

379
N81
No. 6473

DRESS STYLE, COUNSELOR AND CLIENT GENDER AND EXPECTATIONS
ABOUT COUNSELING

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Lisa P. Kimsey, B.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1988

Kimsey, Lisa P., Dress Style, Counselor and Client Gender and Expectations about Counseling. Master of Science (Clinical Psychology), August, 1988, 58 pp., 4 tables, bibliography, 46 titles.

This study explored the effects of counselor dress style and counselor and subject gender on clients' expectations about counseling. Two hundred fifty undergraduate students were given Tinsley's Expectations About Counseling questionnaire. Dress style was shown to have no effect on the expectations measured. Significant main effects were found for client gender, counselor gender and their two way interaction on the measures of responsibility, acceptance, confrontation, empathy, genuineness, tolerance, trustworthiness, concreteness, and immediacy. Post hoc analysis revealed that both male and female participants had higher expectations of female counselors than male counselors. Participants of both genders also expected female counselors to be more confrontive, genuine, trustworthy, concrete, and accepting than male counselors. They also had a higher expectation that counseling would address their immediate concerns.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DRESS STYLE, COUNSELOR AND CLIENT GENDER AND EXPECTATIONS ABOUT COUNSELING	
Introduction.	1
Ethnicity	
Gender	
Dress Style	
Summary	
Method.	13
Participants	
Measures	
Conditions	
Procedure	
Results	16
Dicussssion.	32
Appendices.	40
References.	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations for all Groups on all Scales of the EAC	17
2. F Tests for Main and Interaction Effects on all Significant EAC Scales	24
3. Means and Standard Deviations of all Combinations of Counselor and Subject Sex on Significant Scales of the EAC.	26
4. Post Hoc Comparisons between all Combinations of Counselor and Subject Sex on the Scales of the EAC.	27

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Table	Page
1. Female White Coat One	Appendix C
2. Female White Coat Two	Appendix C
3. Female Formal One	Appendix C
4. Female Formal Two	Appendix C
5. Female Casual One	Appendix C
6. Female Casual Two	Appendix C
7. Male White Coat One	Appendix C
8. Male White Coat Two	Appendix C
9. Male Formal One	Appendix C
10. Male Formal Two	Appendix C
11. Male Casual One	Appendix C
12. Male Casual Two	Appendix C

DRESS STYLE, COUNSELOR AND CLIENT GENDER AND EXPECTATIONS
ABOUT COUNSELING

Considerable research has been conducted examining therapist characteristics which may either facilitate or impede therapy (Bergin & Lambert, 1978; Bergin, 1966, 1971). The initial impetus for conducting studies examining the effects of therapy was due to a study published by Eyesenk (1952) indicating that therapy was not effective. As a consequence, numerous studies have been done examining not only the effects of various forms of therapy but also the potential influence of the therapist upon outcome. Strong (1968) suggested that therapist influence could be enhanced by increasing the therapist's perceived credibility (expertness and trustworthiness) and attractiveness (liking, similarity and compatibility). Since that time, many studies have explored the effects of various therapist characteristics upon client perceptions and behavioral change. Some of the therapist variables which have been examined include perceived therapist attractiveness and trustworthiness (Corrigan, Dell, Lewis, & Schmidt, 1980). Evidential cues for counselors perceived as expert include traditional office decor (Bloom, Trautt, & Weigel, 1977) displayed degrees and awards (Heppner & Pew, 1977; Sell & Siegel, 1978), professional attire (Dell & Kerr, 1976) and therapist-client racial similarity (Atkinson, Maruyama

& Matsui, 1978). Therapist perceived expertness increases with reputational introductions (Spiegel, 1976) as well as with having a doctorate (Scheid, 1976), status (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977) and prestige (Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975). Behavioral cues given by therapists perceived as expert include use of abstract psychological terminology (Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975) and core conditions (Scheid, 1976) and asking relevant questions (Strong & Schmidt, 1970).

Festinger's (1957) cognitive dissonance theory has also stimulated much opinion-change research. According to this theory, dissonance will be experienced when another person holds an opinion contrary to one's own (Festinger, 1957). The magnitude of the dissonance is a function of the degree of perceived discrepancy between the two opinions, with greater discrepancy producing greater dissonance. Dissonance can be reduced by (a) changing one's opinion to that of the other, (b) discrediting the other and reducing the importance of the other's assertions, (c) reducing the value or importance of the issue of conflict, (d) changing the other's opinion, and (e) adding thoughts consistent with one's own opinion and reducing the weight of the other's assertions. The client will change his ideas in the direction of the therapist only if other means of dissonance reduction are controlled. Therapist characteristics which control therapist derogation are credibility and attractiveness.

Applied psychologists have also proposed that therapist characteristics are related to therapy outcome. For example Carl Rogers (1957) proposed the necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change, specifying certain therapist characteristics. The therapist must be able to make contact with the client, remaining congruent and integrated in the relationship. The therapist must have unconditional positive regard for the client, experience empathic understanding of the client's internal frame of reference, and successfully communicate these to the client. Since the late 1950's, many studies have examined these therapist characteristics.

Ethnicity

The empirical literature seems to at least partially support the contention of these theorists. One therapist characteristic which has been investigated extensively is differences in ethnicity. Atkinson (1983) reviewed studies in counselor preference and counselor effectiveness to examine the two sides of the ethnic similarity issue in psychology. He found research with Black subjects reported preference for racially similar counselors, but these results were not replicated with any other group. There was found to be little support for the superiority of ethnically similar therapists. The author concludes that previous research has numerous methodological and theoretical flaws.

Therefore it is proposed that attitudinal differences between ethnic groups be examined prior to concluding that ethnicity does not effect the therapeutic relationship.

In another study Atkinson and Sanchez (1983) proposed that differences in cultural commitment among Mexican American college students would be related to therapist preference and willingness to disclose. It was found that cultural commitment was indeed related to self disclosure and preference for therapist ethnicity, with strong commitment to Mexican American culture resulting in greater preference for ethnically similar counselors and least willingness to disclose.

Several investigators believe that not only do therapist characteristics effect the progress clients will make during therapy but also propose that aspects about the therapist may be an important determinant as to whether the client will come to therapy. Atkinson and Morten (1983) proposed a relationship between stages of cultural identity and preference for therapist race. They found that Black students having a high level of identity with the Black culture were more likely to indicate a preference for a Black counselor than Black students with low identity with their ethnic group. They suggest that Black students who prefer Black counselors may not make use of counseling centers when there are no Black counselors on staff.

