This article reviews research conducted on the interpersonal influence process in counseling, specifically those studies relating to counselor expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The review is organized and analyzed in terms of variables affecting the client's perception of critical counselor characteristics and effects of the variables on the counselor's ability to influence the client. Evidence is presented to suggest that a wide range of events cue clients' perceptions of counselor expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Results from studies are also presented which found that when sources of counselor expertise are combined, the counselor's ability to influence a client's opinion is increased. Future research problems and methodologies are discussed in terms of theory construction, recent research from social psychology, and internal/external validity.
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Abstract

Since 1968 considerable research has been conducted on the interpersonal influence process in counseling. This article reviews that research, specifically those studies relating to counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The research is organized and analyzed in terms of (a) variables that affect the client's perception of critical counselor characteristics, and (b) effect of the variables on the counselor's ability to influence the client. Results indicate that a wide range of events cue client's perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The evidence also indicates that when sources of counselor expertness are combined, the counselor's ability to influence a client's opinion is increased, although parallel findings were not consistently found in the attractiveness and trustworthiness research. Future research problems and methodologies are discussed in terms of theory construction, recent research from social psychology, and internal/external validity.
A common goal in counseling is to facilitate change in clients. Such a goal implies that the counselor can favorably affect the client to alter specific opinions, attitudes, and behaviors. The process of one person influencing the actions, attitudes, or feelings of another has been labeled the interpersonal influence process, a process which has been considered by some the "central core of social psychology" (Zimbardo & Ebbesen, 1970). Research in social psychology has established the importance of several variables in promoting attitude change: source characteristics (e.g., perceived expertness, trustworthiness), message variables (e.g., message discrepancy, incongruity), and recipient characteristics (e.g., locus of control, authoritarianism).

Strong (1968) initially conceptualized counseling as an interpersonal influence process, as he explicitly integrated social psychological concepts into counseling. Since 1968 considerable research has been conducted on interpersonal influence variables in counseling. Investigators have examined a wide range of variables affecting counselor power, or the counselor's ability to influence a client. The purpose of this paper is to review that research; the overall goal is to organize, summarize, and draw conclusions regarding what is empirically known about the events affecting counselor power. The review will analyze the relevant counseling research in terms of (a) variables that affect the client's perception of critical counselor characteristics (i.e., expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness), and (b) effect of these variables on counselor power in terms of influencing both client's attitudes and behaviors. The first three sections of this paper will focus on these objectives for each of the three respective counselor characteristics: expertness, attractiveness, trustworthiness. The last section is devoted to future research, both in terms
of examining future research problems as well as identifying methodologies and research paradigms which may contribute to the development of the interpersonal influence research within counseling.

Expertness

Perceived counselor expertness has been defined as "the client's belief that the counselor possesses information and means of interpreting information which allow the client to obtain valid conclusions about and to deal effectively with his problems" (Strong & Dixon, 1971, p. 562). Delineating the construct further, one finds that perceived expertness has been reported to be influenced by events in at least three categories: (a) objective evidence of specialized training such as diplomas, certificates, and titles, (b) behavioral evidence of expertness, such as rational and knowledgeable arguments and confidence in presentation, and (c) reputation as an expert (Strong, 1968). A fourth category seems to be characteristics associated with the counselor, such as sex, attire, and room decor. In turn, researchers have begun to delineate and to examine the relative function of each of the various aspects of expertness within the counseling context. This section will focus on the research related to the four categories of events which (a) influence perceptions of counselor expertness and (b) affect counselor power.

The first source of expertness that will be examined is objective evidence of specialized training, such as diplomas, certificates, and titles. Although writers have pointed out the importance of visual, objective evidence within a counseling setting for some time (Frank, 1963; Raven, 1965; Schofield, 1964), the effect of diplomas, certificates, and titles alone on perceptions of expertness has only recently been investigated in four counseling studies. Gelso and Karl (1974) found that students perceived counselors as less competent if they did not include the word "psychologist" in their titles, and even rated
such counselors as inappropriate for help with personal problems. Two studies (Heppner & Pew, 1977; Siegel & Sell, 1978) found that specific stimuli such as awards and diplomas hung in a counselor's office favorably cued the initial perception of counselor expertness. A fourth study found that presession introductions manipulating titles, educational and vocational levels did not differentially affect student perceptions of counselor expertness (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977). None of these studies examined the effects of titles or diplomas on counselor power.

