors using the environment. An example of the nonverbal use of

time would include pauses in a conversation or the promptness with which one recognizes the presence of another. Nonverbal behaviors using the body would include eye contact, the condition of the eyes (tears), the condition of the skin (sweat), one's posture, one's facial expression, hand and arm gestures, signs of nervousness or restlessness, touching, and other manifestations like snapping the fingers. Nonverbal behaviors using the environment include interaction distance, the physical setting, one's clothing, and one's location within a room. Nonverbal behaviors using the vocal media include the tone of voice, the rate of speech, loudness, and the quality of diction.

Birdwhistell (1974) listed five manifestations of nonverbal communication. The first is body movement which includes gestures, limb movement, eye and mouth behavior, posture, and touching behavior. Second, proxemics which is the interaction distance individuals observe when communicating with each other. One's physical characteristics is the third. These include, but are not limited to, odors, hair color, and physical appearance. Number four includes artifacts such as clothes, make up, weapons, canes, or "hard hats." The last manifestation is one's environmental setting which includes the arrangement of furniture and the decor of one's surroundings.

These preceding data suggest that nonverbal behavior is manifested in numerous ways. They include facial expression, body position, gestures, interaction distance, voice

quality, choice of words, one's use of time, one's physical characteristics, psychophysiological manifestations, the use of props or artifacts, one's use of the environment, the use of titles, and even entire behavior patterns such as constant lateness.

Factors Affecting Nonverbal Behavior

Those previously discussed manifestations of nonverbal behavior are affected by a multitude of causes. Reusch and Kees (1956) identified many of these causes. They listed the social setting, the degree of familiarity between the communicants, the presence (or absence) of a third party, and earlier, similar, experiences.

Ekman and Friesen (1968) probed into the relationship between nonverbal behavior and psychodynamics. They concluded that some nonverbal behavior has special symbolic value expressing in body language basic and perhaps unconscious attitudes about one's self, one's feelings of worth, and sexuality.

Mahl (1968) concluded that nonverbal behavior is highly idiosyncratic and sometimes gender related. Some nonverbal behavior reflects one's cultural background, and some reflects unconscious personality dynamics.

Dittman (1972) identified four factors affecting one's nonverbal behavior. They are the idiosyncratic qualities of the sender; the characteristics of the sender's ethnic and social background; the purpose of the communication;

and the sender's previous experience relating to the event.

Mehrabian (1972) generally agreed with Ekman and Friesen, but he went a bit further. He stated that nonverbal communication is a function of communicator characteristics, communicator affect, and the quality of the relationship between communicator and communicatee.

These data would indicate that nonverbal behavior is affected by numerous conditions. Some are the idiosyncratic qualities of the individual; the individual's ethnic, social and professional background; psychodynamics; and the qualities of the other person--mutual responsiveness. These factors, both singly and in combination, contribute to one's nonverbal behavior repertoire. What proportion of a given nonverbal manifestation reflects cultural background and what proportion reflects the mutual responsiveness factor is a matter beyond the scope of this investigation. However it is an extremely cogent issue impacting heavily on the interpretation of nonverbal behavior in the counseling interview. There does not appear to be any research addressing this issue.

Purposes of Nonverbal Behavior

Enhancing the Spoken Word

Ruesch and Kees (1956) stated that "action language" served the purposes of pointing out, emphasizing, explaining, and interrupting.

Ekman and Friesen (1968, 1969) concluded that there are four types of speech-enhancing nonverbal behaviors. The first type they labeled, "Emblem," which is any ritualistic action like a handshake. The second they labeled, "Illustrator," which is any action which emphasizes or punctuates. Next, "Regulator," which facilitates the initiation or termination of a conversation. The last they labeled, "Adaptor," which is a scratching or shifting to a more comfortable position.

Gazda (1973) stated that some nonverbal behavior modifies the verbal by masking or accentuating the meaning of words. Other nonverbal behaviors illustrate the verbal, and other regulates the interaction.

Birdwhistell (1974) determined that in supplementing the spoken word, nonverbal behavior is as idiosyncratic as speech itself. He even identified regional dialects of nonverbal behavior.

Reflecting One's Background

Some quantity of nonverbal behavior communicates information regarding one's cultural heritage. Efron (1941) described the gestural characteristics of East European Jews and Italians from Southern Italy. He observed that Jews tended to use gestures for emphasis. Italians tended to gesture more to describe size and shape. Italians usually gestured within a sphere two and one half feet from the body. In contrast, Englishmen gestured within a sphere

within one foot of the body.

Mahl (1968) and Schefflen (1974) both agreed that non-verbal behavior communicates information regarding one's cultural, social, and professional background.

Psychodynamic Manifestations

Feldman (1959) although recognizing the cultural influence on nonverbal behavior, concluded that nonverbal behavior reflects unconscious personality factors.

Mahl (1968) believed that some nonverbal behavior reflects unconscious personality factors.

Ekman and Friesen (1968) concluded that some nonverbal behavior has special symbolic value which reflects the unconscious dynamics of the personality.

Miscellaneous Purposes

Mahl (1968) observed that some nonverbal behavior has the same meaning as the verbal. Some nonverbal behavior reflects meanings contrary to the spoken message. Some nonverbal behavior anticipates and signals upcoming verbal statements. This latter item was observed by Mahl during clinical interviews. For instance, one woman continued to twist her wedding ring during an innocuous portion of a clinical interview. Later on she shifted the topic to her marital problems. This type of phenomenon was observed many times.

Schefflen (1965) investigated a nonverbal phenomenon

which he called "quasi-courtship behavior." An example of quasi-courtship behavior follows. When a man adjusts his tie in the presence of a woman he is signalling her that he is ready to initiate courtship. If the woman responds by patting her hair, she is signalling her receptivity. In spite of the provocative label, the implication of this behavior is not necessarily sexual. There are many variations of quasi-courtship behavior. Schefflen observed this behavior at cocktail parties, staff conferences, class rooms, and in encounter groups. These "courtship" messages are sent and received by male-male pairs, female-female pairs, and male-female pairs. It seems to the investigator that courtship is an unfortunate choice of words because of the sexual implication. "Invitation to communicate" might be more appropriate.

Schefflen (1972) concluded that much of one's nonverbal behavior has the purpose of preserving the existing order or maintaining one's "territory." He described three mechanisms of behavior by which the traditional activities and transactions of people are stabilized. They are:

(1) Behaviors that maintain territory, the bonds, and the dominance hierarchy of a transaction. Some of these behaviors also frame the exchange and hold the immediate environment constant.

(2) There are metacommunicative signals which are enacted when there is ambiguity or uncertainty about the proceedings.

(3) Other metacommunicative acts serve to warn about a deviancy in performance thus facilitating a return to the expected course of action.

Although there is a strong sociological thrust to his work, Schefflen essentially described Ekman and Friesen's (1968, 1969) emblems and regulators.

Schefflen (1974) used the words "paracommunicative means" to describe four levels of meaning to nonverbal behavior. Level One communicates data regarding the health, personality, and social position of the sender. Level Two describes the social commitments among persons who know each other. Level Three describes institutional affiliations, loyalties, values, and beliefs. Level Four describes one's philosophical beliefs.

Although each researcher focused on specific aspects of nonverbal behavior, their research is broad enough to provide overlap. There seems to be general agreement that nonverbal behavior communicates many messages: cultural, social, and professional background messages; unconscious personality factors; and enhancement of the spoken word. There is yet another purpose for nonverbal behavior. It is the communication of affect.

Communicating Affect

Ekman (1965), Ekman and Friesen (1967, 1968, and 1971), and Ekman, Friesen, and Ellsworth (1972) studied the communication of affect by nonverbal means. They concluded that

nonverbal behavior is the principal means of communicating affect.

Shapiro, Foster, and Powell (1968) stated that therapeutic attitudes are communicated by nonverbal behavior.

Speer (1972) wrote that nonverbal behavior is a more valid indicator of affective state than is the verbal.

Haase and Tepper (1972) determined that most of the emotional quality of a message is transmitted nonverbally. In fact they stated that nonverbal behavior communicates twice as much empathy as the verbal. Their observations stressed the expressive qualities of eye contact, trunk lean, body orientation, and interaction distance.

Dittman (1972) concluded that expressions of the face provide a rich and reliable source of data about how the person behind the face is feeling.

Gazda (1973) stated that some nonverbal behavior serves as an emotional display system.