Dynneson, Haviland, Horswill, and O'Connell (1983)

found similar results. They proposed that a preference for ethnically similar counselors among Native American college students would be related to their likelihood of using a counseling center. They found both males and females demonstrated a strong preference for Native American counselors, regardless of the problem situation and the likelihood of using the counseling center increased as clients were given the opportunity to use the counselor of their preference.

The literature examining therapist characteristics, especially ethnicity, has not always provided consistent results. Dixon and La Fromboise (1983) proposed that when working with native Americans, the trustworthiness of a counselor was more important than simple ethnicity. The level of perceived trustworthiness among Black and White counselors, the authors' results indicated, was more important than counselor ethnicity in client's ratings in a variety of areas.

Terrell and Terrell (1984) proposed that Black clients' trust in a counselor would be related to racial similarity and willingness to use the counseling center. The authors found a positive relationship between racial similarity and increased trust level and conclude that Black clients who are distrustful of White people should be seen, at least initially, by a Black counselor to avoid premature termination of counseling.

Gender

Several investigators have also proposed that counselor gender influences client's perceptions of counselor trustworthiness, expertise, and their willingness to seek therapeutic help. For example Chesler (1971) has suggested that women clients have problems that are unique to women and Fabrikant (1974) noted that they were beginning to shift their therapist preferences in favor of female therapists.

Helms and Simons (1976) hypothesized that a relationship exists between sex of the counselor and preference for the counselor among college and non-college women. The authors found that women clients preferred women counselors. These women also felt more comfortable, were more willing to disclose, and believed women counselors to be more competent than male counselors.

Betz and Shullman (1979) proposed a relationship between intake counselor sex, client sex, counselor experience level, sex of the counselor to whom the client was referred, and percent of clients returning for counseling. Their results indicated that clients of both sexes were significantly less likely to return when initially interviewed by male rather than female intake counselors. They also found that clients referred by male intake counselors to other male counselors were significantly less likely to return than were those seen by

and/or referred to female counselors. No significant effects were shown for experience level of the counselor.

Bernstein and Figiolo (1983) found differences as a function of counselor gender and level of credibility. They studied the effects of counselor gender, participant gender, and high or low credibility introduction on adolescent subjects. Female participants had greater confidence in, and perceived the counselor as significantly more attractive and trustworthy than male subjects.

More recent studies show sex to have little or no effect. Baumgardner, Krauskipf and Mandracchia (1981) examined the relationship between client and counselor sex, experience level, and type of referral to return rate of clients after intake interviews. Most differences related to sex were not significant and no differences were found relating to counselor experience level.

Lee, Rapaport and Rodolfa (1983) examined the relationship between sex and experience level of the intaker and assigned counselor, sex of the client, administrative variables, and the premature terminations of clients. They found administrative variables to be the only major factor related to premature terminations, with sex again found insignificant.

Apfelbaum (1958) suggested possible client sex differences in expectancies, with males expecting a

directive (critical, analytical, and nonindulgent) counselor, and females anticipating counselors who are nonjudgemental, permissive listeners. Studies done more specifically with the effects of counselor and subject sex on expectations about counseling, using Tinsley's Expectations About Counseling Questionnaire, have shown sex to have significant effects. Tinsley (1976) found the expectancies of males and females differed significantly for acceptance and directiveness, with females indicating a greater expectation of directiveness. Hardin and Yanico (1983) investigated subject expectations for counseling as a function of counselor gender, problem type and subject gender. Results indicated a significant main effect for subject gender, with women scoring significantly higher on the scales for motivation, openness, responsibility, acceptance, confrontation, genuineness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, and outcome. Men scored higher on directiveness and self-disclosure. Subich (1983) investigated how subjects' expectations for counseling differ as a function of counselor gender specification and subject sex. Females were found to be more motivated for counseling and to take more responsibility for it. Females were also found to expect the counseling psychologist to be more accepting, confrontive, genuine, nurturant, tolerant, trustworthy, and less self-disclosing than did male subjects. Female subjects also expected the process of

counseling to be more immediate.

Dress Style

The relationship between counselors' dress and clients' evaluations of counselors has been the subject of a number of studies. Resnick and Stillman (1972) proposed that college students that met with a professionally attired counselor would be more disclosing and have more positive opinions of the counselor than those meeting with casually attired counselors. Their results showed no differences in client disclosure or perception of the counselor attributable to casual versus professional attire.

Dell and Kerr (1976) proposed that intake counselors who behaved as if they had considerable expertise would be preferred by clients over counselors who appeared to have limited skills. It was also predicted professional versus casual attire would have no significant effect on client's ratings of counselors. Attire did not effect counselor ratings, however attire did interact with interviewer expertise in determining the perceived expertness of the interviewers.

Gelso and Hubble (1978) attempted to replicate and extend prior research in this area by studying the effects of three levels of counselor attire; traditional (coat and tie), casual (sport shirt and slacks), and extremely casual (sweat shirt and jeans) on college students' willingness to self disclose. Their results showed that in general clients

experience significantly lower anxiety with counselors in casual versus extremely casual attire. No differences in anxiety level were found between traditionally and casually attired counselors. Clients had the most desirable reactions to counselors who dressed in a way that was one level more formal than the client's own dress style.

Abramowitz and Amira (1978) set out to clarify information on the effects of type of office setting and clothing style on clients' rating of counselors' understanding, competence, appropriateness to see a friend, appropriateness for one's own treatment, confirmation of expectations about therapy, and attitude toward the therapist. They found no main effects for either formality of therapist attire or professionalism of the therapeutic setting. The subjects did show a slight preference for the counselor casually dressed in the formal room.

Littrell and Littrell (1983) proposed that the counselor's clothing style could communicate the counseling conditions of empathy, warmth, genuineness, and concreteness to Caucasian and American Indian adolescent subjects. They also proposed that American Indians and Caucasians would differ in type of clothing they believed conveyed the counseling conditions. The authors found diverse forms of counselor attire were perceived by both ethnic groups as conveying the counseling conditions. The dimensions of cultural specificity, regional uniqueness, and

fashionability of dress emerged, and ethnic differences were found in students rating of counselors when these dimensions were examined.

Gass (1984) investigated the impact of formality of therapist attire and seating arrangement on observers precepts of therapists' attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness. Significant effects emerged for therapist attire, seating arrangement, and subject gender. The casual attire/no desk setting elicited the highest attraction ratings, and the effects of the seating arrangement were mediated by the subjects gender. Females responded to the behind-desk arrangement with lower ratings of the therapist across all measures. Initial impressions, which were influenced by the therapist's attire and seating arrangement, were correlated highly with subjects' willingness to see this therapist for consultation.

Finally Roll and Roll (1984) hypothesized that formality of counselor attire would effect clients' perceptions of expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness in neophyte counselors. They found the informally attired counselor was perceived as more expert, trustworthy, and helpful. Attractiveness of the counselor and the client's willingness to see the counselor in the future were unaffected by counselor dress style.