Several investigations examined the effects of using titles in conjunction with prestigious information (the third source of perceived expertness) in the initial description or introduction of the counselor. Because these two sources of expertness have been combined as independent variables in many investigations, the review must also examine them jointly. One finding appears quite consistently in studies which combine titles with prestigious information; when the same counselor is introduced with expert credentials as opposed to inexpert credentials, the counselor is viewed as being more expert (Atkinson & Carskadden, 1975; Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977; Greenberg, 1969; Jackson & Pepinsky, 1972; Hartley, 1969; Merluzzi, Banikotes, & Missbach, 1978; Scheid, 1976; Spiegel, 1976; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a). There is some evidence which suggests that the perceptions of counselor expertness in these studies may be limited to certain counselor characteristics. Scheid (1976) found that the status of the counselor only had a significant effect on two variables, counselor competence and counselor comfort; status did not seem to influence perceptions of the counselor in general.

Many of these investigations did not attempt to influence the client's opinions. Eight of the 15 studies (Binderman, Fretz, Scott, & Abrams, 1972; Owning, 1966; Friedenberg & Gillis, 1977; Greenberg, 1969; Jackson &
Pepinsky, 1972; Hartley, 1969; Strong & Dixon, 1971; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a) investigated whether the effects of expert credentials and the counselor's reputation were powerful enough to influence an opinion change in a client. The evidence regarding opinion change is conflicting; Binderman, et al. (1972), Browning (1966), Friedenberg and Gillis (1977), and Hartley (1969) found that credentials and/or a prestigious reputation were sufficient to influence a client's opinions, but Greenberg (1969), Strong and Dixon (1971), and Strong and Schmidt (1970a) did not confirm these findings. Likewise, an earlier study found that status differences did not affect the subject's verbal behavior (e.g., self-disclosure, amount of talking) in an initial interview nor the perceptions of the interviewer's trustworthiness (Jackson & Pepinsky, 1972). In short, it seems that there is considerable evidence which indicates that certain stimuli, such as titles, diplomas, awards, and prestigious introductions do cue a client's perceptions of counselor expertness, but the function of these client's perceptions is not convincingly supported in terms of affecting a counselor's ability to change a client's opinions.

Another category of events which influences perceptions of expertness is characteristics of and/or characteristics associated with the counselor. Research from other areas (e.g., perception, social psychology) indicates that stimuli such as room furnishings affect perceptions of the room occupant (e.g., Maslow & Mintz, 1956; Mintz, 1956) and attire affects perceptions of the person (e.g., Hamid, 1968; Hoult, 1954). Subsequently, the effect of these visual cues on perceived counselor expertness has been investigated. An early study found definite subject preference for moderately formal counselor attire (Raia, 1973). Two studies found that counselor attire (formal or causal) did not affect the subject's ratings of perceived expertness (Amira & Abramowitz, 1979; Stillman & Resnick, 1972). A third study (Kerr & DeL, 1976), found that
attire did interact with interviewer role behaviors in affecting perceptions of expertness, but that the role behaviors seemed to account for most of the variability. Kerr and Dell (1976) found that the interview room (professional or casual) did not affect ratings of counselor expertness. Bloom, Weigel, and Trautt (1977) found that office decor and counselor gender consistently interacted in subject ratings of perceived expertness: an imagined female counselor in a traditional office was perceived as more credible than a female counselor in a humanistic office, and vice versa for male counselors. Amira and Abramowitz (1979) found that room formality affected higher ratings of counselor competence than room informality, but the room furnishings did not affect other ratings (e.g., counselor appropriateness, understanding). An important difference between the last two studies is that the former isolated or maximized the effects of office furnishings in the absence of a counselor, whereas, the latter study examined the effect of office decor in the presence of a counselor.

The sex of the counselor also has received attention. Two studies found no differential perceptions of expertness based on counselor sex (Dell & Schmidt, 1976; Heppner & Pew, 1977). Another study, however, found a significant sex by counselor experience interaction; female expert counselors were rated significantly more expert than male experts, male inexperts, and female inexperts (Merluzzi, et al., 1978).