Schefflen (1974) concluded that the affective tone is communicated by the quality of the posture and the facial set as well as the manner of speaking and moving. He noticed that as greater and greater rapport is established between client and therapist, the participants tend to move towards each other uncrossing their arms and then their legs. They face each other; there is less fidgeting; they scan less; and their faces become more animated.

Ekman and Friesen (1967) refining Ekman's earlier works (1964, 1965) on the communication of affect by nonverbal

behavior, determined that any conclusions regarding the display of affect nonverbally must be drawn from four specific nonverbal cues: body acts, body position, facial expression, and head orientation. They considered the face an affect-displaying system while the body shows adaptive efforts regarding affect. Emotional data are divided into two categories: the nature of the emotion, and the intensity of the emotion. The nature of the emotion has two sub-categories: gross-affective state, i.e., pleasantness--unpleasantness; and the specific affective state, i.e., anger, fear, love, or liking. Thus under this schema an individual might have a gross-affective state of unpleasantness, a specific affective state of fear, and an intensity factor of mild. Information on gross affective state is obtained from head orientation and body position. Information regarding the specific affective state is obtained from facial expressions and body acts. The intensity of emotion is obtained by observing all four modes of nonverbal expression. Ekman and Friesen visualized only two gross affective states: dimensions of pleasantness--unpleasantness and dimensions of attention--rejection. The intensity of emotion is expressed through a sleep-tension dimension.

Ekman, Friesen, and Ellsworth (1972) investigated the categories of specific emotional states as well as aspects of emotional intensity. They identified seven specific emotional states which could be decoded accurately by

observing the face. These are surprise, anger, interest, disgust, contempt, fear, and sadness.

Ekman and Friesen (1975) refined their 1972 findings regarding the expression of emotion in the human face. They stated that the face is a primary, clear, and precise signal system for the expression of emotions. The seven specific identifiable emotional states were redefined into six: happiness, anger, surprise, sadness, disgust and fear. They also recognized that there are various blends of emotions, and they identified 33 blends of those six emotional states. Accurate judgments about emotional states are still possible; however, they state that some training is necessary in order to become skillful.

Mehrabian (1972) also concluded that the communication of affect by nonverbal behavior is limited to a few general emotional states. He described a like--dislike dimension, a more powerful--less powerful dimension, and a responsive--unresponsive dimension. Mehrabian (1972) investigated mixed messages. When the verbal and nonverbal messages are inconsistent, the nonverbal is the more honest. He also investigated deceit. Deceitful communicators nodded and gestured less, exhibited less frequent leg movement, talked slower, had more speech errors, and smiled more than honest communicators.

Other research supports the concept that a relatively high degree of nonverbal activity is associated with liking. Beier (1974) in an investigation on how married

couples send emotional messages, concluded that happy couples sat closer, looked into each other's eyes more, touched each other more often than themselves, and in general talked more. On the other hand, conflicting couples crossed arms and legs, had less eye contact, and touched less. He also concluded that a person can create a beneficial and emotional environment through body movements and voice tone.

Kaufman (1975) studying the affect of nonverbal behavior in the classroom determined that teachers who were more active nonverbally were viewed more positively by their pupils. The pupils with the more nonverbally active teacher also scored higher on their retention of material than those who had been subjected to a relatively nonverbally active teacher.

Hall's (1963) investigation into the phenomenon he labeled "Proxemics," described the impact of interaction distance between individuals. Ekman, Friesen, and Ellsworth (1972) concluded that interaction distance is related to body position which is in turn related to the gross affective state. Hall distinguished among four interaction zones. Zone One measures from zero to one and one half feet from the individual. This is the intimate zone. The second zone measures from one and one half feet to four feet. This is the personal zone. Zone Three, from four feet to ten feet, is the social-consultive zone. The last zone, from ten feet outward is labeled the public communication zone.

Violating these zones will elicit negative feelings from the other. For instance, if one tries to socialize within the intimate zone, he will probably upset the other's sense of personal space, and some type of avoidance behavior will result. Hall included eye contact in his study of Proxemics. He found that frequent eye contact is associated with liking. Status appears linked to the frequency and duration of eye contact. Hall carefully limited the applicability of his work to North Americans.

There is a limited cross-cultural consistency in non-verbal behavior. Ekman and Friesen (1971) stated that there is conclusive evidence of a pan-cultural element in facial behavior and emotion. Those types of nonverbal behaviors which are cultural specific are "illustrators" or "regulators." Each culture selects a small number of expressions and gestures out of the many possible and traditionalizes them for the clarification and simplification of communication. Americans use about 30 basic gestures and 25 postural configurations. They did not intend to imply that there are no cultural differences in the expression of emotion in the face. Cultural differences will be manifested in the circumstances which elicit the emotion, in the action consequences of the emotion, and in the display rules which govern the management of facial behavior in a particular social setting.

Interpreting Nonverbal Behavior

Most researchers stress that interpreting nonverbal behavior can be accomplished accurately only when an analysis of the entire sender is utilized. For instance, Birdwhistell (1974) warned against drawing conclusions about a person from the observation of an isolated gesture. In order to interpret body language, one must include the social matrix of the interview. Meaning is not inherent in particular symbols, acts, or words, but in the behavior elicited by the presence or absence of them in particular sequence in a particular social setting.

Earlier, Birdwhistell (1970) had already warned against studying nonverbal behavior in a clinical setting with the emotionally disturbed. He determined that the emotionally disturbed possess nonverbal behavior patterns which are not part of the repertoire of the remainder of the population. They displayed behavior for durations at intensities or in situations that were inappropriate for such behavior. He also concluded that the emotionally disturbed have a greater capacity for misinterpreting the nonverbal behavior of others.

It follows, then, that in order to decode the nonverbal messages of another, one must know how to differentiate emotional signals from speech-enhancing signals or from cultural signals. In order to make these determinations one must be aware of the other's total background. Nonverbal behavior is a rich source of emotional data, but only in

conjunction with other knowledge. By itself, as a primary source of data, nonverbal behavior can be a limited and misleading indicator of the other's affective state. Hunches may be gleaned, but until confirmed by other sources, they should remain as pure suppositions. For example, does a vigorous arm movement represent anger or a nonverbal exclamation mark?

Mehrabian (1971) provided an excellent framework for interpreting the affective aspect of nonverbal behavior. His previously cited dimensions of emotional states established the framework for interpretation. The first dimension is evaluation (good--bad; beautiful--ugly; or pleasant--unpleasant). The second dimension is potency (large--small; strong--weak; or heavy--light). The last dimension is activity (active--passive or fast--slow). These reflect all basic feelings and attitudes.

Mehrabian (1971) used metaphors to translate feelings into behaviors, and vice versa. Metaphore One is Immediacy. Immediacy reflects the concept that people approach and get acquainted with that which they like and avoid those things with no appeal or which cause pain. Any act reflecting closeness or approach reflects liking such as approaching, touching, eye contact, forward trunk lean, smiling, and in general being active nonverbally. The second metaphor is Power. A large size, expansiveness, height, absence of fear, and relaxation are qualities which imply power or strength. Relaxation can be communicated by cars, furniture,

titles, and also an asymmetrical positioning of trunk and limbs. The third metaphor is Responsiveness. Responsiveness can be either positive or negative. A change in activity, a change in facial expression, a change in the voice quality, and a change in the voice rate are signals of response to something the sender is signalling. This responsiveness metaphor clarifies the obvious: Two people who communicate respond to each other and their nonverbal behavior varies accordingly.

Groves and Robinson (1976) investigated proxemic behavior as a function of inconsistent verbal and nonverbal messages. They concluded that inconsistent messages were associated with greater interpersonal distances especially when the nonverbal messages were negative and the verbal positive. In addition inconsistent messages resulted in lower ratings of counselor genuineness. Spacing behavior is a direct reflection of one's interpersonal attraction.

Knight and Bain (1976) concluded that client comfort is related to interaction distance.

One method for decoding the emotional message of nonverbal behavior would include determining initially which and how much of the nonverbal message is communicating cultural, social, and professional information and how much is enhancing the sender's message. Using Mehrabian's schema the next step would be to determine the degree of immediacy that is observed, i.e., how much liking. Caution must again be applied lest a backward lean be interpreted as

an avoidance. It might reflect a "more powerful" position. Finally attend to the responsiveness of the other person. As previously cited, behavior changes indicate a response to the sender. Similarly if the other person "mirrors" the sender's body and facial cues, then a form of agreement can be inferred.