Summary

To summarize, numerous studies have been done examining

different characteristics of the therapist and the relationship these characteristics have with the counseling process. Those therapist variables which have been examined most extensively include therapist race and gender. In addition, several studies have been done examining the relationship between therapists' dress style and its effect upon client behavior. In general, results of these studies have provided somewhat contradictory findings. Counselor gender and dress style have been shown to significantly effect client attitudes and behavior in some studies, yet produce no effect in others. One reason for the lack of consistent findings may be that previous research may have used an overly simplistic approach to studying therapist variables. It is possible that a combination of therapist variables may contribute to client behavior, rather than a single variable. Additionally, previous research has been limited to exploring a limited range of client behaviors and attitudes as a function of therapist characteristics. Thus, it is possible that the client behaviors or attitudes examined as a function of therapist differences may not have been of importance.

The purpose of this study was to explore the effects of counselor dress style on the clients expectations about counseling. Expectations have been shown to greatly effect the outcome of counseling, consequently knowing the effects of dress style on expectations could enhance the possibility

of successful counseling. Studies which have examined therapist characteristics have provided inconsistent results. One possible reason for these contradictory findings may be that the relationship between a combination of therapist characteristics with a variety of client behaviors and attitudes has not been sufficiently examined. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to examine the combination of counselor dress style, counselor gender, and subject gender upon various dimensions of client expectations about counseling.

METHOD

Participants

A total of 240 undergraduate students from psychology classes at North Texas State University served as subjects for this study. Course credit for participation was given to each student who completed the entire experiment. Male and female subjects were equally distributed between the 6 experimental conditions.

Measures

All participants were given the (Tinsley, 1980) Expectations About Counseling Form (EAC) (Appendix A). This inventory contains 66 items and measures participants' anticipations about 18 areas related to counseling. These are: counselor acceptance, confrontation, directiveness, empathy, genuineness, nurturance, self disclosure, attractiveness, expertise, tolerance, trustworthiness,

client motivation, openness, responsibility, realism, and therapy concreteness, immediacy, and outcome. The 66 items are answered using a seven point Likert-type scale, ranging from "not true" to "definitely true". Total scores are obtained for each of these scales. The internal consistency of the full EAC has been examined and reliability for the scales range from .71 to .89, with a median reliability of .82. All but the realism scale had a reliability of .77 or higher. For the purposes of this study the brief EAC was used. These reliabilities range from .69 to .82, with a median reliability of .76. The correlation between corresponding scales on the full and brief forms of the EAC typically exceeds .85. Consequently, the scales are judged to be a suitable substitute for the full EAC where circumstances require a brief form.

Numerous studies have been done using the EAC. Subich (1983) found that the EAC could distinguish male from female subjects expectations as a function of counselor gender specification and subject sex. In another study Hardin and Yanico (1983), using the EAC, found differences as a function of counselor gender and type of client problem. Also Bernstein and Figiolo (1985) found differences on the EAC as a function of counselor gender and level of credibility. In a more recent study Subich and Hardin (1985) found differences on the EAC as a function of whether clients were assessed a fee. These studies seem to suggest

that the EAC is capable of distinguishing populations. A copy of this inventory is available in Appendix A.

All participants were also given a Background Information questionnaire specifically designed for this study. This questionnaire was used to obtain descriptive information about the samples. A copy of this questionnaire is provided in Appendix B.

Conditions

Three dress styles were used. Females in the white coat condition were attired in dresses with a long white coat which was buttoned in the front. Males in the white coat condition were attired in dress pants, a dress shirt and tie, with a long white coat which was buttoned in the front. Females in the casual condition were attired in jeans and a casual blouse. Males in the casual condition were attired in jeans and a casual pullover shirt. Females in the formal condition were attired in a two piece suit, consisting of a skirt and jacket. Males in the formal condition were attired in a two piece suit and tie.

Procedure

Participants were seen in groups ranging in size from five to 20 students. Initially, they were given the background questionnaire. After all participants had completed this inventory, they were given the EAC form and asked to fill it out as if they would be attending a session with the counselor on the screen. The students were assured

of confidentiality of results and guaranteed that their names would not be associated with the data analysis. They were then shown one of six color slides of a counselor: (a) a female dressed in a white coat; (b) a male dressed in a white coat; (c) a female dressed in casual attire; (d) a male dressed in casual attire; (e) a female dressed in formal attire; and (g) a male dressed in formal attire.

RESULTS

The mean age of male subjects in this study was 21.58 and 21.73 for females. It was anticipated that the interaction of counselor gender and dress style would be significantly related to clients' expectations toward counseling. To do this male and female college students were shown one of six slides, a male or female in casual dress, a male or female in formal dress, or a male or female in a white coat. All subjects were then given the Expectations About Counseling questionnaire.

A 3 (formal, casual, white coat) x 2 (male, female counselor) x 2 (male, female subject) MANOVA was conducted using the 18 scales of the Expectations About Counseling (EAC) as the outcome variables. The means and standard deviations for all groups on the EAC may be found in Table 1.

No significant main effects were found as a function of dress style (Wilks Lambda = .802, approximate $F(36,422) = 1.37$, $p < .08$), the interaction of dress style by counselor sex (Wilks Lambda = .853, approximate $F(36,422) = 1.21$, p

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for All Groups on all scales
of the EAC

	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Condition/ Scale	Motivation		Openness		Responsibility	
Male Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	10.90	5.46	11.60	4.84	20.20	5.36
Female Sub	13.60	4.69	13.00	3.77	20.80	4.39
White Coat						
Male Sub	12.40	3.88	12.15	4.52	17.90	5.01
Female Sub	11.95	4.17	14.35	4.67	21.40	4.40
Formal						
Male Sub	10.70	2.99	11.50	3.41	17.80	3.60
Female Sub	13.60	3.85	15.60	5.03	23.75	3.85
Female Counselor						
Casual						
Male Sub	13.15	4.82	13.95	3.54	22.40	2.79
Female Sub	12.40	4.09	14.15	4.38	21.90	4.40
White Coat						
Male Sub	12.90	4.49	14.70	4.24	23.60	3.57
Female Sub	14.00	4.32	15.15	3.99	22.05	3.60
Formal						
Male Sub	12.15	4.03	12.65	2.845	20.60	3.37
Female Sub	14.85	3.39	115.00	5.15	22.85	4.17