Race is another counselor characteristic which has been investigated. Earlier investigations within counseling revealed a host of findings indicating counselor race seemed to be a factor in counselor perceptions and effectiveness: black clients reported greater understanding (Heffernon & Bruehl, 1971), greater effectiveness (Banks, Berenson, & Carkhuff, 1967; Gardener, 1972), more self-exploration (Carkhuff & Pierce, 1967, and a higher rate of return (Heffernon & Bruehl, 1971) when they were seen by black counselors. Reviews have concluded
that racial similarity seems to be a significant factor in counseling process
and outcomes (Bryson & Bardo, 1975; Sattler, 1970). Counseling research
on the interpersonal influence process, however, has lead to mixed
and inconclusive results. One study found that black students did not rate
black or white counselors significantly different on expertness variables
(Cimbolic, 1972). A second study (Peoples & Dell, 1975) found significantly
different expertness ratings were given to black and white counselors by both
black and white students, but the differential ratings could not be unequivocally
attributed to either counselor race or role performance. Another study (Atkin-
son, Maruyama, & Matsui, 1978) found that counselor race affected expertness
ratings by some, but not by all groups of minority students. A fourth study
found an interaction between counselor role and race; counselors in white-
referent (attractive) and black-expert roles were more influential in both
attitude and behavior change than counselors in white-expert and black-referent
roles (Merluzzi, Merluzzi, & Kaul, 1977).

In short, it appears that characteristics of and/or characteristics
associated with counselors (i.e., attire, room furnishings, sex, race) do not
consistently affect counselor perceptions of expertness. This is a particularly
interesting conclusion given the number of studies (12) which have examined
this question. One interpretation of this finding is that characteristics such
as attire or sex may indeed affect perceptions of counselor expertness, but
perhaps only account for a small portion of the variance, especially when
compared to the percentage of variance accounted for by other sources of
expertness (e.g., expert role behaviors). No conclusions can be made regarding
the effects of these characteristics on counselor power, as only two studies
investigated this relationship.
A fourth category of events that influence perceptions of counselor expertness is behavioral evidence of expertness. Schmidt and Strong (1970) performed the first counseling analogue research regarding the behaviors associated with expertness. Results indicated that behaviors affecting perceptions of expertness included appearing attentive, interested, and confident/organized; using hand gestures; leaning forward; nodding head; and having direct eye contact. Conversely, perceptions of inexpertness were cued by behaviors such as appearing unsure, nervous, confused and inattentive; lacking confidence; using stiff and formal gestures; and being unreactive. A similar investigation by Dell and Schmidt (1976) found that frequency counts of similar behaviors differentiated high and low rated counselors on perceived expertness. The performance of these nonverbal behaviors in other investigations has produced the intended perceptions of counselors as experts or inexperts (e.g., Siegel & Sell, 1978; Strong & Schmidt, 1970a). In addition, the effects of the counselor non-verbal behaviors associated with being relaxed and responsive on perceived expertness have been found in several other studies (Claiborn, 1979; Dell & Schmidt, 1976; LaCrosse, 1975; Peoples & Dell, 1975; Strong, Taylor, Bratton, & Loper, 1971).

Other research has focused on the perceptions of counselors as a function of their verbal behaviors. The amount or level of talking (low, medium, or high) does not seem to affect client perceptions of counselor competence (Kleinke & Tully, 1979). In one study low-disclosing counselors were rated significantly more expert than high disclosing counselors (Merluzzi et al., 1978), but in another study disclosing counselors were viewed as being equally competent as nondisclosing counselors (Nilsson, Strassberg, & Bannon, 1979). The use of psychological terms or psychological jargon has been found to increase perceptions of the counselor's knowledge of psychology (Atkinson &
A counselor superior to a specific verbal therapist in an interview was rated higher in expertise by interpretative co-workers, employing facilitative, empathic, responsive feedback. However, this result was not replicated, however, when the same study was performed with the clients from a Veterans Administration Hospital Clinic (Snyder, Larsen, & Bloom, 1976). Scheid (1976) examined self-report data on perceptions with regard to two factors, counselor behavior, and levels of the facilitative core conditions and counselor status (as outlined in an introduction). He found that counselor behavior produced a main effect on six dependent measures (counselor comfort, counseling climate, client satisfaction, counselor warmth, counselor competence, and general counselor appeal), indicating a strong general effect of counselor behavior. Four studies have found that the counselor’s behaviors seem to account for a major portion of the variance in subject’s perceptions (Amira & Abramovitz, 1975; Sell, Schmidt, 1976; Scheid, 1976; Siegel & Sell, 1976).

Only one study has examined the influence function of the differential perceptions due solely to the abovementioned expert-like behaviors. Jones and Schmidt (1970a) found that the nonverbal behaviors alone were not sufficient to produce a significant effect on the subject’s behaviors.