There is one final word of caution regarding the interpreting of nonverbal behavior, and it relates again to the necessity for knowing the other person thoroughly. The caveat is this: Do not overlook the obvious. Does excessive blinking reflect tension or a new set of contact lenses? Is that a nervous cough or a mild form of throat infection?

Summary of Nonverbal Behavior

Nonverbal behavior is a highly individualized, multifaceted phenomenon affected by many factors and communicating several diverse messages often with the same behavioral manifestations. Interpreted with caution it can be a rich source of data about another person. While it is perhaps foolish to conclude a person is happy because he smiles, it is not foolish to hunch that he is happy. Other nonverbal behavior manifestations and knowledge of the other person can be combined to confirm or deny the hunch.

The Video-taping Process

Landsman and Lane (1963) found that video-taping was a valuable tool in counselor instruction. Preliminary practice

in role-playing situations was found to be helpful in reducing the anxiety of being recorded.

Roberts and Renzaglia (1965) investigated the influence of audio-tape recording on the counseling process. They determined that when clients and counselors realized that they were being taped they interacted differently from those who were not being taped. Specifically, clients made more favorable self-reports and counselors were less client centered when they realized they were on tape.

Poling (1968) studied the effect of video-taping on the counselor-training process. He concluded that video tapes of counseling interviews are valuable. He also determined that initially counselors tended to focus on overt manifestations of client behavior rather than on the effect on the client or the process.

VanAtta (1969) questioned 89 students regarding how they thought they would react to counseling if they knew the interview would be taped. Thirty nine of the 89 (43.8%) responded by stating that they would reject counseling entirely if the interview had to be recorded. The author concluded that any observation of clients dampens the quality of the counseling experience and resistance to counseling increases with the amount of observation.

Gelso (1972) reported that recording does appear to affect clients in certain ways and that the nature of the effect depends, in part, on the type of problem (vocational vs. personal) clients bring to counseling. Clients with

personal problems are inhibited by video-taping. Self exploration is limited and client satisfaction is attenuated under the condition of video-tape observation.

Knapp and Harrison (1972) reviewed the many methods of recording nonverbal data. Among their findings was the fact that it is important to video-tape both parties. Inasmuch as nonverbal behavior is a mutually responsive phenomenon, observing one person without observing the other makes it difficult to make inferences about the on-going dynamics. They advised the using of the split screen image and the amassing of pre-test data over a series of interviews to get the range of possible nonverbal behaviors of the subject.

Tanney and Gelso (1972) experimented to determine the effect of recording on the counseling process. They concluded that those clients who were aware that they were being video-taped found counseling less stimulating than those who were not taped. Counselors tended to underestimate the impact of video-taping on the client.

Summary

Nonverbal behavior is manifested in many diverse ways. Each manifestation can be the resultant of several factors. Nonverbal behavior communicates many messages, and the communication of affect appears to be a major function of it. Only a few gross affective states, such as like--dislike, can be inferred accurately from nonverbal behavior.

To observe a single gesture and then to conclude a fact about another is an erroneous procedure. Interpreting nonverbal behavior must include one's impression of the total person--his professional, social, and cultural background. The best approach to interpreting nonverbal behavior appears to involve observing clusters of behaviors in conjunction with one's knowledge of the individual's background. Even so it would be prudent to check out one's hunches about the other's nonverbal behavior by asking the other for verification.

The precise impact of the video-taping process on the counseling interview is unknown. Indications are that it probably inhibits the counseling relationship which will be reflected in the nonverbal behavior of the involved parties. Hence, yet another caution regarding the generalization of the results of this investigation to a broader population must be observed.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

Literature cited in Chapter II outlined in general terms the dimensions and functions of the entire spectrum on nonverbal behavior. Emphasis was placed on the more recent information pertaining to the communication of affect by nonverbal means. Also cited were the data describing the process of video-taping counseling interviews. The purpose of Chapter III is to describe the research methodology employed in this investigation. Included is a description of the design, the subjects, the instrumentation, and the statistical analysis.

Design

Each subject video-taped a 12 minute counseling interview with one of four role-playing client-confederates. One half of the subjects interacted with a reluctant client, and the other half interacted with a cooperative client. The intent of this cooperative-reluctant assignment was to elicit differing nonverbal behavior patterns due to differing counselor affect towards the client-confederate.

At the completion of the taped interview, each subject (counselor) completed an instrument labeled "Client-counselor Instrument." This instrument measured the counselor's affect toward the client along a like--dislike continuum.

A three person panel of judges reviewed each taped interview. Three judges each reviewed three of Island's 11 nonverbal behavior categories. The remaining two categories were tabulated by the investigator. They were shift categories. During the replay, the tape was halted at each five second interval (frame). At that moment each judge recorded which, if any, of his three assigned nonverbal behaviors occurred. At the conclusion of the tape (144 five second frames), the investigator tallied the number of times each of the 11 nonverbal behavior categories occurred during the 12 minutes. This procedure was repeated for each subject--making a total of 28 judging sessions.

Subjects

Twenty-eight subjects were selected. Twenty-seven were volunteer graduate students enrolled in the Counseling program at Oklahoma State University. One subject, an undergraduate, was a paraprofessional counselor. All subjects were recruited during the Fall Semester of 1976 and the Spring and Summer Semesters of 1977. The investigator appeared personally in various classes to recruit volunteers. At the conclusion of a minimal-information

briefing an information/application blank was passed out to those who indicated an interest in participating. Appendix B contains a copy.

Four role-playing clients were recruited in a similar manner. One male and one female client related a similar, non-sexist problem. However each projected a reluctant, irresponsible manner. The other male and female related a similar problem, but utilized a cooperative manner. Clients and counselors were assigned based on the limitations imposed by their schedules, the TV studio, and the investigator's schedule. A further scheduling factor insured an even split between reluctant and cooperative clients.

Three judges were recruited in a similar manner. They underwent a three-hour training session which familiarized them with nonverbal behavior--especially Island's 11 categories and with the methodology of this investigation. Several excerpts of video-taped interviews were played in order for them to gain familiarity and experience with counting and recording nonverbal behavior frequencies. Initially it took 10 seconds to record the frequencies of one five second frame. As their skills improved, this time was reduced to five seconds.

Instrumentation

Counselor affect along a like--dislike dimension was measured using a modified version of the Purdue Performance

Indicator as used within Kaufman (1974). In this investigation, it was a 14-item instrument containing both positive and negative statements about the client. Each statement was worded alternately positively and negatively. At the conclusion of the taped interview, the subject unknowingly revealed his affect towards the client by answering each of the 14 statements, TRUE or FALSE. Fifteen scores ranging from zero to 14 were possible. The specific score was determined by assessing how many of the statements about the client were answered negatively. If all 14 items had been answered negatively, the counselor's affect score would have been zero. If one positive score had been recorded, then a score of one would have resulted. If two positive (or 12 negative) answers had been recorded, then a score of two would have resulted. Previous validation of the Purdue Performance Indicator resulted in a mean reliability of .78 using the Kuder-Richardson Formula (Kaufman 1974).

Island's Taxonomy

A crucial element in this investigation was Island's Taxonomy of nonverbal behavior categories. Island (1967) developed a taxonomy of 17 nonverbal behavior categories. Using a Q-sort process he attempted to identify nonverbal behaviors which were distinct and succinctly describable. His ultimate purpose was to produce a tool for use in experimentation. Island (1967) reported that his study

included 20 filmed counselor-trainee interviews of 30 minutes duration rated in five second intervals for the presence or absence of behavior categories. His judges were found reliable on a test-retest measure ranging .513--1.00.

Seals and Pritchard (1973) utilized Island's Taxonomy during a study of nonverbal behavior and counselor sub-roles. However they decided that six of the 17 nonverbal behavior categories had to be omitted from their investigation. Three body positions were omitted because a counselor must be in one of the three body positions at all times; hence a frequency of occurrence of body positions compared to other frequencies would be disproportionately large. Head turned away was also omitted because the video-tape process included only the counselor; hence the reference point (the client) could not be observed for comparison. Seals and Pritchard (1973) also discovered that head nods and hand gestures could not be distinguished from head movements and hand movements. This investigation will utilize these findings and concern itself with 11 of Island's 17 categories. A complete description of the 17 categories is in Appendix A.