Table 1--Continued

	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Grand Mean	12.72	4.29	13.65	4.37	21.27	4.42
Condition/ Scale	Realism		Acceptance		Confrontation	
Male Counselor						
Casual						
Male Sub	44.20	10.05	12.65	4.98	12.35	4.66
Female Sub	39.10	9.16	14.45	3.70	14.75	3.49
White Coat						
Male Sub	46.75	10.55	14.55	3.73	13.90	3.90
Female Sub	44.25	6.38	16.00	3.22	17.65	2.41
Formal						
Male Sub	49.35	7.87	12.90	3.16	13.35	2.94
Female Sub	43.670	9.74	15.75	4.16	16.60	3.44
Female Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	42.80	8.20	15.50	2.11	15.40	2.98
Female Sub	38.85	8.78	14.20	4.16	15.40	3.51
White Coat						
Male Sub	42.65	7.82	15.25	4.19	16.30	3.64
Female Sub	41.85	8.84	15.70	3.01	16.30	3.84
Formal						
Male Sub	43.10	7.04	15.30	3.43	14.90	2.82
Female Sub	39.55	8.77	15.40	4.48	17.05	3.20
Grand Mean	43.00	8.97	14.80	3.83	15.33	3.69

Table 1--Continued

Condition/ Scale	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
	Directiveness		Empathy		Genuineness	
Male Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	12.15	4.933	9.90	4.49	16.00	4.18
Female Sub	10.85	4.55	11.05	4.48	17.75	3.40
White Coat						
Male Sub	13.10	3.14	10.95	3.47	15.00	4.29
Female Sub	12.55	3.67	13.40	4.69	18.65	2.97
Formal						
Male Sub	12.25	3.38	12.15	3.68	13.50	3.74
Female Sub	11.70	4.13	11.25	4.30	17.95	3.28
Female Counselor						
Casual						
Male Sub	12.20	5.26	10.75	3.74	17.95	2.64
Female Sub	11.15	4.59	9.50	5.14	19.00	2.05
White Coat						
Male Sub	13.45	5.05	12.05	4.47	18.25	3.30
Female Sub	12.75	3.47	11.85	4.997	19.10	2.02
Formal						
Male Sub	12.60	4.41	13.05	2.70	16.40	3.85
Female Sub	12.25	4.48	9.60	4.39	18.90	2.26
Grand Mean	12.25	4.27	11.29	4.34	17.37	3.61

Table 1--Continued

Condition/ Scale	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
	Nurturance		Self Disclosure		Attractiveness	
Male Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	14.40	4.87	12.40	5.20	11.55	4.85
Female Sub	15.75	3.27	10.50	5.44	11.75	4.11
White Coat						
Male Sub	15.05	2.76	10.00	3.37	11.95	3.48
Female Sub	17.20	2.78	11.30	4.98	12.00	3.86
Formal						
Male Sub	13.45	2.80	12.95	3.12	11.45	3.28
Female Sub	16.75	3.91	11.00	4.02	13.85	3.54
Female Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	16.30	3.389	12.50	4.52	13.10	3.52
Female Sub	15.75	3.05	10.30	5.63	11.90	3.94
White Coat						
Male Sub	16.30	4.30	12.95	4.69	12.00	4.05
Female Sub	16.65	2.62	11.25	5.44	10.90	3.71
Formal						
Male Sub	16.65	2.62	11.25	5.44	10.90	3.71
Female Sub	18.10	2.40	9.95	4.78	12.50	5.27
Grand Mean	15.92	3.55	11.44	4.71	12.13	3.91

Table 1--Continued

	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Condition/ Scale	Expertise		Tolerance		Trustworthiness	
Male Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	13.55	4.17	12.65	4.81	13.70	5.66
Female Sub	14.90	3.75	14.05	4.67	16.15	3.99
White Coat						
Male Sub	14.30	4.20	13.40	3.92	13.40	4.60
Female Sub	16.60	2.45	15.30	4.06	18.30	2.95
Formal						
Male Sub	13.00	2.65	14.05	3.30	12.50	3.30
Female Sub	15.75	4.59	16.40	3.44	17.15	4.42
Female Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	14.70	3.67	14.95	3.48	17.00	3.44
Female Sub	15.35	3.70	14.45	2.87	16.90	3.52
White Coat						
Male Sub	16.55	3.18	14.90	3.82	17.75	4.01
Female Sub	16.70	3.04	14.75	3.40	18.20	2.54
Formal						
Male Sub	15.45	3.17	14.65	3.43	15.50	3.73
Female Sub	16.10	3.46	14.85	4.80	19.00	2.88
Grand Mean	15.24	3.66	14.53	3.90	16.30	4.26

Table 1--Continued

	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Condition/ Scale	Realism		Acceptance		Confrontation	
Male Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	12.80	4.62	15.9	5.22	13.95	5.21
Female Sub	15.65	3.01	19.05	4.57	14.80	3.25
White Coat						
Male Sub	13.65	3.49	16.60	3.78	14.20	3.41
Female Sub	17.95	2.78	20.65	4.97	15.60	4.12
Formal						
Male Sub	13.55	2.89	16.80	4.73	12.30	4.07
Female Sub	16.10	3.43	20.65	4.97	15.60	4.12
Female Counselor						
Causal						
Male Sub	15.70	3.29	20.10	5.08	15.70	3.31
Female Sub	17.35	3.10	18.85	4.77	16.50	3.05
White Coat						
Male Sub	16.99	3.58	18.70	4.39	16.05	3.77
Female Sub	17.80	2.28	20.05	3.60	16.60	2.99
Formal						
Male Sub	15.20	3.28	17.65	3.21	13.80	3.19
Female Sub	17.15	3.37	19.65	5.43	16.95	3.81
Grand Mean	15.81	3.63	18.75	4.68	15.22	3.79

> .05), or the three way interaction of dress style by counselor by subject sex (Wilks Lambda = .885, approximate $F(36,422) = .736$, $p > .05$). However, the main effect of sex of counselor showed a multivariate significance (Wilks Lambda = .809, approximate $F(18,211) = 2.77$, $p < .001$), as well as the main effect for sex of subject (Wilks Lambda = .679, approximate $F(18,211) = 5.11$, $p < .001$).

Follow-up univariate F tests show the factor of counselor sex, to significantly effect responses on the openness, responsibility, realism, confrontation, genuineness, nurturance, self disclosure, expertise, trustworthiness, concreteness, immediacy, and outcome scales of the EAC at the .01 level. Follow-up univariate F tests also show the factor of subject sex to significantly effect responses on the responsibility, realism, genuineness, trustworthiness, and concreteness scales at the .01 level and the openness, confrontation, nurturance, and expertise scales at the .05 level (See Table 2).

A significant interaction between sex of counselor and sex of subject was also found (Wilks Lambda = .851, approximate $F(18,211) = 2.05$, $p < .009$). Univariate F tests of the interaction of sex of counselor by subject sex revealed significant differences on the responsibility, confrontation, trustworthiness, and immediacy scales at the .01 level and the acceptance, empathy, genuineness, tolerance, and concreteness scales at the .05 level.