In short, it appears that a range of both nonverbal (e.g., assertive, attentive, confident, organized) and verbal behaviors (e.g., using jargon, interpretative statements) do affect ratings of counselor expertise. The effect of behavioral evidence of expertise on counselor power is largely unexplored.
consistently cue perceptions of counselor expertness. The function of each of these sources alone in terms of influencing a counselor's ability to alter clients' opinions is not well established. Evidence does suggest, however, that when sources of counselor expertness are combined, counselor's perceptions of expertness as well as the counselor's ability to influence clients' opinions is increased. Only four studies examined behaviors that might be influenced due to perceived counselor expertness. It appears that only client behaviors that require a minimum level of effort were modifiable, and that behaviors requiring more effort were not subject to influence.

**Attractiveness**

Schmidt and Strong (1971) defined perceived attractiveness as the client's positive feelings about the counselor, "liking and admiration for him, desire to gain his approval, and desire to become more similar to him" (p. 348). The utility of perceived counselor attractiveness was initially based on early studies of communication and attitude change which indicated that perceived attractiveness enhanced the ability of a communicator to influence his audience (Back, 1951; Brock, 1965; Sapolsky, 1960). Thus, it was hypothesized that the more attractive the counselor was perceived, the greater the counselor's ability to influence the client. Two questions need to be answered at this point: What type of events influence a client's perceptions of counselor attractiveness?, and What is the function of such client perceptions on counselor power?

Strong (1968) proposed that perceived counselor attractiveness was based heavily on the counselor's behaviors within the interview, specifically behaviors denoting unconditional positive regard and accurate empathy (Rogers, 1957; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967) as well as direct disclosure of experiences, feelings, problems, and attitudes similar to those shared by the client. An analysis of the research on counselor attractiveness revealed investigations which have examined
the effects of (a) attaching verbal labels denoting counselor attractiveness in pre-interview sessions, (b) characteristics of and/or characteristics associated with the counselor, (c) nonverbal counselor behaviors, and (d) verbal counselor behaviors.

The effects of pre-interview counselor descriptions or introductions on perceived counselor attractiveness have been examined in several studies. Greenberg (1969) investigated the effects of informing college students in a pre-interview session that the counselor they were about to hear in an audiotaped interview excerpt was either warm or cold. The students rated themselves as more attracted to the warm therapist and also were more receptive to counselor influence attempts. Patton (1969) obtained similar results in analogue interviews by manipulating pre-interview introductions, liking and being similar to, or not liking and being dissimilar to the client. Goldstein (1971) replicated both of these studies. Essentially he concluded that pre-interview introductions influenced perceived counselor attractiveness when subjects listened to tapes, but seemed to be less effective when subjects subsequently talked to the counselor.

A later study (Claiborn & Schmidt, 1977) found that presession information (high versus low status, and expert versus attractive power bases) did not affect subjects' ratings of the counselor's perceived attractiveness after viewing a counseling videotape.

Subsequent research examined the effects of counselor characteristics (e.g., age, sex) on perceived attractiveness. Two characteristics which seem to be interrelated are counselor sex and physical attributes. The physical attributes of a male counselor were found by Cash, Begley, McCown, and Weise (1975) to influence both male and female subjects' evaluations of counselor attractiveness. College students watched a videotape of a counselor describing himself. In half of the experimental sessions the counselor was cosmetically
altered to be physically unattractive. The results indicated that the students rated the physically attractive counselor as more intelligent, friendly, assertive, trustworthy, competent, warm, likeable, and helpful. Two other studies (Carter, 1978; Lewis & Walsh, 1978) offer slightly different findings. Both suggest that the effect of counselor physical attractiveness on perceived attractiveness may be differentially related to the sex of the counselor and the sex of the client. Specifically, both studies found that physical attractiveness exerted more influence for female counselors and clients; physically attractive female counselors were perceived more favorably by female clients. A fourth study (Fretz, Corn, Tuemmler, & Bellet, 1979) found that the sex of the counselor did not affect attractiveness ratings by female subjects.

Another counselor characteristic which has been examined within perceived counselor attractiveness has been the counselor's age. Results from one study indicate that psychiatric inpatients under 30 years of age rated themselves as significantly more attracted to younger counselors, while other inpatients (ages 30-45, 46 and older) did not differ significantly in their attraction ratings to younger versus older counselors (Lasky & Salomone, 1977). Another study (Kerr & Dell, 1976) found that attractiveness ratings were not affected by characteristics such as interviewer attire (professional or casual) or interview setting (professional or casual).