Statistical Analysis

Introduction

The data collected enabled the investigator to analyze three questions: (1) Is there a relationship between

counselor nonverbal behavior and and counselor affect?

(2) Is there a relationship between between counselor nonverbal behavior and client type--reluctant or cooperative?

(3) Is there a relationship between client type and affect score? The following sub-paragraphs will discuss the statistical process for each question in detail.

Nonverbal Behavior and Affect

From the Client-counselor Instrument each subject obtained an affect score. Scores could have ranged from zero to 14. They, in fact, ranged from two to 13. Each subject also obtained a frequency count for 11 nonverbal behavior categories. A contingency table consisting of 11 columns and 15 rows was constructed to facilitate the application of chi-square techniques which, according to Lindman (1974), are appropriate for frequency-type data. To insure that no less than 20% of the 165 cells (15 rows x 11 columns) contained expected frequencies of less than five, the 15 rows were collapsed to three which represented low, medium, and high counselor affect levels towards the client. Chi-square techniques were then applied to those data to determine if there was a relationship between counselor affect and counselor nonverbal behavior.

The use of large chi-square contingency tables, i.e., three affect levels x 11 nonverbal behavior categories with a single resultant chi-square value for a test of relationship limited the capability of this investigation

to answer questions regarding trends and implications involving nonverbal behavior categories and affect.

To describe more thoroughly the nature of the relationship between affect level and categories of nonverbal behavior, it was necessary to examine smaller portions of the large table, i.e., a single cell. The overall chi-square value is the sum of the values determined within each cell of the large table.

$$X^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^c \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}, \quad df = (r-1)(c-1)$$

where r equals the number of rows in the table,

c equals the number of columns in the table,

O equals the observed frequency of nonverbal behavior at the intersection of row i and column j , and

E equals the product of the observed frequencies for the i th row and the j th column divided by the total number of observations. Therefore the contribution of any single cell to the chi-square value of the contingency table may be represented as

$$k_{ij} = \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$

Thus any cell for which k_{ij} is large contributed substantially to the total chi-square value for the contingency table. However, in order to avoid being overly influenced by a single cell with a high k_{ij} value, it was necessary to examine the value of K_{ij} which is the sum of k_{ij} across all rows, where $K_{.j} = \sum_{i=1}^r k_{ij}$. A $K_{.j}$ value for each of the 11

nonverbal behavior categories was obtained. Hence those nonverbal behavior categories for which K_j is large was investigated further to determine which of the three cells (low affect, medium affect, and high affect) contributed substantially to the large K_j value. It was inferred that that cell with a high k_{ij} value represented a trend of nonverbal behavior for that affect level. Further by observing the sign of the (O-E) value for each affect level, a sense of directionality was obtained allowing one to determine if the frequency varied with the change in affect level, Bartz (1976).

Nonverbal Behavior and Client Type

These two variables were examined in a similar manner to nonverbal behavior and affect level. Instead of a three x 11 contingency table, a two x 11 contingency table was constructed and analyzed. Values for k_{ij} and K_j were obtained in precisely the same manner.

Client Type and Affect Score

To determine whether there was a relationship between client type and affect score, the Mann-Whitney U-Test was utilized. According to Siegel (1956) this test is appropriate when there is a lack of randomness in subject selection and subject assignment.

Summary

Chi-square techniques were utilized to determine if there was a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior categories and counselor affect as well as counselor nonverbal behavior categories and client type. For those contingency tables where a significant relationship was found to exist, an examination of each cell in the appropriate contingency table was conducted to determine the trend of relationships of these variables. The Mann-Whitney U-Test was utilized to determine if there was a relationship between affect score and client type.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The data collected provided answers to the following questions: (1) Is there a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and counselor affect, (2) Is there a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and client type, and (3) Is there a relationship between affect score and client type? The results of the analysis are stated in the subsequent paragraphs in the following sequence: (1) Results of the analysis of nonverbal behavior and affect, (2) Results of the analysis of nonverbal behavior and client type, and (3) Results of the analysis of client type and affect score, (4) Discussion, and (5) Summary. The tables are inserted into the text.

Nonverbal Behavior and Affect

As outlined in Chapter III, a chi-square contingency table consisting of 11 columns (categories of nonverbal behavior) and three rows (low, medium, and high affect level) was constructed. A chi-square value of 363.71 with 20 degrees of freedom was obtained. This value was significant

beyond .0001. Table I depicts these data. Therefore there was a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and counselor affect.

The following subparagraphs describe the nature of the relationships (if any) between specific counselor nonverbal behavior categories and counselor affect. Chapter III outlined the procedures to determine the nature of the relationships. Table II depicts these data.

Nonverbal Behavior #4, Head Support

The results from Table II indicated that K_4 equaled 191.43 and that k_{14} was 150.25 with a positive (O-E) value. The value for k_{24} was 8.04 with a positive (O-E) value and k_{34} was 33.14 with a negative (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively higher frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior at a low level of affect and a relatively lower frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior at a high level of affect.

Nonverbal Behavior #7, Upper Face Movement

K_7 equaled 78.71. The value for k_{17} was 6.67 with a negative (O-E) value; k_{27} was 39.72 with a negative (O-E) value; and k_{37} was 32.32 with a positive (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively lower frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior at a low level of affect and a relatively higher frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior at a high level of affect.

TABLE I
 CHI-SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR
 NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES
 AND AFFECT LEVEL

Affect Level	Nonverbal Behavior Categories (Island's Taxonomy, Modified)*										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Low	88	42	32	29	1	7	6	40	74	34	9
Medium	656	268	444	46	8	97	52	256	573	226	40
High	964	341	901	9	3	67	278	384	956	369	74

$\chi^2 = 363.71, df = 20$

$\alpha > .001$

*Note: Appendix D provides the title of each nonverbal behavior category associated with the numbers 1-11.

TABLE II
VALUES OF K.j, Kij, AND (O-E)² ASSOCIATED WITH
NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES
AND AFFECT LEVEL

Affect Level	Nonverbal Behavior Categories (Island's Taxonomy, Modified)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Low	88.00	42.00	32.00	29.00	1.00	7.00	O
	83.84	31.95	67.59	4.12	.59	8.44	E
	17.31	101.00	1266.65	619.01	.17	2.07	(O-E) ²
	.21	3.16	18.74	150.25	.28	.25	kij
	+	+	-	+	+	-	Sign, (O-E)
Medium	656.00	268.00	444.00	46.00	8.00	97.00	O
	617.43	235.33	497.77	30.37	4.34	62.18	E
	1487.64	1067.33	2891.21	244.30	13.40	1212.43	(O-E) ²
	2.41	4.54	5.81	8.04	3.09	19.50	kij
	+	+	-	+	+	+	Sign, (O-E)
High	964.00	341.00	901.00	9.00	3.00	68.00	O
	1006.50	383.63	811.45	49.50	7.07	100.36	E
	1806.25	1817.32	8019.20	1640.25	16.56	1047.17	(O-E) ²
	1.79	4.74	9.88	33.14	2.34	10.43	kij
	-	-	+	-	-	-	Sign, (O-E)
	4.41	12.44	34.43	191.43	5.71	30.18	k.j

*Note: Appendix D provides the title of each nonverbal behavior category associated with numbers 1-6.

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

Affect Level	Nonverbal Behavior Categories (Island's Taxonomy, Modified)					
	7	8	9	10	11	
Low	6.00	40.00	74.00	34.00	9.00	O
	16.00	33.38	78.68	30.87	6.04	E
	110.04	43.82	21.90	9.80	8.76	(O-E) ²
	6.67	1.31	.28	.32	1.45	kij
	-	+	-	+	+	Sign, (O-E)
Medium	52.00	256.00	573.00	226.00	40.00	O
	121.46	245.81	579.47	227.38	44.46	E
	4824.69	103.84	41.86	1.90	19.89	(O-E) ²
	39.72	.42	.07	.01	.45	kij
	-	+	-	-	-	Sign, (O-E)
High	278.00	384.00	956.00	369.00	74.00	O
	198.00	400.72	944.63	370.66	72.48	E
	6400.00	279.56	129.28	2.76	2.31	(O-E) ²
	32.32	.70	.14	.01	.03	kij
	+	-	+	-	+	Sign (O-E)
	78.71	2.43	.49	.33	1.93	K. j

*Note: Appendix D provides the title of each nonverbal behavior category associated with the numbers 7-11.