Table 2

F Tests for Main and Interaction Effects on all Significant EAC Scales

Condition	Subject Sex		Counselor Sex		Interaction of Subject by Counselor Sex	
	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Motivation	6.43	.01	3.75	.05	.39	.53
Openness	10.53	.01	5.03	.02	2.03	.15
Responsibility	10.38	.01	13.18	.01	9.59	.01
Realism	10.36	.01	7.52	.01	.56	.45
Acceptance	3.29	.07	3.04	.08	5.57	.01
Confrontation	18.49	.01	6.46	.01	7.45	.01
Empathy	.44	.50	.33	.56	5.28	.02
Genuineness	31.86	.01	18.13	.01	4.66	.03
Nurturance	12.18	.01	5.04	.02	2.69	.10
Self Disclosure	7.02	.01	.27	.60	.98	.32
Expertise	8.10	.01	5.99	.01	3.22	.07
Tolerance	2.98	.08	.80	.37	4.10	.04
Trustworthiness	28.07	.01	19.59	.01	7.56	.01
Concreteness	30.77	.01	16.60	.01	4.12	.04
Immediacy	14.69	.01	2.04	.15	6.92	.01
Outcome	14.61	.01	9.02	.03	.38	.53

Since no significant differences were found for the main effect of dress style, the data was collapsed into a 2 (sex

of subj.) x 2 (sex of counselor) design and Tukey's method of post hoc comparisons was used to compare specific groups. The combined means and standard deviations of these groups may be found in Table 3. Due to the prediction that a significant three way interaction would be found, only those EAC scales which were significant for the interaction effect based upon the results of the MANOVA were compared.

Tukey's method of post hoc comparisons were then utilized to identify specific group differences and these results may be found in Table 4. Post Hoc comparisons indicated that male subjects scored higher on the Responsibility scale when seeing a female rather than a male counselor ($p < .01$). In contrast, females seeing female counselors scored higher on the Responsibility scale than males seeing male counselors ($p < .01$). Female subjects also scored higher than male subjects when seeing a male counselor ($p < .01$).

Male subjects scored higher on the Acceptance scale when viewing female as opposed to male counselors ($p < .05$). Female subjects scored higher than male subjects on the Acceptance scale when viewing male counselors ($p < .05$). Both male and female subjects scored higher on the Confrontation scale when viewing female as opposed to male counselors at the $p < .01$ level. Female subjects scored higher than male subjects when viewing male counselors ($p < .01$).

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of all Combinations of
Counselor and Subject Sex on Significant Scales of the EAC^a

Scales/ Condition	MC,MS	FC,MS	MC,FS,	FC,FS
Responsibility	18.63 (4.78)	22.20 (3.44)	21.98 (4.35)	22.27 (4.03)
Acceptance	13.37 (4.06)	15.37 (3.30)	15.40 (3.72)	15.10 (3.93)
Confrontation	13.20 (3.89)	15.55 (3.18)	16.33 (3.33)	16.25 (3.54)
Empathy	11.00 (3.95)	11.95 (3.77)	11.90 (4.55)	10.32 (4.89)
Genuineness	14.83 (4.14)	17.53 (3.35)	18.12 (3.20)	19.00 (2.08)
Tolerance	13.37 (4.03)	14.83 (3.53)	15.25 (4.14)	14.68 (3.72)
Trustworthiness	13.20 (4.58)	16.77 (3.79)	17.20 (3.89)	18.03 (3.09)
Concreteness	13.33 (3.70)	15.93 (3.39)	16.57 (3.20)	17.43 (2.92)
Immediacy	16.45 (4.56)	18.82 (4.35)	20.22 (4.46)	19.52 (4.61)

Note. MC refers to male counselor, MS refers to male subject; FC refers to female counselor; FS refers to female subject.

^aStandard deviations are in parentheses.

Table 4

Post Hoc Comparisons Between all Combinations of Counselor
and Subject Sex on the Scales of the EAC

Responsibility	
FC, MS vs. MC, MS ^a	-3.57**
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-3.35**
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	.22
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-3.63**
FC, FS vs. FC, MS	-.07
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	-.28
*Tukey's Critical Value 1.98 signif. at .05 level.	
**Tukey's Critical Value 2.43 signif. at .01 level.	

Acceptance	
FC, MS vs. MC, MS	-2.00
MC, FS vs. MC, MS	-2.03*
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	.03
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-1.73
FC, FS vs. FC, MS	.54
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	.30
*Tukey's Critical Value 1.82 signif. at .05 level.	
*Tukey's Critical Value 2.23 signif. at .01 level.	

Table 4--Continued

Confrontation	
FC, MS, vs. MC, MS	-2.35**
MC, FS vs. MC, MS	-3.13**
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	-.70
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-2.35**
FC, FS vs. FC, MS	-.78
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	-.70
*Tukey's Critical Value 1.67 signif. at .05 level.	
**Tukey's Critical Value 2.50 signif. at .05 level.	

Empathy	
FC, MS vs. MC, MS	-.95
MC, FS vs. MC, MS	-.90
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	1.63
FC, FS vs. FC, MS	.68
FC, FS vs. FC, MS	.05
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	1.58
*Tukey's Critical Value 2.06 signif. at .05 level.	
**Tukey's Critical Value 2.53 signif. at .01 level.	

Table 4--Continued

Genuineness	
FC, MS vs. MC, MS	-2.70**
MC, FS vs. MC, MS	-3.34**
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	-.58
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-4.17**
FC, MS vs. FC, MS	-1.47
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	-.88
*Tukey's Critical Value 1.57 signif. at .05 level.	
**Tukey's Critical Value 1.93 signif. at .01 level.	

Tolerance	
FC, MS vs. MC, MS	-1.47
MC, FS vs. MC, MS	-1.88*
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	-.42
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-1.32
FC, MS vs. FC, MS	.15
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	.57
*Tukey's Critical Value 1.88 signif. at .05 level.	
**Tukey's Critical Value 2.30 signif. at .01 level.	

Table 4--Continued

Trustworthiness	
FC, MS vs. MC, MS	-3.56**
MC, FS vs. MC, MS	-4.00**
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	-1.27
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-4.83**
FC, MS vs. FC, MS	-.43
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	-.83
*Tukey's Critical Value 1.86 signif. at .05 level.	
**Tukey's Critical Value 2.28 signif. at .01 level.	