Several investigations examined the effects of nonverbal behaviors on perceived counselor attractiveness. Strong, Taylor, Bratton, and Loper (1971) initially found that counselors who manifested greater frequencies of nonverbal movements within an interview (e.g., changed body position and posture, smiled, frowned, gestured, changed head and eye orientations, as well as crossed and uncrossed their legs) were rated by subjects as higher in perceived attractiveness. LaCrosse (1975) investigated similar behaviors (e.g., smiles, positive head nods,
gesticulations, eye contact, shoulder orientation, body lean) and concluded that counselors displaying these behaviors at high frequencies were perceived as more attractive. Other research has subsequently found that interviewers in analogue research engaging in these responsive nonverbal behaviors are perceived as more attractive than interviewers engaging in the unresponsive nonverbal behaviors (e.g., Claiborn, 1979; Fretz et al., 1979). One study examined the effects of nonresponsive and responsive nonverbal behaviors or perceived counselor attractiveness in different analogue formats. Fretz, et al. (1979) found that the earlier non-participatory analogue results did not generalize to the participatory analogue clients exposed to distinct nonverbal conditions did not differentially rate counselors on perceived attractiveness.

Another class of nonverbal behaviors relates to interpersonal interaction distance. Early research not only found that subjects had preferences for certain spatial features (e.g., seating arrangements) of the counseling environment (e.g., Dinges & Oetting, 1972; Haase, 1970; Haase & Dimattia, 1970) but also that the spatial features affected counseling (e.g., Haase & DiMattia, 1976). One study has examined the effects of seating distance on perceived counselor attractiveness. Boucher (1972) found that schizophrenic (but not alcoholic) clients seated within intimate distances (i.e., 12 inches) rated counselors as less attractive than clients seated at personal (i.e., 39 inches) or social (9 feet) distances.

Another series of studies have investigated the effects of verbal behaviors on perceived counselor attractiveness. One counselor behavior which has received a great deal of attention has been self-disclosure. Within counseling, researchers have identified both positive and negative outcomes of counselor self-disclosure (cf. Dies, 1973; Jourard, 1971; Powell, 1968; Weigel & Warnath, 1968). Within the counseling interpersonal influence
literature, counselor self-disclosures in general have been found to increase perceptions of counselor attractiveness (Merluzzi et al., 1978; Nilsson et al., 1979). In addition, counselor self-disclosures of similar experiences, feelings, and attitudes as that of the subjects have increased ratings of perceived counselor attractiveness (Hoffman-Graff, 1977; Strong & Schmidt, 1971). In examining the sources of both perceived counselor expertness and attractiveness, one study suggests that if a counselor was perceived as an expert, a high degree of self-disclosure would temper an otherwise unattractive role (Merluzzi et al., 1978). Another counselor behavior, talking level, has also been investigated; counselors with low talking levels were rated more positively on perceived attractiveness variables than counselors with medium or high talking levels (Kleinke & Tully, 1979).

Attractive and unattractive counselor roles were developed for analogue research (Schmidt & Strong, 1971) which combined many verbal and nonverbal behaviors (e.g., expressed similarities, body lean, friendly, responsiveness). These role prescriptions have been successful in several investigations (e.g., Dell, 1973; Merluzzi et al., 1977; Sell, 1974; Strong & Dixon, 1971). The relative effects of the nonverbal and verbal behaviors on perceived counselor attractiveness is largely unknown. One study suggests that initial perceptions of counselor attractiveness are more heavily dependent on the nonverbal than verbal behaviors (Caliborn, 1979).

In short, the research suggests that a wide variety of events influence perceptions of counselor attractiveness. Two findings appear most consistently. First, several responsive nonverbal behaviors have been consistently related to perceptions of counselor attractiveness: smiles, gestures, eye contact, body lean, shoulder orientation. Second, several counselor verbal behaviors (e.g., self-disclosures, low talking levels) have also been positively related to
perceptions of counselor attractiveness. Other research leads to more tenative conclusions. Pre-interview introductions seem to influence initial perceptions of counselor attractiveness, although some evidence suggests that the pre-interview perceptions are short lived and may change after the initial session. The physical attractiveness and sex of the counselor seem to differentially affect ratings of perceived counselor attractiveness, based on the sex of the client and counselor. Other counselor characteristics, such as age, attire, and office setting, have not been fully examined and thus no conclusions can be drawn. One preliminary finding is that the effect of age of the counselor on perceived counselor attractiveness may be more important for clients under 30 years of age. Likewise, the research regarding the effects of interpersonal interaction distance on perceived attractiveness is inconclusive.