Nonverbal Behavior #3, Head Movement

$K_{.3}$ equaled 34.43. The value for K_{13} equaled 18.74 with a negative (O-E) value. The value of k_{23} equaled 5.81 with a negative (O-E) value, and k_{33} equaled 9.88 with a positive (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively lower level of affect and a relatively higher frequency of occurrence at a high level of affect.

Nonverbal Behavior #6, Smiles

$K_{.6}$ equaled 30.18. The value for k_{16} equaled .25 with a negative (O-E) value (but only slightly so); k_{26} equaled 19.5 with a positive (O-E) value; and k_{36} equaled 10.43 with a negative (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively higher frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior at a medium level of affect and a relatively lower frequency occurrence of nonverbal behavior at a high level of affect.

Nonverbal Behavior #2, Talk Shift

$K_{.2}$ equaled 12.44. The value for k_{12} equaled 3.16 with a positive (O-E) value; k_{22} equaled 4.54 with a positive (O-E) value; and k_{32} equaled 4.74 with a negative (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively higher frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior at a low level of affect and a relatively lower frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior at a high level of affect.

Nonverbal Behaviors 1, 5 & 8-11

The values of K_j were too small for the purposes of interpretation. It can be inferred that their contributions to the overall chi-square value of 363.71 was negligible. See Appendix D for the titles of these categories.

Nonverbal Behavior and Client Type

A second chi-square contingency table consisting of 11 columns (categories of nonverbal behavior) and two rows (client type, reluctant or cooperative) was constructed. A chi-square value of 199.15 with ten degrees of freedom was obtained. This value was significant beyond .001. Table III depicts these data. Therefore it can be concluded that there was a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and client type.

The following subparagraphs describe the nature of the relationships between counselor nonverbal behavior and client type. Procedures used were outlined in Chapter III. Table IV depicts these data.

Nonverbal Behavior #7, Upper Face Movement

The value for K_7 equaled 72.36. The value for k_{17} equaled 40.62 with a negative (O-E) value and k_{27} equaled 31.74 with a positive (O-E) value. This trend reflected a lower frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the reluctant client and a higher frequency of

TABLE III
 CHI-SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR
 NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES
 AND CLIENT TYPE

Client Type	Nonverbal Behavior Categories (Island's Taxonomy, Modified)*										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Reluctant	826	352	505	47	4	116	70	285	733	240	57
Cooperative	882	299	872	37	8	56	266	395	870	389	66

$\chi^2 = 199.15, df = 10$

$\alpha > .001$

*Note: Appendix D provides the title of each nonverbal behavior category associated with the numbers 1-11.

occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the cooperative client.

Nonverbal Behavior #6, Smiles

The value for K_6 equaled 21.79. The value for k_{16} equaled 21.79 with a positive (O-E) value and k_{26} equaled 17.03 with a negative (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively higher frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the reluctant client and a relatively lower frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the cooperative client.

Nonverbal Behavior #3, Head Support

The value for K_3 equaled 28.91. The value for k_{13} equaled 16.23 with a negative (O-E) value and k_{23} equaled 12.68 with a positive (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively lower frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the reluctant client and a relatively high frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the cooperative client.

Nonverbal Behavior #2, Talk Shift

The value for K_2 equaled 27.54. The value for k_{12} equaled 15.46 with a positive (O-E) value and k_{22} equaled 12.08 with a negative (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively higher frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the reluctant client and a relatively

lower frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the cooperative client.

Nonverbal Behavior #1, Talk

The value for $K_{.1}$ equaled 14.02. The value for k_{11} equaled 7.87 with a positive (O-E) value and k_{12} equaled 6.15 with a negative (O-E) value. This trend reflected a relatively higher frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the reluctant client and a relatively lower frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior associated with the cooperative client.

Nonverbal Behaviors 4, 5 & 8-11

The values of $K_{.j}$ were too small for the purposes of interpretation. It can be inferred that their contribution to the overall chi-square value of 199.15 was negligible. See Appendix D for the titles of these categories.

Client Type and Affect Score

As outlined in Chapter III, the Mann-Whitney U-Test was utilized to determine if there was a relationship between affect score and client type. Two values of U were obtained: 185.5 and 10.5. When utilizing the value 10.5, the result is significant beyond the .001 level. Hence there was a relationship between affect score and client type. Further, inspection of the score distribution revealed that high affect scores were associated with

cooperative clients and low affect scores were associated with reluctant clients. Table V depicts the calculations for U.

Discussion

Both Beier (1974) and Kaufman (1975) associated a relatively high frequency of nonverbal behavior with liking and being liked. That is, individuals tend to express positive feelings for another by being more nonverbally active, and the reverse is true. As the degree of liking shifts towards the dislike end of the dimension, nonverbal behavior also changes from more active to less active. The findings of this investigation tend to support these conclusions.

Of the 11 nonverbal behavior categories analyzed with affect level, six were statistically nonsignificant. Of the remaining five categories; two, upper face movement and head movement, had relatively high frequencies of occurrences associated with a high affect level. Two others; head support and talk shift, had high frequencies of occurrence associated with a low affect level. At first glance this seems to contradict Beier (1974), Kaufman (1975), and some of the conclusions of this investigation. However, head support and talk shift are non-movement categories; hence no inconsistency exists. The fifth category, smiles, also had a high frequency of occurrence associated with a low affect. This apparent discrepancy is not inconsistent with previous findings. Mehrabian's (1972) findings

TABLE IV
VALUES OF K.j, kij, AND (O-E)² ASSOCIATED WITH
NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES
AND CLIENT TYPE

Client Type	Nonverbal Behavior Categories (Island's Taxonomy, Modified)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Reluctant	826.00	352.00	505.00	47.00	4.00	116.00	O
	749.20	285.56	604.01	36.85	5.26	75.45	E
	5898.24	4414.27	9802.98	103.02	2.34	1644.30	(O-E) ²
	7.87	15.46	16.23	2.80	.30	21.79	kij
	+	+	-	+	-	+	Sign, (O-E)
Cooperative	882.00	299.00	872.00	37.00	8.00	56.00	O
	958.80	365.44	772.99	42.15	6.74	96.55	E
	5898.24	4414.27	9802.98	103.02	1.59	1644.30	(O-E) ²
	6.15	12.08	12.68	2.18	.24	17.03	kij
	-	-	+	-	+	-	Sign, (O-E)
	14.02	27.54	28.91	4.98	.54	38.82	K.j

*Note: Appendix D provides the title of each nonverbal behavior category associated with the numbers 1-6.

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

Client Type	Nonverbal Behavior Categories (Island's Taxonomy, Modified)					
	7	8	9	10	11	
Reluctant	70.00	285.00	733.00	240.00	57.00	O
	147.38	298.28	703.15	275.91	53.95	E
	5987.66	176.36	891.02	1289.53	9.30	(O-E) ²
	40.62	.59	1.27	4.67	.17	kij
	-	-	+	-	+	Sign, (O-E)
Cooperative	266.00	395.00	870.00	389.00	66.00	O
	188.62	381.72	899.85	353.09	69.05	E
	5987.66	176.36	891.02	1289.53	9.30	(O-E) ²
	31.74	.46	.99	3.65	.14	kij
	+	+	-	+	-	Sign, (O-E)
	72.36	1.05	2.26	8.31	.31	K. _j

*Note: Appendix D provides the titles of each nonverbal behavior associated with the numbers 7-11.

TABLE V

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AFFECT SCORE AND CLIENT TYPE

Subject No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Client Type	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	C	C
Affect Score	2	4	5	5	5	6	7	7	7	8	8	9	9	10
Rank	1	2	4	4	4	6	8	8	8	10.5	10.5	12.5	12.5	15

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

Subject No.	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Client Type	C	C	R	R	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Affect Score	10	10	11	11	11	11	12	12	12	12	12	13	13	13
Rank	15.0	15.0	18.5	18.5	18.5	18.5	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	27.0	27.0	27.0

U = 185.5

U = 10.5, $\alpha > .001$

concerning deceitful communicators indicated that deceitful communicators smiled more and gestured less. This description might fit those counselors interacting with reluctant clients and/or with a low level of affect. Inasmuch as counselors are reminded constantly of the necessity for unconditional positive regard, it follows that any feelings deviating from those warm, empathetic feelings a counselor "should have," might be suppressed, yet be manifested through nonverbal behavior.