Concreteness	
FC, MS vs. MC, MS	-2.60**
MC, FS vs. MC, MS	-3.23**
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	-.63
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-4.10**
FC, MS vs. FC, MS	-1.50
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	-.87
*Tukey's Critical Value 1.60 signif. at .05 level.	
**Tukey's Critical Value 1.96 signif. at .01 level.	

Table 4--Continued

	Immediacy
FC, MS vs. MC, MS	-2.37**
MC, FS vs. MC, MS	-3.77**
MC, FS vs. FC, MS	-1.40
FC, FS vs. MC, MS	-3.07**
FC, FS, vs. FC, MS	-.70
FC, FS vs. MC, FS	.70

*Tukey's Critical Value 1.75 signif. at .05 level.

**Tukey's Critical Value 2.15 signif. at .01 level.

Note. Scores obtained by subtracting row from column number
^aMC refers to male counselor, MS refers to Male subject, FC refers to female counselor, FS refers to female subject.

Also, both male and female subjects scored higher on the Genuineness scale when viewing female as opposed to male counselors at the $p < .01$ level. Female subjects scored higher than male subjects when viewing male counselors ($p < .01$).

On the Tolerance Scale, female subjects scored higher than did male subjects when viewing male counselors ($p < .05$).

Male subjects scored higher on the Trustworthiness scale when viewing female as opposed to male counselors ($p < .01$). Female subjects scored higher than male subjects when

viewing male counselors ($p < .01$). Females with female counselors scored higher on the Trustworthiness scale than males with male counselors ($p < .01$).

Male subjects scored higher on the Concreteness scale when viewing female as opposed to male counselors ($p < .01$). Female subjects scored higher than male subjects when viewing male counselors ($p < .01$). Females with female counselors scored higher on the Concreteness scale than males with male counselors ($p < .01$).

Male subjects scored higher on the Immediacy scale when viewing female as opposed to male counselors ($p < .01$). Female subjects scored higher than male subjects when viewing male counselors ($p < .01$). Females with female counselors scored higher on the Immediacy scale than males with male counselors ($p < .01$).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore participants' expectations toward counseling as a function of subject gender, counselor gender, and counselor dress style. It was predicted that a significant three way interaction effect among these variables would be found. To explore this hypothesis, male and female college students viewed slides of either a male or female, depicted as a counselor, who were dressed either; (a) formally, (b) in a white coat, or (c) casually.

Contrary to what was predicted, no significant differences were found for the three way interaction of participant gender, counselor gender, and dress style. Further, no significant main effects were found as a function of dress style. Thus, the present study indicates that dress style in combination with gender or alone is not related to clients' expectations toward counseling. This finding is consistent with previous research. Resnick and Stillman (1972) as well as Dell and Kerr (1976) found no differences in level of client disclosure or amount of positive opinions about the counselor as function of their dress style.

However, these findings have been inconsistent. Other studies also looked at participants anxiety level, general liking or preference for a counselor as a function of dress style. In addition, studies have looked at a smaller range of expectations, usually limited to attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertise.

Littrell and Littrell (1983) looked at dress style's influence on the expectations of empathy, warmth, genuineness, and concreteness, but also included American Indians as a variable and did not explore counselor or participant gender. They found diverse forms of counselor attire were perceived by both ethnic groups as influencing the counseling expectations. The dimensions of cultural specificity, regional uniqueness, and fashionability of

dress emerged, and ethnic differences were found in students' ratings of counselors when these dimensions were examined. Similar findings have been supported by Roll and Roll (1984), Gelso and Hubble (1978), Gass (1984), and Abramowitz and Amira (1978).

Although no significant differences were found as a function of dress style, this study contained several limitations. Therefore, it may be premature to conclude that attire is not an important variable effecting the counseling relationship. One limitation is that the different dress styles used in this study were within a relatively narrow range. It is possible that had more diverse forms of dress styles been used, different results may have been found. Second, participants used in this study consisted of a college student population. In general, more liberal dress styles are accepted among this population (Morgan , 1988). Also these participants were not experiencing emotional problems. It is possible that if actual client had been used, different results may have been found. It is suggested that other studies be done exploring different types of dress styles using actual clients varying in educational and socioeconomic levels.

Finally, although many previous projects, including the present study, did not find significance, it should not be concluded that dress style may not become significant factors in the future. Clothing styles continuously change.

Although dress style was not found to be a significant factor at this time, it is possible that clothing may become an important variable in the future.

The lack of significant differences as a function of dress style may have both theoretical and applied significance. At a theoretical level, the way an individual dresses, in part, is often considered to be a reflection of an individual's intra and interpersonal styles (Morgan, 1988). However, the present study indicates that dress was perceived as a significant reflection of individuals in this study. It is suggested that other studies be done not only explaining expectations as a function of dress style but also examine why, dress style does or does not effect client's expectations.

These results may also have clinical implications. Many clinics and agencies (cf. Burke, 1987; NTSU Clinic Manual) emphasize appropriate dress codes when seeing clients. Results of the present study indicate a relatively broad range of dress styles may be acceptable without adversely effecting the clients' expectations.

Significant main effects were found in the present study for the variables of client gender, counselor gender and the two way interaction of these variables on the outcome measures of responsibility, acceptance, confrontation, empathy, genuineness, tolerance, trustworthiness, concreteness, and immediacy. In general,

post hoc analysis revealed that, when viewing a female counselor both male and female participants had higher expectation of female counselors than male counselors. Participants of both genders also expected female counselors to be more confrontive, genuine, trustworthy, concrete, and accepting than male counselors. They also had a higher expectation that counseling would address their immediate concerns.

Overall, these results suggest that both males and females prefer seeing female counselors. However, if required to see a male counselor, female students had higher expectations than males.

These results are consistent with a previous study done by others. Helms and Simons (1976) found women clients preferred women counselors. More specifically, female clients felt they would be more comfortable and willing to disclose to female counselors. Female clients also believed women counselors were more competent than male counselors. Similarly, Betz and Schulman (1979) reported that clients of both sexes were significantly less likely to return when initially interviewed by male rather than female intake counselors, and were even less likely to return when seen by a male intake counselor and referred to another male for counseling. Bernstein and Figiolo (1983) studied the effects of counselor gender, participant gender, and high or low credibility introduction on adolescent subjects.

Regardless of gender, female participants had greater confidence in, and perceived the counselor as significantly more attractive and trustworthy than male subjects.