Another group of analogue studies examined the effects of increasing perceptions of counselor attractiveness on counselor power. Patton (1969) combined pre-interview introductions (anticipated liking or not liking the counselor) with two counselor roles (liking or not liking the client) during a simulated counseling interview. Results indicated that ratings of attraction were affected by both conditions, and that attractive interviewers were more influential in altering the students' opinions of themselves. Schmidt and Strong (1971) varied counselor self-disclosure of similarities and dissimilarities (four per interview) and altered two counseling roles, apparent liking or disliking of the subject through gestures and manners. Results indicated that the counselors were not able to differentially alter students' self-ratings regarding their perceived need for achievement. Similarly, Sell (1974) found that the differential perceptions of counselor attractiveness did not affect ratings regarding their need for achievement. Another study found that while interviewers in an
attractive role were able to influence self-reports of completing an action plan, the frequency of these reported completions were not statistically different from other experimental manipulations (Dell, 1973). Merluzzi et al. (1977) found that black-expert and white-referent interviewers were most influential in affecting attitudinal and some behavior changes, but no significant main effects were found due to perceived attractiveness alone. In a more complex study, Strong and Dixon (1971) crossed attractive and unattractive role behavior with expert and inexpert introductions. While they failed to find influence differences between the attractiveness roles when expert introductions were present, they did find significant influence differences when the expert introductions were removed. It was concluded that expertness may mask some of the effects of perceived counselor attractiveness. Strong (1978) suggested that the masking effect due to expertness may explain the unsuccessful findings of previous research on attractiveness.

In summary, the evidence provided seems to indicate that several events influence the client's perceptions of counselor attractiveness: pre-interview introduction, the type and frequency of nonverbal behaviors, counselor self-disclosure of similarities, and low talking levels by counselors. Other events affecting perceived counselor attractiveness may be counselor and client physical attributes, sex, and age as well as interpersonal distance. The function that these events have on counselor power is less clear. In some cases, behaviors related to counselor attractiveness were able to influence clients to alter their opinions or self-ratings (Greenberg, 1969; Goldstein, 1971; Hoffman-Graff, 1977; Patton, 1969; Strong & Dixon, 1971), whereas unsupportive evidence is found in other investigations (Schmidt & Strong, 1971; Sell, 1974). The interaction effects between perceived attractiveness and expertness may explain some of the above-mentioned inconsistencies as some research suggests that
attractiveness is more functional when the counselor lacks credibility (Strong & Dixon, 1971).

**Trustworthiness**

The concept of trustworthiness is the third potential source of counselor power. Early research within social psychology investigated the effects of perceived trustworthiness, and quite consistently found that trustworthy communicators were more effective than untrustworthy ones in influencing the attitudes and opinions of other people (Cohen, 1964; Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Kelman & Hovland, 1953; Miller & Basehart, 1969). Based on this research, Strong (1968) initially described trustworthiness as a function of the communicator's (a) reputation for honesty, (b) social role, (c) sincerity and openness, and (d) perceived lack of motivation for personal gain. In addition, specific behaviors were identified which seemed likely to influence perceived counselor trustworthiness, such as "paying close attention to the client's statements and other behavior, by communicating his concern for the client's welfare, by avoiding statements indicating exhibitionism or perverted curiosity, and by assuring confidentiality of all transactions" (Strong, 1968, p. 222).