The relationship between the frequency of occurrence of non-verbal behavior and affect level was similar to the frequency of occurrence of counselor nonverbal behavior and client type. For instance, of the 11 nonverbal behavior categories associated with client type, six were statistically nonsignificant, and five of those six were also statistically nonsignificant with affect level. Of the remaining five statistically significant nonverbal behavior categories, the frequencies of four, upper face movement, head movement, smiles, and talk shift, were associated with the reluctant client similar to low affect level. Those four also were associated with a high affect level in a manner similar to the cooperative client. The fifth category, talk, had a high frequency of occurrence associated with the reluctant client, but considering that there is a relationship between talk and talk shift, the results are not contradictory.

Inasmuch as counselors who interacted with reluctant

clients displayed similar nonverbal behavior patterns as counselors expressing a relatively low regard for their clients, one may speculate whether counselor-trainees respond to reluctant clients negatively and to cooperative clients positively. In other words, is the counselor's regard for his client dependent, at least in part, on the type of client? This "interaction effect" has been discussed by Dittman (1972), Mehrabian (1972), and Schefflen (1972). Although it is intuitively obvious that all individuals respond and counter-respond to each other, one might hope that counselors' regard for their clients is somewhat independent of the idiosyncratic qualities of the client.

There is a factor which probably influenced the outcome of this investigation, counselor subrole. The basis for the frequency count of the counselor nonverbal behavior categories was a 12 minute counseling interview. In order to control for consistency, each counseling interview was arranged as an initial or intake interview. It seems logical that during the first 12 minutes of a 50 minute interview (with an undetermined number of interviews theoretically possible to follow), that the counselor might primarily be "listening" or "gathering information," two of the 12 subroles utilized by Seals and Pritchard (1973). A counselor could be bored or entranced by listening, and his nonverbal behavior would reflect that. It would be interesting to replicate this investigation with an additional variable,

counselor subrole. It could be then determined if the relationship between nonverbal behavior categories and affect/client type varies depending upon which of the 12 subroles the counselor is operating from.

Summary

Chi-square techniques established that there is a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and counselor affect. The same techniques also established that there is a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and client type. The Mann-Whitney U-Test established that there is a relationship between affect score and client type.

Chi-square techniques were also applied to the data to determine the trend of the relationships between specific counselor nonverbal behavior categories and affect level as well as specific counselor nonverbal behavior categories and client type. Five nonverbal behavior categories appeared associated with client type.

Table VI depicts the relationships among the variables of high and low affect, high and low frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behavior, and those nonverbal behavior categories which were statistically significant.

TABLE VI
 FREQUENCIES OF NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR
 ASSOCIATED WITH AFFECT LEVEL
 AND CLIENT TYPE

Affect Level	Frequencies of Nonverbal Behavior	
	High	Low
Low	Head Support Smiles	Upper Face Movement Head Movement Talk Shift
High	Upper Face Movement Head Movement Talk Shift	Head Support
Client Type		
Reluctant	Talk Shift Talk Smiles	Upper Face Movement Head Movement
Cooperative	Upper Face Movement Head Movement	Talk Shift Talk Smiles

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The stated purposes of this investigation were to determine if there was a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and counselor affect during the counseling relationship, if there was a relationship between counselor nonverbal behavior and client type, and if there was a relationship between level of affect and client type.

Chi-square techniques were applied to the data to determine if a relationship existed between counselor nonverbal behavior and (1) affect level, and (2) client type. The Mann-Whitney U-Test was utilized to determine if a relationship existed between client type and affect level score. In all three instances, the statistical techniques confirmed the existence of a relationship with a significance level beyond .001.

Chi-square techniques were also applied to the data to determine the trend of the relationships between specific nonverbal behavior categories and (1) affect level, and (2) client type. Five nonverbal behavior categories appeared associated with affect and five appeared associated with client type. The subsequent paragraphs describe the

specific relationships.

Conclusions

During the counseling relationship high frequencies of upper face movement, head movement, and talk shift were associated with a high affect level, and low frequencies were associated with a low affect level.

During the counseling relationship high frequencies of head support and smiles were associated with a low and medium affect level, respectively, and low frequencies were associated with a high affect level.

During the counseling relationship, high frequencies of upper face movement and head movement were associated with the cooperative client, and low frequencies were associated with the reluctant client.

During the counseling relationship, high frequencies of talk, talk shift, and smiles were associated with the reluctant client, and low frequencies were associated with the cooperative client.

Table VI depicts the relationships between nonverbal behavior and affect level. It also depicts the relationships between nonverbal behavior and client type.

Since the Mann-Whitney U-Test calculations yielded a value significant at the .001 level, it can be concluded that the counselor's affect toward reluctant clients differs from their affect toward cooperative clients. Observations of the score distribution revealed that high affect

scores were associated with the cooperative client and low affect scores were associated with the reluctant client.

Recommendations

As stated in Chapter I, more research is needed to describe counselor nonverbal behavior in the counseling relationship. This investigation was an attempt to remedy this situation. Although any investigation into this general area would be beneficial to counselors, the results of this investigation indicated that certain areas for investigation would be more productive than others.

First, future inquiries into nonverbal behavior should include the subrole variable. Inclusion of this aspect will provide for a more thorough understanding of the moment-to-moment dynamics of the counseling relationship.

Second, considering the extremely diverse factors which affect one's nonverbal behavior, it is time to cease investigating isolated gestures and begin investigating clusters of behaviors such as Mehrabian's (1971) concept of immediacy. Such an investigation might try to discover if there is a relationship between immediacy and low affect/reluctant client and/or high affect/cooperative client.

Third, due to statistical necessity this investigation omitted all manifestations of body lean. This is regrettable since body lean is a significant nonverbal signal of affective state. It would be productive if body lean by itself was investigated to determine the nature of its relationship

with affect and reluctant clients. Since body lean is also a signal of status, attempting to differentiate between "status lean" and an "affect lean" might be interesting also.

Fourth, one wonders whether Island's Taxonomy of non-verbal behavior is yet a valuable research tool. It appears to have serious shortcomings, i.e., omitting body lean and the inability to distinguish hand gestures and head nods from head movements and hand movements.

In general much of the previous research on nonverbal behavior has not specified the counseling relationship. It has also concentrated on nuances of gestures and micro-expressions which are interesting, but of little practical use to the counselor. Concentrating on the counseling relationship, on nonverbal behavior clusters, and on affect will produce useful data thereby providing a better tool to increase counselor effectiveness.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartz, Albert E. Basic Statistical Concepts in Education and Behavioral Sciences. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Company, 1976.
- Beier, Ernst G. "Nonverbal Communication: How We Send Emotional Messages." Psychology Today, October 1974, pp. 52-55.
- Birdwhistell, R. Introduction to Kinesics. Louisville, Kentucky: Louisville University Press, 1952.
- Birdwhistell, R. Expressions of the Emotions in Man. New York: International University Press, 1963.
- Birdwhistell, R. Kinesics and Context. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.
- Birdwhistell, R. "The Language of the Body: The Natural Environment of Words." Human Communication. Ed. A. Silverstein. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Halsted Press, 1974, pp. 128-129.
- Dittman, A. Interpersonal Messages of Emotion. New York: Springer Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.
- Efron, D. Gesture and Environment. New York: King's Crown Press, 1941.
- Ekman P. "Body Position, Facial Expression, and Verbal Behavior During Interviews." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68, 1964, pp. 295-301.
- Ekman P. "The Differential Communication of Affect by Head and Body Cues." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 1965, pp. 726-735.
- Ekman P. and W. V. Friesen. "Head and Body Cues in the Judgment of Emotion: A Reformulation." Perceptual and Motor Skills, 24, 1967, pp. 711-723.
- Ekman, P. and W. V. Friesen. "Nonverbal Behavior and Psychotherapy Research." Research in Psychotherapy. Ed. J. M. Schlein. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1968, pp. 179-215.