Other authors, also using the Expectations about Counseling Inventory (EAC) have found results consistent with the present study. That is, females tend to have higher expectations about counseling than males. For example, Tinsley (1976) found the expectancies of males and females differed significantly for acceptance and directiveness, with females indicating a greater expectation of acceptance and males indicating a greater expectation of directiveness. Hardin and Yanico (1983) investigated subject expectations for counseling as a function of counselor gender, problem type, and subject gender. Results indicated a significant main effect for subject gender with women scoring significantly higher than males on the scales measuring motivation, openness, responsibility, acceptance, confrontation, genuineness, attractiveness, trustworthiness, and outcome. Men scored higher on directiveness and self-disclosure. Contrary to the present study, no significance was found for counselor gender. Subich (1983) investigated how subjects' expectations for counseling differ as a function of counselor gender specification and subject sex. Females were found to be more motivated for counseling and to take more responsibility for it. Females were also found to expect the therapist to be more accepting, confrontive,

genuine, nurturant, tolerant, trustworthy, and less self-disclosing than did male subjects. Female subjects also expected the process of counseling to be more immediate. Contrary to the present study however, neither the studies by Tinsley (1976) or Subich (1983) reported significant differences as a function of counselor gender.

As can be seen some studies have found differences as a function of counselor gender. However for the most part, differences in counselor preferences and expectations as a function of counselor gender are a relatively consistent finding in previous research including the present study. This finding has implications both for future research and clinical applications. One potential research implication is that although findings have indicated that female counselors are preferred, limited studies have been done examining why females are preferred. Research designed to explore those factors which seem to make female counselors more desirable would be useful.

At an applied level, results of this and previous studies suggest that especially female clients should be assigned to female counselors. The results also indicate that males may benefit from seeing female counselors. Then, one practical implication is that female counselors might be effective in working with clients of both genders.

APPENDIX A

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT COUNSELING

Expectations About Counseling

Directions

Pretend that you are about to see a counseling psychologist for your first interview. We would like to know just what you think counseling will be like. On the following pages are statements about counseling. In each instance you are to indicate what you expect counseling to be like. The rating scale we would like you to use is printed at the top of each page. Your ratings of the statements are to be recorded on the answer sheet provided. For each statement, darken the space corresponding to the number which most accurately reflects your expectation. Do not make any marks in the questionnaire booklet.

You responses will be kept in strictest confidence. Please fill in the STUDENT NUMBER GRID on the answer sheet. Your answers will be combined with the averages. Your participation, however, is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate in this research, just hand the questionnaire and unmarked answer sheets back to the person in charge.

To complete the questionnaire properly, you need one answer sheet and a #2 pencil. Tell the person in charge if you do not have the necessary materials.

When you are ready to begin, answer each question as quickly and as accurately as possible. Finish each page before going to the next.

NOW TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ON THE ANSWER SHEET

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not True	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Fairly True	Quite True	Very True	Definitely True

I EXPECT TO . . .

1. Take psychological tests.
2. Like the counselor.
3. See a counselor in training.
4. Gain some experience in new ways of solving problems within the counseling process.
5. Openly express my emotions regarding myself and my problems.
6. Understand the purpose of what happens in the interview.
7. Do assignments outside the counseling interviews.
8. Take responsibility for making my own decisions.
9. Talk about my present concerns.
10. Get practice in relating openly and honestly to another person within the counseling relationships.
11. Enjoy my interviews with the counselor.
12. Practice some of the things I need to learn in the counseling relationship.
13. Get a better understanding of myself and others.
14. Stay in counseling for at least a few weeks, even if at first I am not sure it will help.
15. See the counselor for more than three interviews.
16. Never need counseling again.
17. Enjoy being with the counselor.
18. Stay in counseling even though it may be painful or unpleasant at times.

Appendix A--Continued

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ON THE ANSWER SHEET

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not True	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Fairly True	Quite True	Very True	Definitely True

I EXPECT TO . . .

19. Contribute as much as I can in terms of expressing my feelings and discussing them.
20. See the counselor for only one interview.
21. Go to counseling only if I have a very serious problem.
22. Find that the counseling relationship will help the counselor and me identify problems on which I need to work.
23. Become better able to help myself in the future.
24. Find that my problem will be solved once and for all in counseling.
25. Feel safe enough with the counselor to really say how I feel.
26. See an experienced counselor.
27. Find that all I need to do is to answer the counselor's questions.
28. Improve my relationships with others.
29. Ask the counselor to explain what he or she means whenever I do not understand something that is said.
30. Work on my concerns outside the counseling interviews.
31. Find that the interview is not the place to bring up personal problems.

Appendix A--Continued

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ON THE ANSWER SHEET

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not True	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Fairly True	Quite True	Very True	Definitely True

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS CONCERN YOUR EXPECTATIONS ABOUT THE COUNSELOR

I EXPECT THE COUNSELOR TO . . .

32. Explain what's wrong.
33. Help me identify and label my feelings so I can better understand them.
34. Tell me what do do.
35. Know how I feel even when I cannot say quite what I mean.
36. Know how to help me.
37. Help me identify particular situations where I have problems.
38. Give encouragement and reassurance.
39. Help me to know how I am feeling by putting my feelings into words for me.
40. Be a "real" person not just a person doing a job.
41. Help me discover what particular aspects of my behavior are relevant to my problems.
42. Inspire confidence and trust.
43. Frequently offer me advice.
44. Be honest with me.
45. Be someone who can be counted on.
46. Be friendly and warm towards me.
47. Help me solve my problems.

Appendix A--Continued

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ON THE ANSWER SHEET

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not True	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Fairly True	Quite True	Very True	Definitely True

I EXPECT THE COUNSELOR TO . . .

48. Discuss his or her own attitudes and relate them to my problems.
49. Give me support.
50. Decide what treatment plan is best.
51. Know how I feel at times, without my having to speak.
52. Do most of the talking.
53. Respect me as a person.
54. Discuss his or her experiences and relate them to my problems.
55. Praise me when I show improvement.
56. Make me face up to the differences between what I say and how I behave.
57. Talk freely about himself or herself.
58. Have no trouble getting along with people.
59. Like me.
60. Be someone I can really trust.
61. Like me in spite of the bad things that he or she knows about me.
62. Make me face up to the differences between how I see myself and how I am seen by others.
63. Be someone who is calm and easy going.
64. Point out to me the differences between what I am and what I want to be.

Appendix A--Continued

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ON THE ANSWER SHEET

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not True	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Fairly True	Quite True	Very True	Definitely True

I EXPECT THE COUNSELOR TO . . .