Strong and Schmidt (1970b) designed a counseling analogue study to evaluate the effects of perceived counselor trustworthiness on counselor influence. The untrustworthy role included behaviors which were intended to reflect ulterior motives on the part of the interviewer, lack of confidentiality of interview content, as well as boastfulness and exhibitionism by the interviewer. The trustworthy role included the absence of the above mentioned behaviors, and in general, a genuine interest in the client. Results indicated that the role manipulation was statistically significant, but that the mean ratings of both conditions were in the trustworthy range.
Kaul and Schmidt (1971) investigated some of the dimensions of perceived trustworthiness by varying trustworthy and untrustworthy verbal content and nonverbal behaviors in twenty-four short videotaped scenes. They were able to construct roles which led to perceptions of trustworthy and untrustworthy counselors, and also found that the interviewer's nonverbal behaviors had a greater impact on perceptions of trustworthiness than did the words that the interviewer used. A similar conclusion was found in another study by Roll, Schmidt, and Kaul (1972); physical manners (e.g., body positions, moderate relaxation, affirmative head nods, hand movements, eye contact) were stronger cues than verbal content for inducing perceptions of trustworthiness. Other research found that counselors were perceived as more trustworthy when their nonverbal behaviors were responsive rather than nonresponsive (Claiborn, 1979). Two studies have examined the effects of specific verbal behaviors on perceived trustworthiness. One investigation found that interpretative statements by counselors were perceived as more trustworthy than restatements (Claiborn, 1979). Another study found that low disclosing counselors were perceived as more trustworthy than high disclosing counselors (Merluzzi et al., 1978). The latter study also found an interaction based on the sex of the counselor; low-disclosing female counselors were rated more trustworthy than high disclosing female counselors, but male high and low disclosing counselors were not different from one another.

Rothmeier and Dixon (in press) studies the effects of perceived counselor trustworthiness on counselor influence using an extended counseling analogue. The untrustworthy role included topic shifts, inaccurate paraphrasing, factual inconsistency, mood and interest change, and a breach in confidentiality. The extended analogue allowed the consistency dimension of trustworthiness to be introduced into the roles. They found statistically significant role differences
in perceived interviewer trustworthiness which held up in a one week follow-up.

Two of these studies examined the effect of perceived trustworthiness on counselor influence. Strong and Schmidt (1970b) found that the experimental manipulation did not differentially influence the client's self-rating regarding need for achievement (note that the manipulation of the independent variable was only marginally successful in this study). Rothmeier and Dixon (in press) found no significant effect of the role manipulation on need for achievement rating immediately following the interview, but a significant effect on the achievement ratings was evident at a one-week follow-up testing.

In summary, several studies have delineated events which positively affect perceptions of counselor trustworthiness: responsive nonverbal behaviors, interpretative statements, behaviors associated with confidentiality, few consistent behaviors, self-disclosures, and in some cases the sex of the counselor. Only two investigations have examined the effects of perceived trustworthiness on counselor power, and only one study has found that perceived trustworthiness increased the counselor's ability to alter the clients opinions. In comparison, less research has been conducted on perceived counselor trustworthiness than perceived attractiveness or expertness. In turn fewer conclusions can be made regarding which events affect perceptions of counselor trustworthiness, and less can be stated about the effect of perceived trustworthiness on counselor power.

Future Research

The purpose of this section is to discuss directions for future investigations, both in terms of delineating research questions as well as identifying research methodologies which may contribute to the development of the interpersonal influence research in counseling. Specifically, topics to be examined include: (a) theory testing and construction, (b) recent research from social
psychology, and (c) internal and external validity.

Strong and Matross (1973) theoretically described counselor power (P) as a function of the congruence between the perception of the counselor as a helpful resource (R) and the perceived needs (N) of the client; symbolically depicted as \( P = f(R \cong N) \). It is important to note that the major focus of the interpersonal influence research has centered on the events which influence the manner in which the client perceives the counselor (Strong, 1978). There has been an absence of research which has systematically explored the effects of the client's perceived needs on counselor power. Because of this absence, the theoretical formula \( P = f(R \cong N) \) regarding the components of counselor power, has not been examined (save Heppner & Dixon, 1978). Likewise, to date many of the studies reviewed have little implication for theory. Those studies that focus on the perception of the counselor as the only dependent variable and fail to test the influence effects of the manipulated perceptions have few implications for dissonance theory (Strong, 1968), attribution theory (Strong, 1970; Brehm, 1976), reactance theory (Brehm, 1976), or any other theory of interpersonal influence.