- Ekman, P. and W. V. Friesen. "Nonverbal Leakage and Clues to Deception." Psychiatry, 32, 1969, pp. 88-106.
- Ekman, P. and W. V. Friesen. "Constants Across Culture in the Face and Emotion." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, 1971, pp. 124-129.
- Ekman, P., W. V. Friesen, and P. Ellsworth. Emotion in the Human Face. New York: The Pergamon Press, 1972.
- Ekman, P. and W. V. Friesen. Unmasking the Face. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Feldman, S. Mannerisms of Speech and Gestures in Everyday Life. New York: International University Press, 1959.
- Gazda, G. M. Human Relations Development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.
- Gelso, C. J. The Effect of Audio and Video Recording on Clients. College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland Counseling Center Research Report, 1972.
- Gladstein, J. "Nonverbal Communication and Counseling/Psychotherapy: A Review." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 4:3, 1974, pp. 34-57.
- Groves, J. and J. D. Robinson II. "Proxemic Behavior as a Function of Inconsistent Verbal and Nonverbal Messages." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23:4, 1976, pp. 333-338.
- Haase, R. F. and D. T. Tepper. "Nonverbal Components of Empathic Communication." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19:5, 1972, pp. 417-424.
- Hall, E. T. "A System for the Notation of Proxemic Behavior." American Anthropologist, 65, 1963, pp. 1003-1026.
- Island, D. D. "The Development and Analysis of Categories of Nonverbal Behavior of Counselors in Filmed Interviews." (Unpubl Ed.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1967.)
- Kaufman, P. "The Effects of Nonverbal Behavior on Performance and Attitudes in the College Classroom." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)
- Knapp, M. L. and Randall P. Harrison. "Observing and Recording Nonverbal Data in Human Transactions." (Paper presented to the Annual Convention of Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1972.)

- Knapp, M. L. Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Knight, P. H. and Carolyn K. Bain. "Degree of Client Comfort as a Function of Dyadic Interaction Distance." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23:1, 1976, pp. 13-16.
- Landsman, T. and D. Lane. "Audio-visual Media, Yes, Depersonalization, No." Audio-visual Instructor, 8, 1963, pp. 128-133.
- Lifton, W. M. Groups, Facilitating Individual Growth and Societal Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.
- Lindman, H. Analysis of Variance in Complex Experimental Designs. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1974.
- Mahl, G. "Gestures and Body Movements in Interviews." Research in Psychotherapy. Ed. J. M. Schlein. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1968, pp. 179-215.
- Mehrabian, A. "Communication Without Words." Psychology Today, September 1968, pp. 43-55.
- Mehrabian, A. "Nonverbal Betrayal of Feeling." Journal of Experimental Research in Personality. 5, 1971, pp. 64-73.
- Mehrabian, A. Silent Messages. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1972.
- Mehrabian, A. Nonverbal Communication. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton Company, 1972.
- Paling, E. G. "Video-tape Recordings in Counseling Practicum." Counselor Educator and Supervisor, 8, 1968, pp. 33-38.
- Pei, M. The Story of Language. New York: The New American Library, 1960.
- Roberts, D. and F. Renzaglia. "The Influence of a Tape Recording on Counseling." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12, 1965, pp. 10-16.
- Rogers, C. "The Interpersonal Relationship: The Core of Guidance." Harvard Educational Review. 32, 1962, pp. 416-429.

- Ruesch, J. and W. Kees. Nonverbal Communication, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956.
- Schefflen, A. "Quasi-Courtship Behavior in Psychotherapy." Psychiatry, 28, 1965, pp. 245-257.
- Schefflen, A. Body Language and Social Order. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Schefflen, A. How Behavior Means. Garden City, New York: The Anchor Press, 1974.
- Seals, J. and C. Pritchard. "Nonverbal Behavior as a Dimension of Counselor Subrole." Counselor Education and Supervision. December 1973, pp. 150-152.
- Shapiro, J., C. Foster and T. Powell. "Facial and Body Clues of Genuineness, Empathy, and Warmth." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 24, 1968, pp. 233-236.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics, Garden City, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.
- Speer, D. "Nonverbal Communication of Affective Information." Comparative Group Studies, 3:4, pp. 409-423.
- Strong, S., R. Taylor, J. Bratton, and R. Loper. "Nonverbal Behavior and Perceived Counselor Characteristics." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 1971, pp. 554-561.
- Tanney, M. and C. Gelso. "Effect of Recording on Clients." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19:4, 1972, pp. 349-350.
- Truax, C. "Effective Ingredients of Psychotherapy: An Approach to Unravelling the Patient-Therapist Interaction." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 10, 1963, pp. 256-263.
- VanAtta, R. "Excitatory and Inhibition Effects of Various Methods of Observation in Counseling." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16:5, 1969, pp. 433-439.

APPENDIX A

ISLAND'S (1967) TAXONOMY

Head Movement. Any and all movements of the head are included in this category, including nods, shakes, head gestures, gross and subtle head position changes, except those very slight head movements associated with speaking. Also excluded in this category are head movements resulting from chair movement. The observer in every case decides if the movement was or was not a result of head and neck muscle movements.

Head Nods. Any and all up and down head movements made while the counselor is not talking and consisting in general of more than one up and down cycle, but designed to include even slight but noticeable up and down movements of this nature in this category. It does not include the so-called "negative nod" (the head shake), but it could be considered similar to categories described elsewhere as a "positive nod" or "listening nod".

Head Turned Away. Any and all occurrences when the counselor turns his head away and/or shifts his glance away from the client, except when the shifted glance is very, very brief.

Head Support. Any and all occasions when the counselor supports or partially supports his head by his fist, hand, fingers or arm are included in this category. Since it is impossible for the observer to determine if, in fact, the head is being supported by this manner, all questionable occurrences are included, with the general stipulation that the elbow should be resting on something. Examples of

this category are such occasions when the fingers or open hand is gently resting against the face or chin, or when one finger is pushing against the cheek, in addition to the more common fist or knuckles resting in support of the chin or cheek.

Head Support Shift. This category is derived from data in Category 4 and is not directly tallied from the films. This category is designed to measure every new occurrence of Category 4, provided these occurred at least five seconds apart. Thus, while Category 4 would be recorded every five seconds, if the shift to the behavior or out of it would be recorded in Category 5.

Lower Face. Any and all movements of the lower face, including pursing the lips, biting and licking the lips, opening and closing the mouth when not speaking, general other mouth movements, moving the tongue inside the lips, moving the nose, grimacing, touching the lips with hands or fingers comprise this category. Not included are all smiles and laughs. The lower face category defines the area beneath the eyes.

Smile. Any and all occurrences of a full-fledged smile, usually with teeth showing, cheeks pouched and wrinkles at the corners of the mouth very pronounced are included in this category. Teeth do not have to show as a criterion, however, more important was the pronounced difference in the wrinkles at the corners of the mouth. Slight grins, grimaces, and slight smiles while talking

were not counted. Since a smile is somewhat difficult to define for replication, it in effect becomes defined by whatever the observer decides a smile is.

Upper Face. Any and all occurrences of facial movements above the eyes comprise this category, including raising and lowering of the eyebrows, presence of wrinkles in the forehead, other movements of the forehead, changes in wrinkles at the corners of the eyes, but it excludes movement of the eye lids themselves, since tapes are not adequate to allow reliable measures of eye lid movements.

Hand Movements. Any and all occurrences of hand and finger movements are included in this category, even those movements which are very slight.

Hand Gesture. This category includes any and all gestures of the hands which usually occur when the counselor is talking. These gestures are not random hand-arm movements but are defined as emphatic in nature, such as a wide hand-sweep or symbolic desk pounding, although the magnitude of distance moved by the hand need not be a criterion, since an emphatic gesture may, in fact, require movement of only a few inches.

Arm Movement. Any and all occurrences of a significant movement of the elbow or wrist, usually involving a displacement of two to three inches distance constituted an arm movement. This category is recorded even if it occurred momentarily and returned to the same position.

Forward Position. One of three body positions

into which the observer is obliged to categorize the counselor's position during each time segment. This category included positions that ranged in "forwardness" from a slight leaning forward in the chair, from a hypothetical perpendicular plane with the floor, to a very pronounced forward leaning, which may involve, for example, leaning on the desk. Usually both feet are or could be on the floor.

Upright Position. This category is one of three body positions into which the observer is obliged to categorize the counselor's position during each time segment. This category includes a somewhat smaller range of possible positions than Category 12. The postures vary around the counselor sitting more or less in the "good posture" position, upright in his chair, more or less vertical, or perpendicular to the floor. This position could be slightly more backwards than forward since many counselors appeared to maintain an "upright" position while tipping slightly back in a swivel chair.