65. Just give me information.

66. Get along well in the world.

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

SS# _____

1. Age: _____ Sex: Male _____ Female _____
2. Marital Status: single _____ separated _____
married _____ divorced _____
3. Number of children: _____
4. Classification: Freshman _____ Junior _____
Sophomore _____ Senior _____
5. College Major: _____
6. Occupational plans upon graduation: _____

7. Father's occupation: _____
8. Mother's occupation: _____
9. Father's educational level: _____
10. Mother's educational level: _____
11. What would you estimate the population of your home town to be?
under fifty thousand _____ over fifty thousand _____
over one hundred thousand _____
12. What would you estimate your parents' total income to be?
under \$30,000 _____ \$30,000 to \$50,000 _____
\$50,000 to \$100,000 _____ over \$100,000 _____

APPENDIX C
ILLUSTRATIONS

1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12



52

REFERENCES

- Amira, S., & Abramowitz, S. I. (1979). Therapeutic attraction as a function of therapist attire and office furnishings. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47 (1), 198-200.
- Apfelbaum, D. (1958). Dimensions of transference in psychotherapy. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Atkinson, D., & Carskadden, G. (1975). A prestigious introduction, psychological jargon, and perceived counselor credibility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 180-186.
- Atkinson, D. (1983). Ethnic similarity in counseling psychology: A review of research. The Counseling Psychologist, 11 (3), 79-92.
- Atkinson, D., Maruyama, M., & Matsui, S. (1978). Effects of counselor race and counseling approach on Asian Americans' perceptions of of counselor credibility and utility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 76-83.
- Bergin, A. E. (1966). Some implications of psychotherapy research for therapeutic practice. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 71, 235-246.
- Bergin, A. E., & Lambert, M. J. (1978). The evaluation of therapeutic outcome. In A. Bergin and S. Garfield (Eds.) Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior (2nd ed.) (pp.249-262). New York, NY: John Wiley.

- Bernstein, L., & Figiolo, S. W. (1983). Gender and credibility introduction effects on perceived counselor characteristics. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30 (4), 506-513.
- Betz, N. E., & Shullman, S. L. (1979). Factors related to client return rate following intake. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 542-545.
- Bloom, L. J., Weigel, R. G., & Trautt, G. M. (1977). "Therapeugenic" factors in psychotherapy: Effects of office decor and subject-therapist sex pairing on the perception of credibility. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 867-873.
- Burke, A. (1987). NTSU Clinic Manual. Department of Psychology, North Texas State University, Denton, TX.
- Chesler, P. (1971). Patient and patriarch: Women in the psychotherapeutic relationship. In V. Gornick and B. K. Moran (Eds.), Women in Sexist Society. Studies in power and powerlessness (pp. 154-202). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Claiborn, C. D. & Schmidt, L. D. (1977). Effects of pre-session information on the perception of the counselor in the interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 259-263.
- Corrigan, J. D., Dell, D., Lewis, K. N., & Schmidt, L. (1980). Counseling as a social influence process: A review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 259-263.
- Eysenk, H. J. (1952). The effects of psychotherapy: An evaluation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 319-324.

- Fabrikant, B. (1974). The psychotherapist and the female patient: Perceptions, misperceptions and change. In V. Franks and V. Burtle (Eds.) Women in therapy: New psychotherapies for a changing society (pp. 108-130). New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1974.
- Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Gass, C. S. (1984). Therapeutic influence as a function of therapist attire and the seating arrangement in an initial interview. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40 (1), 52-57.
- Hardin, S. I., & Yanico, B. J. (1983). Counselor gender, type of problem and expectations about counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 294-297.
- Hardin, S. I., & Subich, L. M. (1985). A methodological note: Do students expect what clients do? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32, 131-134.
- Haviland, M. G., Horswill, R. K., O'Connell, J. J., & Dynneson, V. V. (1983). Native American college students' preference for counselor race and sex and the likelihood of their use of a counseling center. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30 (2), 267-270.
- Heppner, P. P., & Pew, S. (1977). Effects of diplomas, awards and counselor sex on perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 147-149.

- Hubble, M. A., Gelso, C. J. (1978). Effect of counselor attire in an initial interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25 (6), 581-584.
- Kerr, B. A. & De, D. M. (1976). Perceived interviewer expertness and attractiveness: Effects of interviewer behavior and attire and interview setting. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 170-172.
- Kline, F., Adrian, A., & Spevak, M. (1974). Patients evaluate therapists. Archives of General Psychiatry, 31, 113-116.
- Krauskopf, C. J., Baumgardner, A., & Mandracchia, S. (1981). Return rate following intake revisited. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28 (6), 519-521.
- La Framboise, T. D., & Dixon, D. N. (1981). American Indian perception of trustworthiness in a counseling interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28 (2), 135-139.
- Littrell, M. A., & Littrell, J. M. (1981). Formal/informal dimensions in perceptions of counselors' dress. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 53, 751-757.
- Littrell, M. A., & Littrell, J. M. (1983). Counselor dress dues. Evaluations by American Indians and Caucasians. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 13 (1), 109-121.
- Morgon, P. (1988). Up, down or out. Dallas Morning News, April 19th, pp. 1c & 4c.

- Morten, G., & Atkinson, D. R. (1983). Minority identity development and preference for counselor race. Journal of Negro Education, 52 (2), 1956-1961.
- Rodolfa, E. R., Rapaport, R., & Lee, V. E. (1983). Variables related to premature terminations in a university counseling service. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30 (1), 87-90.
- Rogers, D. R. (1951). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 95-103.
- Roll, S. A., & Roll, B. M. (1984). Neophyte counselor attire and college student perceptions of expertness, trustworthiness and attractiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 23 (4), 321-327.
- Sanchez, A. R., & Atkinson, D. R. (1983). Mexican-American cultural commitment, preference for counselor ethnicity, and willingness to use counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30 (2), 215-220.
- Scheid, A. B. (1976). Client's perception of the counselor: The influence of counselor introduction and behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 503-508.
- Schmidt, L. D., & Strong, S. R. "Expert" and "inexpert" counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17 (2), 115-118.
- Siegel, J. C., & Sell, J. M. (1978). Effects of objective evidence of expertness and nonverbal behavior on client-

- perceived expertness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25, 188-192.
- Simons, J. A., & Helms, J. E. (1976). Influence of counselors marital status, sex, and age on college and noncollege women's counselor preference. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23 (4), 380-386.
- Spiegel, S. B. (1976). Expertness, similarity, and perceived counselor competence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 436-441.
- Strong, S. B. (1976). Counseling: An interpersonal influence process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15, 215-224.
- Stillman, S. & Resnick, H. (1972). Does counselor attire matter? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19 (4), 347-348.
- Subich, L. M. (1983). Expectations of counselors as a function of counselor gender specification and subject sex. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 421-424.
- Subich, L. M. & Hardin, S. I. (1985). Counseling expectations as a function of fee for service. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32, 323-328.
- Terrell, F., & Terrell, S. (1984). Race of counselor, client sex, cultural mistrust level, and premature termination from counseling among Black clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31 (3), 371-375.
- Tinsely, H. E. (1980). Expectations About Counseling. Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.