Whereas the interpersonal influence process in counseling was originally based on research from social psychology, the subsequent counseling research in this area does not appear to have been integrated with current research from social psychology. The interpersonal influence research in counseling largely has focused on the source characteristics variable (e.g., perceived expertness). Counseling research has focused much less (if at all) on two other major variables established in social psychology on attitude change research: message variables (e.g., message discrepancy, incongruity), and recipient characteristics (e.g., locus of control, authoritarianism). For example, parallel research in counseling regarding message characteristics might be
based on the following social psychological research: messages involving threat of consequences (e.g., Miller & Basehart, 1969), opinionated messages (e.g., Mehrley & McCroskey, 1970), message incongruities (e.g., Sutton, 1970), two-sided messages (e.g., Jones & Brehm, 1970), presentation of factual evidence (e.g., McCroskey, 1969), and effects of forewarning (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1977). Other research could examine recipient or client characteristics, based on the following social psychological research: locus of control (e.g., Ritchie & Phares, 1969), authoritarianism (e.g., Harvey & Hays, 1972), and involvement with an issue (e.g., Dean, Austin, & Watts, 1971). Whereas client characteristics have been examined in counseling for some time, the application of such research to the interpersonal influence process has not been done. Client characteristics such as cognitive complexity (see Harren, Kass, Tinsley, & Moreland, 1979), expectations of counselor (see Ford, 1979), and client involvement in counseling (see Gomes-Schwartz, 1973) have been found to be important variables in counseling outcome research, and also may affect client perceptions of the counselor and the interpersonal influence process. Other lines of research from social psychology which may have relevance for counseling research involve the cognitive processes of recipients or clients through which incoming information and arguments are evaluated (see Hass, 1980), as well as the self-presentation research (impression management) on attitude change (e.g., Hass & Mann, 1976). In short, the above-mentioned social psychological investigations identify and examine variables that have been related largely to the process of attitude change, and may have a great deal of relevance for future research on the interpersonal influence process in counseling.

While some investigators have questioned the external validity of laboratory analogue research (Bordin, 1974; Goldman, 1976; 1977), other investigators
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...met none of the five boundary conditions. Meeting one or more of the boundary conditions analogue studies to counseling practice is suggested that research was needed to evaluate differences between data collected in laboratory analogues (meeting at least one of boundary conditions) and counseling settings. The results of the investigations have been mixed. Two studies found significantly different responses between subjects participating in a quasi-counseling analogue and subjects in a vicarious-participation analogue (Fretz et al., 1979; ...). Other studies have found very similar results between analogue studies and naturalistic investigations (Elliot, 1979; Helms, 1978). A more complex investigation revealed that the generalizability of analogues may be contingent on the dependent variables in question, the type of relationship to be predicted, and the experience level of the counselors (Kushner, 1978). In short, the external validity of the analogue research on the interpersonal influence process in counseling is unclear, and warrants further investigation especially with regard to a range of dependent variables.

This assessment of the external validity of interpersonal influence research does not negate the conclusions formulated earlier regarding the research findings for perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. It is the authors' opinion that the earlier research has successfully identified and isolated events associated with perceived expertness, attractiveness, and to some extent trustworthiness in counseling, which is an outcome that was achieved through highly controlled (analogue) conditions. Given the multitude of studies in this area which have emphasized internal validity, it now seems desirable to evaluate the external validity of these findings through alternative research strategies, such as through what has been labeled experimental
field and correlational field research (Gelso, 1979). Further analogue research may also have application for counseling, but should attempt to meet more of Strong's proposed "boundary conditions" than typical of previous research.

In addition to strengthening the external validity of the earlier research, field research in this area holds a great deal of potential for creating new knowledge. For example, at present there is little data on the relative or comparative effects of the various sources of expertness (or attractiveness and trustworthiness for that matter) on client perceptions of counselors, and ultimately the interpersonal process. Furthermore, research has not examined what happens to the events which cue perceptions of expertness and affect the influence process over time (i.e., after the first, second, third or nth interview). Research questions abound: Do some behaviors affect perceptions of counselor expertness and subsequently the influence process, more than others? Are some events more salient for perceived counselor expertness initially, such as diplomas and titles? Does the relative importance of events change over time, such as counselor attire, verbal behaviors (e.g., counselor self-disclosure) and nonverbal behaviors (e.g., attentiveness)?

What are the relationships between perceptions of counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness initially, and over time? In short, since Strong's 1968 position paper sufficient evidence has been gathered to support the existence of the interpersonal influence process in counseling. It appears that the general question about the existence of the process has been answered. It it now time to ask more specific questions of "who, what, when, where?" (Gelso, 1979) in examining the events associated with the interpersonal influence process in greater detail.
Footnotes

Requests for reprints should be sent to P. Paul Heppner, 210 McAlester Hall, Department of Psychology, University of Missouri- Columbia, Columbia, Missouri, 65211.
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