Backward Position. This category is one of the three body positions into which the observer is obliged to categorize the counselor's position during each time segment. This category included positions of "backwardness" from a slouched backward lean in an upright chair to a pronounced tip of the chair to accentuate the backward lean. One general criterion is that one or both feet of the counselor would no longer be able to touch the floor, except when in the backward slouch, although the use of this cue is by no

means applicable across all counselors, particularly the women counselors.

Body Shift. This category is derived from data in Categories 12, 13, or 14 and is not directly tallied from the tapes. Every occurrence of the beginning of a position as described in the categories 12, 13, or 14 constitute a recording for this category.

Talk. This category is tallied from the sound tapes of the interviews, not from the films. Talk is defined as the utterance of an understandable English language word including single word responses, but not including mumbles, huh-huh, uh-huh, mmmmm, hmmmm, groans, etc.

Talk Shift. This category is derived from data in Category 16 and is not tallied directly from either the tapes or the films. Every new speech (defined in Category 16) begun by the counselor constitutes a recording for this category, provided a time interval separates the speeches. A new speech could be defined as a single word response, such as "Yes", followed by nothing more, or it could be defined as the first word in a 3-minute speech of continuous verbiage. In both examples, one tally would be recorded for this category, since this category confines itself to shifts into speaking behavior.

APPENDIX B

APPLICATION FOR SUBJECTS

October, 1976

You have indicated an interest in participating in a doctoral dissertation experiment. I need a total of 30 subjects who are willing to conduct a counseling interview with a role-playing client. The interview will last 12 minutes, and it will be video-taped. The general nature of the experiment involves the counseling process. I cannot say more lest I bias the results; however, in no way will you as prospective counselors be judged, criticised, or in any way demeaned. At the conclusion of the data collection I will explain the purpose of the experiment and how you contributed to it. Your tapes will be available for review also. I anticipate that this will involve no more than 30 minutes of your time. I appreciate your interest and participation. If you desire to participate, please fill out the remainder. I will contact you subsequently.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

AGE _____ SEX _____ MARITAL STATUS _____

ANY PREVIOUS COUNSELING EXPERIENCE? _____. IF YES, WHAT TYPE,
WHERE, AND FOR HOW LONG?

PLEASE LIST YOUR FREE TIME.

APPENDIX C

CLIENT-COUNSELOR INSTRUMENT

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

COUNSELOR-CLIENT INSTRUMENT

The rating scale consists of 14 statements concerning the client you have just interviewed. Please respond to each statement by checking the TRUE space if it describes the client or FALSE if it does not. Do not ponder over the statement, your "gut reaction" is preferred.

	TRUE	FALSE
1. The client seems honest.	_____	_____
2. The client does not speak well.	_____	_____
3. The client seems concerned with his problem.	_____	_____
4. The client seems self-confident.	_____	_____
5. The client exhibits good use and command of the English language.	_____	_____
6. The client does not have a clear, pleasant voice.	_____	_____
7. The client seems humorless.	_____	_____
8. The client has poor posture.	_____	_____
9. The client presents his/her problem clearly.	_____	_____
10. The client has an interesting problem.	_____	_____
11. The client does not put his ideas across logically or orderly.	_____	_____
12. The client is boring.	_____	_____
13. The client presents his problem forcefully.	_____	_____
14. The client does not appear well groomed.	_____	_____

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGES

Instructions for Judges

Your function as a judge is to count the frequency of occurrence of each of your assigned nonverbal behavior categories. Three judges will count three categories each. Nonverbal behavior categories have been grouped and assigned to facilitate observation.

A 12-minute video-tape of a counseling interview will be played for you. However, the replay will be accomplished in five second frames. Each five seconds, the tape will be halted and the occurrence or non-occurrence of each category recorded. If the appropriate nonverbal behavior category was on-going at the end of the frame, or if it occurred during the frame, then it is scored as an occurrence. A nonverbal behavior can occur only once during the five second frame. If it continues into the next frame (or into the next dozen), it still occurs a maximum of once in each frame. Therefore, in essence, a behavior can only occur once or not occur at all within each frame.

A worksheet has been provided for each judge. There are 144 squares representing each five second frame in the 12 minute interview. There are three groups of 144 squares which accommodates your three nonverbal behavior categories.

The procedure will go like this: The investigator will alert the judges and announce, "Frame 1, go," and he will roll the tape. At the end of five seconds he will stop the tape, and the judges will mark their worksheets. An "X"

represents the occurrence. No occurrence will be marked, "0". The investigator will call out, "Ready" Frame 2, Go."

Island's Taxonomy, Group #1, Judge #1

Category #1: Talk. This category is defined as the utterance of any understandable word including single-word responses including uh-huh's, huh-uh's, and mmm's.

*Category #2: Talk Shift. These data are tallied from the data in Category #1 and is not tallied either from the audio or visual portion of the video-tape. Every new speech begun by the counselor constitutes a recording for this category provided a time interval separates the speeches. A new speech could be a single word uttered once or a three-minute explanation. In both examples one tally would be reported for talk shift since it is confined to shifts into speaking behavior.

Category #3: Head Movement. Any and all movements of the head are included including nods, shakes, head gestures, gross and subtle head position changes except those very slight head movements associated with speaking. The judge in each case decides if the movement resulted from head and neck muscle movements.

Category #4: Head Support. Any or all occasions when the counselor supports or partially supports his head by his fist, hand, fingers, or arm. The elbow should be resting on something.

*Category #5: Head Support Shift. These data are derived

from the information in Category #4. It measures each new occurrence of Category #4 provided each new occurrence happens at least five seconds apart.

Island's Taxonomy, Group #2, Judge #2

Category #6: Smile. All occurrences of a full-sized smile, usually with teeth showing, cheeks pouched and wrinkles at the corners of the mouth. But teeth do not have to show to be a smile. Generally it is the overall effect generated by the mouth, the eyes, and cheeks. Similar movements associated with talking do not count.

Category #7: Upper Face Movement. All occurrences of facial movement above the eyes including raising and lowering of the eyebrows, presence of wrinkles in the forehead, other forehead movements, and changes in the wrinkles at the corners of the eyes comprise this category. Eye lid movements are excluded.

Category #8: Lower Face Movement. All movements of the lower face, including pursing of the lips, biting and licking the lips, opening and closing the mouth while not speaking, general mouth movements, moving the tongue across the lips, moving the nose, grimacing, touching the lips with the hands or fingers comprise this category. Smiles and laughs are excluded. The lower face is defined as the area beneath the eyes.

Island's Taxonomy, Group #3, Judge #3

Category #9: Hand Movements. All occurrences of movement of the hand and fingers even those which are very slight.

Category #10: Arm Movement. All occurrences of movement of the elbow and wrist usually involving a displacement of two to three inches constitute arm movement. This category is recorded even if it was momentary and the arm returned to the same location.

Category #11: Body Shift. Every occurrence of the beginning of a new position for the body is recorded. There are three body positions: forward, upright, and body position backwards. The first recording of this category must be accomplished in the first frame as the subject must be in one of the three body positions at the start. Henceforth the shift is recorded as the subject shifts his body into a new position.

*Shift categories are tabulated after the tape review by counting the frequency occurrence of the beginning of the movement.

VITA 2

John Hawkins Woodyard

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE DYNAMICS OF COUNSELOR NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR IN
THE COUNSELING RELATIONSHIP

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in New York City, New York, July 23, 1931, son of Mr. and Mrs. Darrel Woodyard. Married to Marianne Black of Copenhagen, Denmark on December 28, 1957. Two children: Catherine, 18 and Thomas 13.

Education: Graduated from East Rockaway High School, East Rockaway, New York, in June 1949. Attended Oklahoma A & M College for one year earning 31 credit hours. Attended the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, received Bachelor of Science degree in June, 1954. Attended Texas Western College during the period 1963-1967 earning 18 credit hours. Attended the University of Maryland, Overseas Division, Heidelberg, Federal Republic of Germany during the period 1971-1972 earning 15 credit hours. Attended Boston University, Overseas Division, Heidelberg receiving a Masters of Education degree in September, 1974. Completed all requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1978.

Professional Experience: Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army (Retired). Military service for 21 years includes approximately four years of continuing military education, four and one half years on the ROTC faculty of Texas Western College, various administrative staff positions, and command of a 750 person organization. Overseas service includes Vietnam, Korea and Germany for a total of six and three quarters years.